

From: Matt & Lisa Free [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, December 30, 2025 12:42
To: Local Plan <Local.Plan@colchester.gov.uk>
Cc: Graham Barney <grahambarney@copfordwitheasthorpeparishcouncil.gov.uk>; Copford with Easthorpe Parish Clerk <parishclerk@copfordwitheasthorpeparishcouncil.gov.uk>; withammp@parliament.uk <withammp@parliament.uk>
Subject: Re: URGENT: Comprehensive Formal Representation – Policy PP29 (Colchester Local Plan Preferred Options)

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [learn why this is important](#)

This message originated **Externally**. Do **not** click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender, were expecting it and know that the content is safe.

IMPORTANT: Please acknowledge receipt of this representation and confirm it has been registered as a valid, comprehensive objection to Policy PP29.

Dear Planning Policy Team,

Further to my previous correspondence regarding site PP29, I am writing to submit additional evidence based on the Council's recent refusal of 165 homes in Tiptree (Maldon Road) in October 2025.

I wish to specifically draw the Council's attention to the statements made by Karen Syrett (Lead Planning Officer) regarding that case, which set a clear and binding precedent for how sites like PP29 should be treated.

1. Application of Settlement Boundary Policy

In the Tiptree refusal, Karen Syrett explicitly stated that the development was rejected because it *"lies outside the settlement boundary and is therefore considered to be within the countryside."*

As PP29 is located entirely outside the settlement boundary defined in the adopted Copford with Easthorpe Neighbourhood Plan (2023), the Council must apply Ms. Syrett's logic consistently. To approve PP29 would be to ignore the very policy boundary that the Council used to defend the countryside in Tiptree just two months ago.

2. Unacceptable Harm to Rural Character

The Tiptree decision concluded that the proposal would cause *"unacceptable harm to the rural character of the landscape."*

- If 165 homes were deemed by the Council to cause "unacceptable harm" to a rural setting, then the 300 homes proposed for PP29—nearly double the scale—will have a catastrophic impact on the rural character of Copford.
- Ms. Syrett's assessment confirms that the Council views the protection of rural identity as a priority. This must extend to the protection of the green gap and the "Open Countryside" status of the land at PP29.

3. Direct Conflict with Local Standards

In the Tiptree case, the Council demonstrated that it will not sacrifice village identity for speculative housing. Given that Colchester currently maintains a 5.17-year housing land supply (as of December 2025), there is no "emergency" requirement to override Ms. Syrett's established position on boundary protection.

Conclusion

To remain consistent with the professional standards and policy interpretations set by Karen Syrett in October 2025, the Council must conclude that PP29 is an unsuitable location for development. It fails the same test of landscape harm and boundary violation cited in the Tiptree refusal.

I request that this email be formally added to my existing objections for the Regulation 18 consultation and that PP29 be omitted from the Local Plan.

Yours faithfully,

Matt Free

