

From: **Mark Bloomfield** <

Date: Wed, 22 Apr 2026 at 21:24

Subject: Feedback on the Feasibility and Suitability of Development Proposals: Land East of Copford

To: <>

I am writing to provide feedback regarding the feasibility of the two options currently proposed for the "Land East of Copford." Having reviewed the site maps and the neighbour feedback in the context of the Copford with Easthorpe Neighbourhood Plan, I wish to highlight several critical constraints that challenge the viability of these proposals.

1. Conflict with Established Local Plan Allocation

The feasibility of these proposals is undermined by their departure from the Colchester City Council Local Plan.

- **Volume Discrepancy:** The Local Plan allocates up to 300 homes for Copford. Welbeck's proposal for 340 homes represents an inappropriate increase over the sustainable limit identified by the Council.
- **Site Selection:** The Local Plan identifies more balanced sites which utilize less of the central field. The Welbeck options represent a "dominating use" of the land that contradicts Policy CE1, which aims to resist urban sprawl and the merging of settlement areas.

2. Strategic Suitability of "Option 2" (Veteran's Accommodation)

Regarding the proposal for a 3-storey veteran's housing and training facility, I believe this location is fundamentally unsuitable for the intended demographic:

- **Connectivity and Support:** Copford is situated on the opposite side of town from the Colchester Garrison and the established military outreach organizations. Placing veterans here would isolate them from the very amenities and support networks they require.
- **Amenity Access:** Compared to alternative sites closer to Colchester's town center, Copford lacks the walking-distance infrastructure needed for specialized housing.
- **Scale:** A 3-storey building is architecturally inconsistent with the village character and, at the bottom of gardens on London Road, would significantly block light and diminish residential amenity.

3. Village Infrastructure and the Proposed Café

The inclusion of a café area within the development appears to be a solution in search of a problem.

- **Lack of Demand:** A café is simply not needed in a village setting like Copford, where existing community hubs are sufficient.
- **Resource Misalignment:** The proposal prioritizes a commercial café over critical infrastructure. The development offers no provision for primary school capacity or healthcare, which are the actual requirements for a sustainable expansion of this scale.

4. Highways and Access Feasibility

The plan to funnel traffic for 340 homes through a single entry/exit point on School Road presents significant safety risks:

- **Junction Safety:** Positioning a junction on a partially blind bend—less than 100m from the curve—raises serious visibility and safety concerns.
- **Cumulative Load:** School Road cannot feasibly absorb traffic from 340 new dwellings, especially when considering the "ripple effect" from major developments at Marks Tey and Stanway.

5. Environmental Constraints and Resident Privacy

The field is a documented habitat for the Skylark (a Red List species) and a foraging route for Badgers and Hares. Furthermore, the current layout lacks "equity of respect" for existing residents. While School Road properties are afforded a "ransom strip" buffer, the homes on London Road (Nos. 45–69) have no such protection, leading to an unacceptable loss of privacy.

In summary the Welbeck proposals are less feasible than the sites currently outlined in the Colchester Local Plan. The increased density, the hazardous access point, and the inclusion of unnecessary or poorly located facilities (the café and veteran's block) suggest that these options are not the right fit for the sustainable growth of Copford.

I am also forwarding a copy of this email to the Colchester planning office and local councillors for their records.

Kind regards,

Mark Bloomfield

Address removed-