



Wivenhoe Neighbourhood Plan Report on Nov 2014 Consultations Written Comments Appendix

Section A – 'live' consultation

1. Economic & Business Development (121)

Application to create new business park (52)

list positive comments (agree/important)

Don't want to add to traffic problems so depends where.

Good idea but not at the bottom

Is present bus. park fully used? If yes a new one must be at top near Vine Parade area.

If it's near top of the town and there really will be takers.

Not at the bottom, no space, traffic.

Depends what you mean by bus. park. Agree if small units and in a sensitive location near top of town.

Agree. relocate.

Or smarten up existing bus. park.

As long as it doesn't go at the bottom of town.

Not at bottom end of town, it would cause more traffic chaos.

Only if developers are not allowed to market it so that they can turn them into residential properties. need appropriate protections.

Should be, people need jobs.

Depends on location, not at bottom of village.

At the top of the town.

Depends on type of businesses attracting and location. Freelancers who do not have high volume or physical visitors could work. Otherwise traffic issues.

Build next to football ground.

Only if site is sensitive to area of Wiv and units are small. 1 light industrial to serve local employment needs.

Not in the town + possible locations are 1) Elmstead Rd next to sports ground 2) Keelars Lane.

More retail and business should be attracted to Wiv.

Yes for jobs, but where? Extra traffic needs to be considered.

Should include start-up premises to encourage local entrepreneurs. Consider moving present bus. centre to new location would reduce Avenue/High St traffic and give opportunity for small residential development.

Stimulating local employment and entrepreneurship. Needs strategic working with traffic/parking and exist-

ing businesses especially if located at top of Wiv.
New bus. park for start-ups at top of village.
A good idea but not at the bottom of Wiv. it would create even more traffic.
Not where it is now. Needs to be accessible from Keelars lane.

list negative comments (disagree/not important)

Cannot be done.
Where on earth would this fit. Is there a real need for this.
You should try living up the top with.
The infrastructure cannot take anymore traffic along the high st + Clingoe hill.
No, not needed, too much traffic.
No, it would generate too much traffic.
No, already tried at Cooks Yard- now houses.
No, it will increase traffic.
No, could increase traffic.
Why? who needs it, not at low end to keep heavy traffic down.
No to create a new one. Yes to upgrading existing one, however parking + access limited.
Plenty of businesses in Wiv. Self-employed need a hub for information exchange and networking. Bus. park an old-fashioned concept.
As usual, lower Wiv "Not on our back door" It will be dumped on the periphery as usual.

list neutral/unclear

Is there demand?
Better to make combined home working and residential use easier i.e. planning rules altered to allow mixed use.
Not in the town because no parking. improvement of current bus. park would be welcome, make it more attractive, inviting, usable.
Cannot be done.
Tried, not worked.
Should depend on road improvement.
Not sure, bus. units in new riverside development should be more fully used.
Existing bus. centre is very well used by commercial and creative businesses, because it's affordable has some flexibility and feels a safe and cooperative set-up within which to run a business or other enterprise.
There are a lot of people + small enterprises here who could use small/flexible + cheap workspaces. Start-up selling spaces etc. Whether in lower of upper Wiv. depending on whether you need footfall. small term affordable lets.
Best place for bus. park is in Engine Shed instead of another white elephant art gallery type thing.
Where?

Change of use from retail to residential (25)

list positive comments (agree/important)

Agree, shops useful for elderly people
Agree property mixed use c/should be supported our town will die if retail and business not maintained
Agree but you need to define compelling evidence x2
Agree: we need local amenities as in Brightlingsea. No room for new residential parking
Agree but market forces might prevent it anyway
Wivenhoe needs business and shops x2
Cannot afford to become bedroom community – need infrastructure and local employment opportunities balanced with residential x3
We need to encourage more business in Wivenhoe. This will not happen if existing businesses have no facilities to operate in

<p>Strongly agree. It should be made simple to allow change of use from old shops, now residential to business use again – esp to shops. Agree in principle but problem of unused sites. ? business rate level? Agree – school are at capacity. Infrastructure stretched Yes, will improve the town’s image I agree - Need for more proper shops – baker greengrocer, butcher etc. Absolutely, especially for the remaining pubs.</p>
<p>list negative comments (disagree/not important)</p>
<p>Surely this depends on the location of property, why should this be such a big deal Disagree – working patterns are changing. We need to encourage home based business and that means mixed use not one or other Would depend on location, for instance whether or not there is adequate parking.</p>
<p>list neutral/unclear</p>
<p>We should see buildings put to realistic use, not left empty until financial circumstances change. Put pressure on empty building owners What is compelling evidence. X2 We need to support our business by lowering rents. Helping with marketing etc</p>

Enquiry to formulate strategy for business parking (49)

<p>list positive comments (agree/important)</p>
<p>Yes – but a community is not <u>only</u> about supporting businesses other activities can be even more important Needs to happen A strategy is needed for <i>transport for businesses</i> not just parking – ie other ways to get about New strategy needed. The 3 hour parking limit in the car park is detrimental to people coming to wivenhoe to help at local functions Agree – especially at vine parade. Charging for parking at cooks shipyard does not help businesses Yes, but where and parking? Yes agree don’t think there should be parking charges, limits at carparks or near businesses lower Wiv. We need people to come to wiv and encourage new businesses. Not before time! X2 Are we talking shops or small manufacturing? Yes improve access wherever. (query if this was from B1?) Agree but also to support general activity Improved parking yes – but park and ride maybe? Agree but we don’t have the space Enquiry ? investigation?– for <u>all</u> as clubs, theatre, nurseries, churches all need facilities nice <u>idea</u> – providing residents are not inconvenienced not below co-op. Traffic for buses to station reaching crisis agree but it needs to be FREE parking to bring in people for local businesses so important traffic is horrendous agree, road improvements and parking enforcement also needed. Station and cook’s shipyard parking have empty spaces while roads are clogged and impassable – needs proper strategy that incorporates business needs. Not only for business x4</p>
<p>list negative comments (disagree/not important)</p>
<p>Not convinced that more parking leads to more people. We have great public transport. The council should stop charging for parking particularly in Cooks Crescent X2</p>

No, better public transport, cycle facilities

Disagree - focus on alternative ways for people to visit our businesses – bike routes, trains, foot.

Unrealistic given existing density of wiv layout x2

So they can take even more of your money in charges

list neutral/unclear

Ideology – cooks – they park on road near door, empty space in car parks

Agree re cook's yard – whenever I go past parking places are empty so it must be producing practically no revenue – A white elephant.

I would have thought this applies more to residents given low level of businesses in town

Insufficient rationale as to why and which category of business

No parking charges!

No more car parking should be provided

Needs to be done not talked about

In your dreams

No more cars

What is needed is action, not more talking! X3

You could just improve the public transport options

Too many shoppers to the co-op use the Cedric site for parking. At times hazardous

If the engine shed eventually goes that would provide extra parking space, let's push for that.

2. Countryside, River & Environment (61)

Public access to the river will be maintained or improved; leisure use of the riverbank will be confined to low-impact uses (34)

list positive comments (agree/important)
<p>Yes we are so lucky to have the river on our doorstep – let's use it more!</p> <p>Yes, public slipway needed.</p> <p>Agree but traffic needs sorting out.</p> <p>Agreed. No Romford Navy and their Chav skis.</p> <p>No jet skis. Increase signage.</p> <p>Agree. Although what is 'low impact' and some people's leisure is another's nuisance.</p> <p>Yes. A <u>usable</u> public slipway and river speed limit between barrier and Colchester.</p> <p>Public access to the river is vital if we are to develop businesses in Wivenhoe. Need to supply reasons for people to visit. Plus speed limit.</p> <p>Agree. Better disabled/buggy access.</p> <p>Yes. Get rid of the hazard of high speed bikers!!</p> <p>River access is vital to character of Wivenhoe.</p> <p>Agree maintain access to river.</p> <p>Yes – but need public landing stage accessible at all states of the tide & slipway.</p> <p>Need public landing stage and riverside path maintained.</p> <p>Enforcement of speed limits on river. No cycling on sea wall it is a footpath.</p> <p>Of course yes. Essential for quality of life.</p> <p>There should be a 'pit-stop' for tea as part of the restaurant offer (for walkers and sitters). Ideally dinghy park should go and the tarmac between Pearl Walk & barrier and some seats and play area facilities put in that area.</p> <p>Agree – sailing club could make some money selling tea and cakes?!</p> <p>Agree. The riverbank is the reason many people choose to live here.</p> <p>River access very important.</p> <p>Like this idea – can we still provide for dinghies & also open access for kayaks/canoes?</p> <p>Strongly agree limit speed activity on the water.</p> <p>No jet skis. What do we mean by public access.</p>
list negative comments (disagree/not important)
list neutral/unclear
<p>Access should be improved with parking.</p> <p>Improve free! access and Free! parking. Existing pay for parking is ludicrous, pointless and deterring visitors!</p> <p>Must consider vehicular access: already huge traffic to old shipyard.</p> <p>Free car park visitors. x4</p> <p>Easy access to the river bank and access to quay.</p> <p>Please don't ban angling on the sea wall. Would it be possible to Council to contribute to sailing club ramp rather than building own facilities.</p> <p>It will need pressure to make 'managed retreat' mean maintaining the sea wall with gaps and bridges rather than just letting it go.</p> <p>Car parking must be free to all residents at all times.</p>

Wildlife habitats will be retained or increased (10)

list positive comments (agree/important)
Yes, especially the area E of rectory road where gravel pits are. Yes – agree. Many existing green spaces are great for this & the Quarry area could have ore pedestrian access. Yes but ensure that condition is optimised too. Yes, but how? <u>Stop</u> builders building on every scrap of green left.
list negative comments (disagree/not important)
list neutral/unclear
Lots of potential for enhanced management of fields behind Cricket ground for better wildlife. We <u>must</u> make sure the orchids survive on the old 'Heath' at Wivenhoe Cross. Rare plants on increase here. Demand the highest possible levels of protection for our countryside, woods and marshes. x2 More awareness building ^education about all the 'small' ways we can work as a community to increase effectiveness of hos spaces support wildlife.

A country park will be designated along the A133 and up the edge of Salary Brook (see map), providing a wildlife corridor and open green break. No development will be permitted on this land other than in very exceptional circumstances (17)

Code	C3
Statement (short version)	Countrypark along A133
initials	16
number of comments	0
number of unreadable comments (no need to include below if you can't read them)	
list positive comments (agree/important)	Great idea to be pushed for. (the exceptional circumstances phrase is worrying though!). x2 Agree – but not with 'other than exceptional circumstances'. There should be <u>no</u> circumstances that permit development. Sounds good. Provide transport/access there too. Definitely agree. No development along Salary Brook & up Clingoe Hill. Agree, but university is already building near there. Strongly agree but needs management either by Colchester Rangers or Essex Wildlife Trust. Yes. Join up the woodlands for a wildlife corridor. Agree. But delete 'other than in exceptional circumstances'. Agree - & no circumstances should warrant developing it.
list negative comments (disagree/not important)	
list neutral/unclear	It cannot be a country park if in private ownership, but it can be a green area, not developed. Do you believe for one minute that Tendring Council will agree? Lovely pipe dream. It's on Colchester and Wivenhoe land so it can work! Colchester councillors and MP back it.. Development should be focused on <u>railway stations</u> therefore

Alresford/Wheeley not where suggested north of A133. The country park would help ditch that plan.
 Maybe link to cemetery/burial/cremation/green or woodland burial idea?
 This is a great idea although how does it work with housing development proposals.

3. Community facilities & Leisure activities (193)

A new cemetery in Wivenhoe (37)

list positive comments (agree/important)
<p>Perhaps- older residents who have always lived here may want this plus area for ashes burial. Yes but a green one natural burial site would create a new woodland. New cemetery goo but a 'green' one preferable. I support cremation too. Yes, really important to keep family connections to Wivenhoe. A cemetery is part of community life. Important. Yes, green burials too. Yes. Green area for social history of Wivenhoe. Yes- as important for community history and wildlife habitats. Definitely needed – present cemetery will soon be full. Yes, but watch out for water table and water courses. Very much overdue. I feel that it is really important to have a cemetery in Wivenhoe. I agree very strongly! Traditional + green burial please. Desparately needed we are running out of space. I would support green burial which creates a wood as at Wrabness; would benefit both the bereaved and the people of Wivenhoe in the future. An area for green burials. An area for green burial. An area for green burial is a good idea. Green cemetery only. Yes for green burials and <u>places for ashes!!</u> x2 Plant some trees and create a green cemetery. Green burial site if additional area needed. But where should this be sited? Green burial or/and garden of remembrance- cemeteries though ok use too much space. Cremate and scatter! Integrated, multi-cultural, green facility that supports cremation and green or woodland burial? How about a green or woodland cemetery site. x2</p>
list negative comments (disagree/not important)
<p>Cremate! x2 Cremation. I support cremation. Disagree. Use cremation. No need for more cemeteries. Cremate.</p>
list neutral/unclear
<p>Consider making existing cemetery more attractive.</p>

More allotments (19)

list positive comments (agree/important)
Yes there is demand so really important. Gardens are generally quite small in Wivenhoe so more important than some houses. We need to grow food to live. Plus it's quite fun. Yes. 60+ on waiting list. Always needed. Yes but smaller so more people have a chance to have one. Yes, extend existing. Lovely idea work with university. x2 Yes but where – link with Transition Wivenhoe. Is there scope for inviting people to 'allot' space in their gardens – almost like an opportunity for apprenticeships? Yes – not everyone has a garden. Smaller, taster plots seem a good idea a) so people don't fail; b) more people, esp. those without a garden can have a 'growing' experience. Yes, if there's a need. Yes, as clearly a need exists. Priority for people without gardens – Lack of suitable site for more space Use gardens! Not opposite Millfields!
list negative comments (disagree/not important)
A vogue so <u>No</u> . Tell people to use their own gardens! What happens when allotments become out of fashion?
list neutral/unclear
Not a priority, maintain open spaces but good if it stops building. I'm not personally interested in allotments, we have some, so would rather see other things being prioritised.

Additional buildings for community activities (40)

list positive comments (agree/important)
Yes, but probably more cost effective to upgrade/enlarge existing buildings. Yes, also look at existing ones. Yes, for our younger people. Save Philip Rd. If needed. Funds first to improve existing premises (grants could be available). Very important. The community buildings provision has not been extended for years and so many new houses have been built. Meeting room for small groups needed. x2 Public space to show art/design. A properly planned stage facility for G&S, drama, gigs, etc. Very important – Wivenhoe is a thriving community and there is currently a lack of facilities. Agree. If Wivenhoe is to grow we will need more. Develop a list of existing, unmet demand etc. Provided existing are fully used. What about opening up Colne Social club at the bottom of Park Rd? x2 Definitely. Re-open Philip Rd. Need modern centre to house various activities, art, sport, social, cafe, mini gym. Knock down Philip Rd and start again. Very important. Church social functions have to take place in the church which is often very inconvenient and involves hard work. Let's have Papa's Fish & Chip shop, rite for community/church use. x2 Yes. At least make full use of the existing buildings. The glacial progress of surgery and the closure

of Philip Rd suggests need for a lot mor push from WTC.
list negative comments (disagree/not important)
Surely enough community spaces exist? If further space needed then the Engine Shed seems obvious choice. I don't think we need more.
list neutral/unclear
Better use of current buildings. Bring back Philips Rd. Help WTC find funds for developing the now large site which they own. We tried that with Engine Shed which ground to a halt but would be obvious site. Improve and update existing facilities. Improve the existing before building new. Improve and update. Improve existing. Upgrade existing. Re-open/improve Philip Rd. Improve existitng. Let's update existing, e.g. computer facilities and held for older people to access information. Encourage more use of school facilities but with a Council employee to open and supervise to relieve pressure on schools' caretaking staff. Bring back Philip Rd. Great place where I learned to dan for 15 years! Improve existing. Improve existing buildings. Improve existing first. Upgrade and develop existing sites. Modern facilities needed.

A swimming pool (41)

list positive comments (agree/important)
Brilliant. Yes yes, or public one at uni would be good. Significant lack of swimming pools in the area. This is a particular issue as children need to be taught to swim when they live near a river! In cooperation with the university. Yes, with university. Please. It is a trek to Leisure Centre or B'sea (summer) and we need the exercise. Yes. Collaboration with university. Yes, please, Work with university. x3 We could share with university. Please! University has the space certainly. Is ideal. Park is not enough. Use university. Stand-alone for village too expensive/space. x3 Would be great but where? Most obvious would be to tie it in with the university. At university would be great. At the university. Good idea, to work with university. Yes it would be great to have leisure facilities within Wivenhoe – anything to avoid the traffic to Andrews Ave. With university would be great! Yes please, from LC age 4. I love swimming we need swimming pools also we need to learn so we can save our lives.

<p>Yes – especially linked with schools and university. We should be training top swimmers. University with no pool? Yes because it would be very popular.</p>
<p>list negative comments (disagree/not important)</p>
<p>No. University has age-old plans for one which would be great idea. No – work with university to improve access to sports facilities. No need for small community. No – prefer astro turf play area for kids football, netball etc. Not practical. Difficult to staff. A waste of money. Will never happen anyway. No! Too expensive. No – should be at the university. No, work with University.</p>
<p>list neutral/unclear</p>
<p>Nice idea but: -where? -running costs? -size; will it end up being too small for much use? Nice idea if funding allows but not essential. Other things more important but Shed could become swimming pool. OK with university. Otherwise money can be better spent elsewhere. Perhaps better to increase access to Colchester pool – cheaper bus fares, more direct routes, concessions for OAPs. Not essential. Other issues more important. Pool with cheap friendly cafe would be possible amenity for all young people esp. young people if admission was affordable.</p>

Improved play and social facilities for 11 to 16 year-olds (29)

<p>list positive comments (agree/important)</p>
<p>This is an investment into the whole communities future. Definitely. Start by opening Philip Rd up to youth community. Yes, but would they be used? Provision most important. Youth club needed. Yes, but <u>must</u> involve 11-16 year olds. Go for cafe-style space with internet connection. Yes, indoor and outdoor. Agree strongly. Would rather provide our young people with things to do here, particularly eve's and weekends, rather then them going off to Colchester. Agree, great idea. Pls consult youngsters They're the experts. Good idea. Where? on Park Rd? Agree. Cafe, milkshake place? Centre with support for teenage issues. Yes agree. Youth club with improved space (I.e indoor space). Favilities for older children needed. Very important. There is very little provision for young people in Wivenhoe. Ther's need to engage more with young people and have serious options for them. A cafe they might actually want to use. Adequate space and facilities for the Hub youth club are very important. Squash court like W. Mersea. Yes, important for all ages. Yes, this group is too often neglected and they need to be outside.</p>
<p>list negative comments (disagree/not important)</p>

list neutral/unclear
<p>Save Philip Rd! Need area for kids and teens. Children's play area need improving and maintaining as they are very poor for the size of the town. Needs to be more facilities in the town, not Uni. (squash courts, badminton). 15-16 year olds no longer have an interest in youth clubs. Getting volunteers to run them is the problem, but good idea in theory. Many 11-16 year olds don't go to these due to potential bullying – yes, our children suffered badly from this in Wivenhoe. Ask 11-16 year olds (at the Colne) what they'd use as not sure this age group wants a shared space. Free buses so they can get to facilities. It's the bullying that is wrong, not the facility. That can be dealt with.</p>

The plan will promote better access and facilities for all people with disabilities (27)

list positive comments (agree/important)
<p>Station access needs improving Ditto and street lighting improvement Especially at station So if you have a mobility impairment how do you get off the train from London Make all buildings with an eye to people with less ability Station essential Especially at station Good access makes it better for everyone 100% it would be disastrous otherwise Free parking near barrier for disabled users Particularly the down platform at the station Particularly the station Station access, potholes, pavements, new buildings must consider the rail station Full access to both sides of station Station still an issue Especially at station Pavements, shops, cafes at bottom of village must support this. Improve parking and keep toilets open at station, free parking at weekends, evenings. Including access to the station Stop people parking on the pavements, drop kerb by railway bridge Yes this could definitely be improved Platform height Impossible for people with disability to get across New surgery access may be problem Especially station Lack of access & facilities at station is a disgrace</p>
list negative comments (disagree/not important)
list neutral/unclear

4. Heritage & Townscape

The conservation area should be extended to include additional properties as shown on the map (15)

list positive comments (agree/important)
Important to retain character of Wivenhoe. Agree. Yes, it should be <u>adopted</u> already agreed (2008) Agree but line west on High Street should include the Folly and the Hall wall. Agree but not sure why Edwardian (?) villas on Avenue weren't included. Agree but home owners should have a channel of expressing wishes not affecting visual aspect. Agree as long as home owners can discuss changes they need for their ease and comfort.
list negative comments (disagree/not important)
Disagree. Don't pickle in aspic.
list neutral/unclear
A farce. Adoption of the Qube proposed new boundaries has already been agreed but failed to be implemented by CBC. Suggest a FOIA to see how much money was wasted by Qube consultation. Already so much new building – we need green spaces! x2 This has already been agreed by public consultation circa 2006/7. All the info has already been provided and this is on NP website. Why this area? What are the implications? What does this mean for residents? Neither agree nor disagree. Don't know enough about implications, meaning. What would this achieve? Properties often spoiled with inappropriate windows etc.

Within the conservation area controls will be put in place according to Article Four directions, for example concerning the type of windows that can be installed and to prevent properties from being rendered or re-roofed with inappropriate materials (21)

list positive comments (agree/important)
Absolutely. Surely this is exactly what a conservation area should include. This is important but undergrounding cables is as important in the conservation area. Agree or what's the point of a conservation area. Agree but energy efficiency must be encouraged. Agree with reservation. Generally agree but consideration must be given to new building materials available. Agree. Help should be offered re energy if needed. Efficiency (secondary glazing). Solar panels should be allowed. Agree. But with sensible pragmatism. Yes, but should be backed up with a conservation area design guide with advice/contacts for advice to help people do right thing. As long as cost and need is considered agree. Homeowners may need grants to accommodate this. Agree in principle but owners must be allowed to improve insulation in an appropriate way e.g. modern style double-glazing which is barely noticeable.
list negative comments (disagree/not important)
Disagree. We should be encouraging sensitive energy efficiency improvements which may include replacement wooden (not plastic) windows and external insulation. No! Heat and light most important! +enlightened architecture.

Some old properties cannot support the <u>weight</u> of double glazing and plastic windows in <u>similar style</u> should be allowed.
Disagree. small houses such as in Queens Rd are reasonably affordable. If Art. 4 then repairs would be too costly and lots rented out – landlords may not be willing to pay.
If you lived in one of those draughty houses you would fit plastic wood col windows.
Not too much fussing about style please – we need good new and innovative buildings – <u>NOT</u> Essex vernacular.
Disagree. These need considering case by case or the place will become a museum.
list neutral/unclear
Has to be balanced with sustainable energy/greener living.
Too much street furniture and signage in Cons area.
Depends on who decides. Should be light touch controls e.g. to maintain appearance of a terrace but diversity is good.

Small green spaces within the built up area should not be built on (10)

list positive comments (agree/important)
Agree - as the density of houses means lost vistas.
Homes need spaces to breathe. Ill-considered development placing smothers settlement + green swards must be preserved for their air and light contribution.
Agree. Open spaces are restorative, anti-stress etc.
Agree. The importance of green spaces to people's well-being is well recognised.
Agree and especially not the green opposite Millfield school.
Agree. These spaces are valuable for children to play.
Small green spaces are environmentally essential.
Agree. We need to keep green spaces as much as possible. No more concrete.
list negative comments (disagree/not important)
Disagree. Better to have some in-fill to keep distinct settlement.
list neutral/unclear
How do you rank the importance of these spaces? Where are we going to allow building for our expanding population. You cannot have it both ways!

Existing gardens should not be subdivided to provide building plots (37)

list positive comments (agree/important)
This is a sure way to loss of green spaces and overcorwding with knock-ons to the car parking pressures.
This would only make potential flooding worse. Don't build on gardens.
Agree that gardens should be kept and flooding needs to be considered.
Agree. Due to flooding problems.
Absolutely agree. This should not be allowed.
Agree. No garden grabbing.
Agree. Develop some design criteria to ensure new housing fits in the streetscape- too much cramming at present.
Agree. Stop over-developing.
In-fill ruins the house setting. Invariably the owner develops and then runs away to let others suffer their greed. Do not back garden snatch.
Agree up to a point. We need to have minimum sizes for gardens but very large gardens could be divided with very careful planning and design.
Agree. Green areas good for our lungs and well-being. Plant more trees.
Agree. But each application may have it's own merits. x2

Not to be done by builders who just want to make money. Clauses should be made to prevent this, i.e. living in new dwelling and then selling- avoiding taxes.
Agree. Need to preserve the character of the town.
Agree. Enough in-fill building already.
Agree!! In most cases but depends on each application.
Agree. Too much building being crammed in any space available. You need gardens.
Not a blanket ban but only allow if good access and not too close to neighbours. x2

list negative comments (disagree/not important)

Need a pragmatic approach. x2
Disagree. There should be scope for home offices, granny or children's annexes etc.
Surely it must be considered on a case by case basis.
It all depends. Pragmatic case by case approach needed.
Why not divide – many gardens are over-sized for modern living and density in towns should be increased to preserve the green belt.
Surely it should depend on the circumstances of each application. x2
If large enough and allows for development, why not?
Every application must be taken on its merits and uniqueness. x2
I think there should be a pragmatic approach to this, not a blanket rule.
Should be decided on individual case basis.
Everyone treated on merit.
Disagree on a blanket denial – some properties have decent land around and better than not looking after the garden.
Each case should be assessed on its merits.

list neutral/unclear

Only if very large and with good access to non-main roads.

5. Infrastructure needs

All new builds in Wivenhoe should be designed for energy efficiency and sustainability (26)

list positive comments (agree/important)

Agree but NO EYESORES.
Yes. Should be a law of the country! x2
Should be compulsory.
Agree but should reflect building already there.
Yes, we're very behind this curve in this country- let's make Wivenhoe a beacon of sustainability.
Yes but must be visually attractive- renewable material using recycled plastics. Deteriorating wood can look terrible!
Yes- needs to cover heat, electricity, water use & drainage i.e. permeable ground surfaces.
100% agree and that's not just slapping on solar panels on the roof. It's proper eco-design with proper eco-materials.
Agree. No planning permission otherwise.
Strongly agree, not just about solar panels. Priority is high levels of insulation and breathability, healthy as well as efficient.
Absolutely top priority.
Yes yes yes. Badd for the environment to use too much electricity.
Definitely. technology is becoming cheaper; look at German 2014 lawson energy saving standards, now part of building regulations.
It's common sense.

<p>Yes but style is important- you cannot rely on architects! V strongly agree. I don't think there should be planning consent without these plans in place. This should be national policy.</p>
list negative comments (disagree/not important)
list neutral/unclear
<p>Not if they look like the houses at Thorrington/Good point/Agreed!/Oh I like them! Building regulations already require this. Who thought that up DOH. Building regs depend on good enforcement & don't always aim high – there is scope for zero carbon homes not yet in regs. Housing developments should provide infrastructure improvements as part of their plans.</p>

We want to see much improved mobile voice and data reception in lower Wivenhoe and will therefore press for early adoption of solutions to this problem (17)

list positive comments (agree/important)
<p>Yes, but where would the mast go? Why not upper Wivenhoe? O2 3G reception is not existent in Elmstead Road and Feedhams Close. x3 Agree. Press for optical connection not towers. Agree. But don't like the idea of a new radio mast appearing! Improvement would encourage local businesses too. To what extent does poor reception/broadband disproportionately affect especially businesses of lower Wivenhoe – priority in this way perhaps. Yes, agree. Hopeless for Vodafone in lower Wivenhoe <u>but</u> where would the mast go? Agree. Why not approach St Mary's to use the tower, or barrier? Across all of Wivenhoe. It's not just lower Wivenhoe that suffers from bad reception.</p>
list negative comments (disagree/not important)
Can live with inconvenience if means no more masts.
list neutral/unclear
<p>Mine is good. Use Virgin. A life of silence is great. I have a problem in Spring Chase. I had to have Sky because there was <u>no</u> signal for TV! (near the Coop). Ours isn't too bad. (Three).</p>

6. Traffic & Transport

New developments will be permitted only where the impact on existing roads is minimised and traffic is directed away from the town onto roads feeding into the B1027 and A133 (13)

list positive comments (agree/important)
Agree- if Hythe gates were opened at peak times to help traffic flow.

As long as not along Black Horse lane- too narrow too dangerous if people would access lower Wivenhoe through Dene Park.

Yes, but how are cyclists meant to use these roads safely if there is more traffic?

Agree, but impact on other infrastructure and facilities must also be considered.

Yes, look towards A120.

Yes- needs to be integrated with business park/infrastructure ideas.

Agree, makes travel to work difficult.

Agree – current roads cannot take any more traffic.

Agree. Traffic reduction a priority. x2

list negative comments (disagree/not important)

I oppose 1-way idea for Belle Vue, Rectory Rd, The Avenue – will end up a race track.

list neutral/unclear

Adequate (not toy town) roads as should have been considered before the Port & shipyard developments were built, together with adequate and free off-road parking.

This should not prevent a modest amount of in-filling e.g. at Cedric's.

Where new development is planned, easy access to public transport and a comprehensive network of walking and cycling routes will be required (16)

list positive comments (agree/important)

Let's go for this in both old and new areas- how about Dutch scheme of no street furniture, kerbs etc so all have equal rights & responsibilities?

Of course but link parts of the town better also.

Not shared walking/cycling routes. Let's hear it for the pedestrians!

Yes & developers should pay for this.

Agree also bend on Alresford Rd for walkers & children.

Yes- every plan should include paths.

Cyclists need much safer routes and all people need to respect everyone else on the paths.

Agree & surface the Wivenhoe trail.

Absolutely. This will enhance the feel of 'community'.

Agree- walking & cycling routes are CRUCIAL (& need lighting properly).

Agree a lot. Roads too small can cause a lot of damage.

Agree. Pavements need attention.

Yes of course. The river path to uni is good but feels dangerous as a pedestrian. Future paths need demarcation.

Yes, agree, encourage lighting of alleys & clear passage.

list negative comments (disagree/not important)

list neutral/unclear

Parking, (high initial costs but long-term benefits) Consider underground where geologically suit. 1) public with bus pick-up to lower town; 2) new developments as in France, mound a dwellings (garage & utilities). New roads need to be planned to be wide enough for parking and driving along and the traffic needs to slow down.

The network of walking and cycling routes across the town will be improved, widening footpaths and pavements (31)

list positive comments (agree/important)

Yes- might stop cyclists riding on pavements.

Agree- cycling in Wivenhoe can be dangerous to cyclists and pedestrians.
 Where is the new cycle route to uni? no promised path built.
 Strong need for cycle path along the road from Wivenhoe to the university; path across fields won't be used.
 Agree, but the main cycle path needed is the one to link to Boundary Road.
 Proper cycle routes are badly needed- especially on the main road into Wivenhoe (from the University).
 Agree- but we still need a cycle/footpath to university; has been promised for years.
 A cycle path from Wivenhoe to University is needed but must be along road- across fields would not be used in the dark.
 A high priority is a cycle route between the University and Wivenhoe along the Colchester Road- this is very dangerous for both cyclists and cars, especially after dark. x2
 Good idea, not safe to cycle on the roads.
 Agree if feasible and creating traffic choke points.
 Agree- but deter cycling on pavements- children & adults on bicycles a danger to visually impaired.
 Strongly prioritise off-road, safe route from Wivenhoe to University.
 Yes, but not at the expense of narrowing roads; can bridge at the end of Station Road be widened? very tricky for cars, buses and pedestrians at present.
 This would really improve cyclist/pedestrian safety in Wivenhoe. There's not enough room for walking safely.
 Yes they should be improved on safety grounds.
 Agree, good for safety/leisure/tourism.
 Agree, but roads should be widened too. Especially at harbour end of village.
 Try Dutch scheme of removing pavements etc so all have equal rights especially below railway.
 Agree- use more back roads/different routes as shrinking main roads isn't an option, sadly.
 Agree with some reservations. Not possible in many areas.
 Don't permit developments until the cycle paths are delivered; learn from University cycle path experience.
 Pavements are lethal- repairs would be the best start! Don't widen (inserted: definitive) footpaths for bike access- safe areas to walk are essential, elderly & children don't anticipate bikes.

list negative comments (disagree/not important)

Disagree. Widening roads would make existing roads narrower & even more difficult to negotiate.
 I do agree with this comment- by widening paths it must mean narrowing roads- all for it if this doesn't happen.
 Disagree. Make roads narrower is not the answer.

list neutral/unclear

Watch the railway line. There is erosion and it will go.
 Not sure that widening pavements & footpaths would be good. Repairing & maintenance more important.
 A footpath is very much needed along Alresford Road.
 Pavements up by Broome Grove are so difficult to push a buggy on- all pot holes and so uneven; please improve pavements.

We will encourage the adoption of safe routes to schools (34)

list positive comments (agree/important)

Walking to school has obvious benefits
 Yes but need to discourage access by cars x 2
 This is a no-brainer but it needs to happen with safe walking routes and encourage parents not to take their children by car
 Safe cycle paths urgently needed
 Agree - with integrated cycle/scooter/wheel-chair/walking paths, well sign-posted with signage that educate about safe responsible usage.
 Has to be on-going and holistic
 Child walk-to-school-share instead of car-share x 2
 Maybe 'walking buses' to encourage children + parents to feel safe about walking to and from school

<p>Agree but children must be encouraged to walk to school x 2</p> <p>Agree walking and cycling</p> <p>Children should be safe and able to walk to school</p> <p>Parking on yellow lines near Broomgrove impairs safe route to school</p> <p>So they can walk and keep parents' cars further away from entrances. Nightmare!</p> <p>Agree safer routes = less cars = less traffic = bliss</p> <p>Agree children need to be kept safe</p> <p>Children must be able to walk to school if it is safe to do so x 2</p> <p>There should be safe walking routes throughout</p> <p>And slow the traffic down</p> <p>How about a 20 mph limit within 1 mile of schools</p> <p>Definitely needed especially for older children who come and go alone</p> <p>Has to be on-going and holistic</p> <p>Yes why hasn't this happened already?</p> <p>Who would think otherwise</p> <p>No parking outside schools</p>
list negative comments (disagree/not important)
<p>Stating the obvious</p> <p>This is impossible as all parents derive and park wildly on paths, verges, green spaces. Great in an ideal world.</p> <p>I disagree that all parents drive wildly - in my experience most are concerned with all children's well-being/safety</p> <p>I have no choice but to drive as we both work but I always park contentiously</p>
list neutral/unclear
<p>Do you mean cars or pedestrians?</p> <p>More worried about secondary school transport provision</p>

Developments must be designed to minimise car use and encourage innovative transport solutions, such as community car sharing clubs, electric changing points and improved transport information (50)

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. list positive comments (agree/important) 2. Yes! Park and Ride by 'Green' buses 3. Agree, no more residential development otherwise 4. Agree, Build the University cycle path and surface the Wivenhoe Trail 5. Agree Cheaper bus and train tickets to Colchester might cut down a lot of traffic 6. Agree traffic already a problem 7. Traffic needs to be reduced. Hard to cross the road, especially for the lederly. Only one zebra crossing none at Vine Parade/Colchester Road. 8. Agree congestion is terrible, particularly The Avenue where vehicles regularly mount pavements 9. Yes. Cycle paths and have bike parks to leave them safely 10. Yes. Why is there no free parking in RR Station lots when no/few trains? Sundays? Evenings? 11. Lower price on public transport as well needs to be actioned 12. Frequent public transport 13. Traffic a major problem 14. What about improving the transport solutions first – light along cycle path 15. There is little excuse for so much car use – our transport is extremely good by most standards 16. Support electric car initiatives, charging points and car sharing clubs 17. More people should walk or use the bus so the roads are not so busy 18. Hitching post to university or to train station 19. It would be an advantage if there were bus routes to other villages or other parts of Colchester
--

20. Can the town/university look at an electric 'milk float' type vehicle to run regularly, dropping in to pick up especially around houses for elderly to increase access and minimise traffic?
21. Needs online strategy and good advertising
22. Yes – please also address the awful state of pavements congestion in the Avenue
23. The roads in Wivenhoe can't take any more
24. as above Yes absolutely
25. Absolutely essential to the survival and prosperity of Wivenhoe

list negative comments (disagree/not important)

1. When will this ever happen? Dream on(2)
2. as above
3. Nice idea but dream on
4. Wishful thinking! Developers use this as an excuse to cut down on parking space resulting in narrow roads congested with parked cars
5. People want to keep their cars but improved transport facilities would be good
6. Society is already reliant on cars etc. More education needed to 'look after yourself' exercise
7. Think it's about educating folks on these issues. The narrow roads are part of the charm of Wivenhoe maybe develop 'pull in' areas and speed ramps
8. I don't see this as a priority
9. Start building that bloody promised cycle path and then we might have some faith in these sorts of process. We can then see some results
10. Cars are here to stay – developers must provide enough space to keep cars off the paths
11. Disagree - investment in public transport systems FIRST
12. Nice idea but unrealistic. People like their cars Park Road needs double yellows on one side
13. People need cars, get over it!
14. Just silly and unrealistic
15. How long has it taken to NOT provide cycle path to the university?
16. Is this really a question of attitude? This area is one of the heaviest car-using in the country
17. Developments should be designed/built with properly sized access roads and adequate free parking for residents/visitors.
18. More houses = more cars, end of story
19. as above – totally agree

list neutral/unclear

1. Hazardous at times for both traffic and pedestrians
2. Stop building on front space. Don't be lazy park on your front drive/in your garage, it's what it's for.
3. Can electric car charging points be integrated with green technology – solar? Wind?
4. New roads the solution. BICYCLES easy, comfortable enjoyable cheap healthy keeps the fat off faster than walking
5. New roads should be wider to allow street parking and off-street parking. But community car sharing and electric charging point a good idea
6. Traffic in the Bowes Road should be looked at and parking for residents should be applied

7. University

Any university development must include plans to cut car use in order to lessen traffic on Clingoe Hill, Greenstead roundabout and Colchester Road (57)

list positive comments (agree/important)

Create safe car-free cycle route for wiv station to uni
 Agree -also need a safe cycle route x 3
 Yes - but how?
 What about a rail station for the University where the footbridge is

Try to discourage car use which has grown enormously
 The new junction on Clingoe Hill is only signposted Knowledge Gateway and it should also be sign-posted University North Campus and be promoted as primary entrance.
 The uni must consider impact of expansion and how people will get there x2
 Need safe cycle route , car share, etc
 Agree, they should fund a bus system
 Agree - why no shuttle bus from town for example x4
 Agree but need way to make it happen
 And agreements should be followed up e.g. Uni were allowed multi-storey car park on the condition we got cycle path which did not materialise x2
 Traffic should be directed to Clingoe Hill - this would mean moving the uni barrier.
 Agree and should include agreement to upgrade and reopen Boundary Road

list negative comments (disagree/not important)

So what do you suggest? Open Boundary Road for uni people would decrease movement on Clingoe Hill but still bunch at junctions
 Unrealistic and better to become more realistic and understand relationship between uni & Colchester Council
 Unrealistic x 2
 Pie in the sky. We all love our cars too much
 Unrealistic. Uni is a business and will do what it likes. We need to look at new route to A12.
 How would this be a practical objective? New development surely means for people.

list neutral/unclear

Boundary Road should be open x 11
 Electronic sign to indicate when barrier is open
 ECC needs to 'adopt' Boundary Road x2
 Open barrier when roadworks/incident on Clingoe Hill x 5
 Traffic also heavy on the Avenue leading to the University towards Greenstead
 Traffic such a problem in village and access to
 Traffic build-up at peak times already unacceptable
 Cycling Boundary Road through is lovely now on the bus
 Educate people not to block the roundabout at the bottom of Clingoe Hill
 Ease congestion by having bridges over roads and open up Boundary Road
 Cycle path is so long overdue its embarrassing.
 Reduce the time to cross the road at the pelican crossing at Tesco's roundabout
 Paint do not enter hatching on Tesco roundabout
 Can't see why uni was given huge lights/junction on Clingoe Hill as well as their private road

Developments put forward by the University without pre-application consultation with Wivenhoe Town Council will be opposed (10)

list positive comments (agree/important)

1. Agree – we should as a town be a part of the process for any development
2. Uni must consult or residents could find increased students presence less acceptable especially with loss of facilities e.g. shops bank etc.
3. Agree, uni sees itself as part of Colchester not Wivenhoe. How can this be addressed?

list negative comments (disagree/not important)

- Must work with University most students are a delight and add to life here – especially in bringing diversity – only a tiny minority a nuisance but effects disproportionate
- Don't oppose just for the sake of it if has not been consulted on first – only oppose on valid grounds otherwise our opposition will loose credibility
- Why? The uni is outside the town

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No, fault in Wivenhoe TC views on development and application , having see very amatuerish bigoted and erroneous comments – disagree Absolutely disagree, better to have more open communication
list neutral/unclear
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If the university wish to develop they should be made to open their road for all traffic So get that cycle way built and improve Route 57

8. Residential & Land use

What sort of houses does Wivenhoe need?

Recent house building within Wivenhoe has mainly provided family homes. Our research has found a need for a greater mix, and thus more of the following types: do you agree or disagree? Particularly if you disagree, please explain further (39)

- Some smaller homes for single people and young couples

list positive comments (agree/important)
Affordable homes Definitely, but must be of a good build, design and garden plots. Nobody wants Hythe type apartments – our 20/30 years old children hate them. Buy to let should be prohibited. Agree and housing for rent Yes, affordable Yes, but why is there no ‘affordable’ housing category Affordable housing so our children have an opportunity to stay Yes, can buy to let be controlled? Affordable housing for local first time buyers Young and old, proper people space with room to stretch and access to the outdoors – affordable, not stingy and cheap, and GREEN GREEN GREEN.
list negative comments (disagree/not important)
These already exist but are too expensive. Building more won’t help. Not a good idea in the long term families should be able to stay in their homes as they grow in size and number.
list neutral/unclear

- Homes that are suitable for older people who wish to downsize

list positive comments (agree/important)
People want to stay in their own familiar homes as long as possible Within walking distance of shops But not too far from shops and transport
list negative comments (disagree/not important)
list neutral/unclear
But profit will always win I am sorry to say

- Sheltered/ supported housing for the elderly

list positive comments (agree/important)
Agree over other options although overall smaller homes to house folks with a need

Where not peripheral to community, lower Wivenhoe would be good as many don't drive Not stuck on too far from public transport More sheltered/supported housing needed This does not exist at all at present More sheltered housing will be needed as we all live longer More supported housing could free up existing larger houses Critical that need is carefully assessed not just demand, so housing is available for trusts / housing associations
list negative comments (disagree/not important)
list neutral/unclear
Need fewer London commuters Sustainable energy efficient houses whoever they are for This will never happen they wont make enough money for developers

- A residential care home for the elderly

list positive comments (agree/important)
Small dwellings for a mixture of occupants Do we have a good care home too? 21st century mix of housing We need to keep existing sheltered housing There is no provision at present for a care home Yes to care home. Does the positive response indicate ages of people at this wall? Yes I am getting old! Agree but not out in the sticks away from village facilities and activities Care home not 100 beds. Small scale 30 max in keeping with Wivenhoe. Think about needs of residents not care home owners, look at small scale operators.
list negative comments (disagree/not important)
we don't want any more Wivenhoe does not need any more building, other areas in borough should be developed
list neutral/unclear
cottage hospital facility attached to a decent medical centre would be good The elderly will always be forgotten about, they don't make the council any money

Where should new housing be built (and where should it not be built?)

Any decisions on this have to be based on clear arguments that will stand up to examination and to challenges from landowners. A set of criteria have yet to be decided but our working list is as follows, we would like your views on the importance of the following (64)

- Wivenhoe's identity as a separate town/village must be preserved with a clear green break between the University (on both sides of Colchester Road) and the Wivenhoe settlement area, and with a clear break between Wivenhoe and Alresford

list positive comments (agree/important)
--

Important to preserve the setting and identity of communities and to retain light and air to settlements. No need to swamp villages with expanding boundaries, there are other options. Wiv must be kept as a separate town not become an extension of Colch. Clear break between Colch and Wiv must be kept. who wants to be labeled as east Colch?
list negative comments (disagree/not important)
list neutral/unclear

- There should be a presumption against development on land zoned as coastal protection belt (see map)

list positive comments (agree/important)
no reduction of the cp belt coastal area is important part of Wivenhoe's character I thought this was already guaranteed protect the setting of the Colne river should be dredged important not to build houses vitally important no building on site beside Millfield isn't this obvious?
list negative comments (disagree/not important)
Area near Millfields field could be new sports/social building so I guess I disagree
list neutral/unclear

- No land of high landscape value should be developed and the vistas from and towards Wivenhoe should be protected

list positive comments (agree/important)
Any application needs to be looked at from this point of view.
list negative comments (disagree/not important)
list neutral/unclear

- Land that is environmentally important for nature conservation should not be used [no written comments]
- New housing must be spread across several locations. Small developments will be preferred to larger ones

list positive comments (agree/important)
Yes, only smaller- in keeping with infrastructure. Agree but cost implications. Yes – keep character rather than huge housing estates. No houses required but small is best if has to be. Yes – imaginative in-fill, changed use – anything rather than sprawl.

<p>Agree – need to design developments on scale which helps create community. Agree – large developments are anonymous and soul destroying. Yes, only small developments.</p>
<p>list negative comments (disagree/not important)</p>
<p>No. It will cause trouble with people buying houses with (view?) they'll be hemmed in. Preferably no development at all.</p>
<p>list neutral/unclear</p>
<p>Least worst option, but where? It's a myth that more housing is needed. We need house prices to come down. Keep to minimum. Prefer minimal development. No development. x2 No building on land that can grow food.</p>

- Sites and types of development which will not lead to a significant increase in peak hour traffic on busy roads such as Rectory Road and the Avenue are to be preferred

<p>list positive comments (agree/important)</p>
<p>Agree but bus provision needed. Agree as long as the bus route is meaningful (and not just a planning exercise). Absolutely vital. It was a disgrace that Cooks Yard development was permitted without building a new road access. x2 Yes but how? These are main roads in and out!!</p>
<p>list negative comments (disagree/not important)</p>
<p>list neutral/unclear</p>
<p>Also not through Dene Park as traffic incresed here 1000-fold. Why not make these roads a one-way system? Create a new road out of Wivenhoe via Anglesea Road, Ballast Quay and then behind Millfield up to Keelars Lane. x3 All potential sites need to be considered and suitable traffic management solutions found (also public transport)</p>

- Development should be sited to allow easy pedestrian and cycle access to the rest of Wivenhoe settlement area and should be within 0.5 miles of a bus stop

<p>list positive comments (agree/important)</p>
<p>Absolutely agree but 0.5 mile is quite a long way. Send some buses more widely. Good ides but half a mile is quite a long way for some people. Better than nothing though, x2 Important but not if this is used to argue for new development on green fields. But <u>no</u> bikes on pedestrian paths or footpaths as now a hazard. Important footpath for everyone on Alresford Rd.</p>
<p>list negative comments (disagree/not important)</p>
<p>0.5 miles is far too long for people with walking problems.</p>
<p>list neutral/unclear</p>
<p>Bus companies may change their routes and services so it is not relevant where houses are built, instead fo-</p>

cus on influencing bus companies to continue providing services.
Whole huge question of parking and access needs.
Separate bike tracks, enforce bike lights/bells and off! pavements.
A large part of Wivenhoe is already more than 0.5 mile away from bus stop.

- Benefits from rival uses for a site, such as playing fields, open space, cemetery and allotments, must be assessed when judging suitability for housing use

list positive comments (agree/important)
list negative comments (disagree/not important)
who's getting the backhanders? Housing has to go somewhere, Integrated small scale development don't forget the value of open land, for food productio and landscape consideration to be given to higher density priority should be given to essential community infrastructure
list neutral/unclear

Section B – on line voXup[©] consultation

Because of the different methodology used in the on-line consultation, it was not possible to connect Agree or Disagree votes with any particular comment and in this Section of the Written Comments no attempt has been made to read a negative or positive into the comments, so all have been grouped together.

Where no on-line comment at all was left in any of the main or sub-headings of any of the 8 consultation categories, those headings have been omitted below.

1. Economic & Business Development (19)

Application to create new business park (12)

- The existing business park should be better developed or even re built to better use the space.
- Maybe to a new Business park but the current one could be better developed.
- No to any Business Park in Lower Wivenhoe. It can't take any more traffic - not even postal courier vans to desktop businesses.
- Yeah it would be good to see some concrete plans, esp about the planned types of businesses.
- Should be more attractive than current ugly one.
- The current one looks unsightly.
- location should be on the edge of the built up area.
- Agree in principle, much more detail needed.
- In addition to the university knowledge gateway?
- all depends where.
- This seemed to be an important point as business premises are a distinct need.
- not any old business park, but something which is well thought out, supports the needs of the community. near exit roads - ie not creating additional traffic. also need to think about foot/cycle access from town.

Change of use from retail to residential (3)

- It depends who the judges of the evidence are. Objectivity needs to be ensured.
- Agree with this. It'll be tough to balance against the demand for housing
- Wivenhoe has lost retail business premises in recent times because demand for homes, which command relatively high prices, has led to a paucity of shops in the town.

Enquiry to formulate strategy for business parking (4)

- Parking needs to be rationalised to allow free flow of traffic, usher commuters into the station carpark, and provide space for visitors and customers
- high time somebody did!
- Parking in Lower Wivenhoe restricted in most part to residents to avoid people driving around looking for somewhere to park. Free parking in council car park by

- barrier to enable this restriction to work for visitors and those from upper Wivenhoe
- need to think about how to have 'smarter parking' - currently too many cars touring lower Wiv, looking for spaces. perhaps limited parking there (short stay/residents only/disabled only, but more awareness of availability elsewhere.

2. Countryside, River & Environment (9)

Public access to the river will be maintained or improved; leisure use of the riverbank will be confined to low-impact uses (6)

- Public access
- It's a shame the tables have been removed from the front of the pub for more parking; You can't get away from the hustle and bustle of the town any more because the cars are there. It doesn't feel as natural any more.
- There should be a public hard; The area around the quay should be a no parking zone; Some features or seating further along river would be good; Parking charges at Cooks should be lifted to encourage people from top of town to come and walk and enjoy river.
- essential to the character of the town, which still feels like a village.
- greater provision of seating along the river, not just near the Rose and Crown but upstream and downstream.
- The river aspects are a highly valued feature of Wivenhoe. .My judgement of enjoying this is in peace.....sailing craft Yes, speedboats No.

A country park will be designated along the A133 and up the edge of Salary Brook (see map), providing a wildlife corridor and open green break. No development will be permitted on this land other than in very exceptional circumstances (3)

- As long as there are no houses
- The 'country park' will be open space with opportunities for leisure use, especially cycling and walking, but no future development for housing or business.
- country park may not be the most appropriate designation, maybe other forms of planning restraint. Other country park locations eg 41 acres may deliver more for the purposes of a country park.

3. Community facilities & Leisure activities (9)

This was one of the 'ranking' questions for which the live consultation questions had to be adapted. Respondents to the online consultation were alerted in this section's introductory paragraph that there were 5 proposals following which they were asked to rank in importance. As only a Yes/No could be entered, no ranking beyond a first choice was in reality possible.

A new cemetery in Wivenhoe (2)

- Essential, huge demand to be buried in Wivenhoe, both woodland, conventional

and putting ashes into area designated and landscaped appropriately.

More allotments (1)

- Yes, there is a waiting list, demand, and a community organised to run allotments.

Additional buildings for community activities (1)

- Art spaces are dotted around town and generally very small, a permanent larger space would be good.

A swimming pool (3)

- That would be great instead of travelling across town
- would be a fantastic asset for town
- Work closely with University. Very effective in the health and wellbeing agenda for all residents.

Improved play and social facilities for 11 to 16 year-olds (2)

- That would be great! there isn't really any places for teens to 'hang out'.
- I don't have a child that old - there's plenty for the younger ones, but can see the lack in their age range and the value for everyone of there being something for them. The local young people are so great, they are really kind to younger ones when they come onto the skate park etc. i'd support indoor and outdoor spaces for meeting up, and maybe equipment if feasible.

4. Heritage & Townscape (2)

Existing gardens should not be subdivided to provide building plots (2)

- i've agreed with this but feel that as it stands the proposal is too rigid
- Must depend on the size of the garden and the impact of additional traffic on the adjoining road: the house may change hands in the future and what started as a granny annex may become a young couples' home.

6. Traffic & Transport (2)

Where new development is planned, easy access to public transport and a comprehensive network of walking and cycling routes will be required (1)

- Public transport may have to be adapted to the new development. You cannot rule out development because there is no access to public transport AT PRESENT.

The network of walking and cycling routes across the town will be improved, widening footpaths and pavements

- i cannot vote on this: it is up to ECC Highway

7. University

Any university development must include plans to cut car use in order to lessen traffic on Clingoe Hill, Greenstead roundabout and Colchester Road (2)

- It is worth bearing in mind that many University staff live outwith Colchester and can only get to work in a reasonable time by car.
- Just makes sense. If you are expanding and thus inevitably causing more traffic then you need to show how you are ensuring you are lessening existing traffic. Most students and staff DON'T need to drive. Put in more restrictions and it is easier for those that genuinely do.

Developments put forward by the University without pre-application consultation with Wivenhoe Town Council will be opposed (1)

- this is just silly. 'No application will be entertained until after consultation with WTC has taken place'

8. Residential & Land use

Where should new housing be built (and where should it not be built?)

- some limited build on this (i.e. Green belt) is ok, a lot of the surrounding land is zoned like this so it would really restrict if we protect it all.
- There should be no building of new houses that would increase the traffic along Rectory Road/ Rectory Hill. Traffic has increased significantly over the past years and should new housing be built in Alresford as is proposed then it would increase even more. It is a route used by many children walking to and from Millfields School and would increase the danger to them. Wivenhoe council should stop Brett lorries/cement mixes using the road at high speed as a cut through our village when there are other more direct routes they could use. New housing would be better suited to the land adjacent to Wivenhoe fire station.
- Sounds like a very sensible plan! Is there any influence over transport planning here?
- Surely you'd bring the buses to the development, not the other way round?
- This is crucial. Traffic is an issue and much of it is people driving within the town area, which isn't necessary in most cases. Get most people out of cars, and then journeys that require cars will be quicker. and everyone's safer.

END