

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED] Transport Strategy & Engagement Manager
Sent: 13 October 2014 09:36
To: [REDACTED] Strategic Development Officer
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: The Orchard, Barrack Street, Bradfield

Ok thanks [REDACTED]

Best Regards

[REDACTED]
Transport Strategy & Engagement Manager
Economic Growth and Development
Essex County Council. | telephone: [REDACTED] email:
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED] Strategic Development Officer
Sent: Monday, October 13, 2014 08:29 AM
To: [REDACTED] Transport Strategy & Engagement Manager
Subject: RE: The Orchard, Barrack Street, Bradfield

[REDACTED]

It was initially offered not requested.

We didn't change our stance the planning officer decided it wasn't appropriate to request the works.

I will not be attending the next committee.

Regards,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Strategic Development Officer
Economic Growth and Development
Essex County Council
[REDACTED]

Please consider the environment before printing this email

From: [REDACTED] Transport Strategy & Engagement Manager
Sent: 12 October 2014 22:40
To: [REDACTED] Strategic Development Officer
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: The Orchard, Barrack Street, Bradfield

[REDACTED]

Thanks but I am sure you can understand why I was confused on this one as we asked for junction realignment then changed our stance

Why is that the case?

I take it you have all you need for the next planning committee?

Best Regards

[REDACTED]

Transport Strategy & Engagement Manager

Economic Growth and Development

Essex County Council. | telephone: [REDACTED]

| mobile: [REDACTED] | email: [REDACTED]

PLEASE NOTE MY NEW TELEPHONE NUMBER

From: [REDACTED] Strategic Development Officer

Sent: 10 October 2014 11:45

To: [REDACTED] Transport Strategy & Engagement Manager

Cc: [REDACTED]

Subject: RE: The Orchard, Barrack Street, Bradfield

[REDACTED]

No.

This is not considered essential to enable the development. The PO would not consider it so will not include in his Decision Notice.

Regards,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Strategic Development Officer

Economic Growth and Development

Essex County Council

[REDACTED]

Please consider the environment before printing this email

From: [REDACTED] Transport Strategy & Engagement Manager

Sent: 09 October 2014 23:38

To: [REDACTED] Strategic Development Officer

Cc: [REDACTED]

Subject: RE: The Orchard, Barrack Street, Bradfield

[REDACTED]

Should we not be pushing/ challenging on the possibility of securing the junction realignment?

Best Regards

[REDACTED]

Transport Strategy & Engagement Manager

Economic Growth and Development

Essex County Council. | telephone: [REDACTED]

| mobile: [REDACTED] | email: [REDACTED]

PLEASE NOTE MY NEW TELEPHONE NUMBER

From: [REDACTED] Strategic Development Officer
Sent: 03 October 2014 10:41
To: [REDACTED] Transport Strategy & Engagement Manager
Subject: RE: The Orchard, Barrack Street, Bradfield

[REDACTED]

I presume it wasn't included as it didn't meet the 5 tests he has to work to.

The realignment was offered as an improvement which the agent and I discussed.

Regards,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Strategic Development Officer
Economic Growth and Development
Essex County Council

[REDACTED]

Please consider the environment before printing this email

From: [REDACTED] Transport Strategy & Engagement Manager
Sent: 03 October 2014 10:34
To: [REDACTED] Strategic Development Officer
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: The Orchard, Barrack Street, Bradfield

[REDACTED]

I would appreciate if this discussion could remain in ECC/ EH rather than being played out out-with our organisation please.

So if you agreed with the developer that the junction required realignment why did TDC PO think this could not be sought?
So you initially did ask for this?

Best Regards

[REDACTED]

Transport Strategy & Engagement Manager
Economic Growth and Development
Essex County Council. | telephone: [REDACTED]
| mobile: [REDACTED] | email: [REDACTED]

PLEASE NOTE MY NEW TELEPHONE NUMBER

From: [REDACTED] Strategic Development Officer
Sent: 03 October 2014 08:45
To: [REDACTED] Transport Strategy & Engagement Manager

Cc: [REDACTED]

Subject: RE: The Orchard, Barrack Street, Bradfield

[REDACTED]

The agents and I discussed the proposal and agreed research should be made at the junction. They provided all the information necessary and was agreed with me. It was included in the first submitted application.

Subsequently, it was left out at the suggestion of the PO who felt it could not be Conditioned.

No junction works are being requested. I have requested the carriageway on Barrack Street be extended in width to 4.8m and a walkable verge to be provided across the sites frontage to Barrack Street. Both have approval in principle by the developers and LPA. Nothing has been secured as its not been decided yet.

Regards,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Strategic Development Officer
Economic Growth and Development
Essex County Council

[REDACTED]

Please consider the environment before printing this email

From: [REDACTED] Transport Strategy & Engagement Manager

Sent: 02 October 2014 16:38

To: [REDACTED] Strategic Development Officer

Cc: [REDACTED]

Subject: RE: The Orchard, Barrack Street, Bradfield

[REDACTED]

I understand that you are busy, everyone is rather hectic at present however I was made aware of this meeting late and I was unaware of the application until a couple of days ago hence the lateness of my request.

Why did TDC not feel the junction realignment was able to be included?

So your initial recommendation asked for the junction realignment? What are we asking for now? What has been secured?

Best Regards

[REDACTED]

Transport Strategy & Engagement Manager

Economic Growth and Development

Essex County Council. | telephone: [REDACTED]

| mobile: [REDACTED] | email: [REDACTED]

PLEASE NOTE MY NEW TELEPHONE NUMBER

From: [REDACTED] Strategic Development Officer
Sent: 02 October 2014 09:50
To: [REDACTED] Transport Strategy & Engagement Manager
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: The Orchard, Barrack Street, Bradfield

[REDACTED]

Unfortunately leaving a request for considerable information so close to your meeting date and time is not helpful as I am already committed work wise covering two Districts. This meeting did not just get scheduled.

The original application was submitted with the junction realignment included.

This application layout was not acceptable to Tendring so amended plans were submitted which were acceptable.

The Planning Officer was not confident that he was able to include the realignment in his Decision and we agreed it would not be included for this revised submission.

The original recommendation was not deleted from the notes which confused Members and the PC (I had omitted it completely).

The scheme of footway works appears to be perceived by Members and PC as connected to the planning application which it is not, yet more confusion!

The realignment was desirable but NOT essential to the proposed development. There is no collision data at the junction of Barrack Street and Steam Mill Road and the HA considers that there will be no detrimental effect on safety at this location.

This has been communicated to the LPA and accepted ([REDACTED] email).

Regards,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Strategic Development Officer
Economic Growth and Development
Essex County Council
[REDACTED]

Please consider the environment before printing this email

From: [REDACTED] Transport Strategy & Engagement Manager
Sent: 02 October 2014 09:09
To: [REDACTED] Strategic Development Officer
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: The Orchard, Barrack Street, Bradfield
Importance: High

[REDACTED]

Thanks for your emails on this development today but it appears that there is a great deal of confusion.

With regard to our response to this application and I can't see it on the application website, and the highway improvements plan is of poor quality – please can you provide both of these please ? Also I am confused as to whether the junction improvements have been conditioned or not as the notes of the planning committee meeting appears to state that they are a condition as below:

Prior to the occupation of the proposed development, the applicant shall provide the junction realignment to the Barrack Street/Heath Road/Steam Mill Road Junction as shown detailed in Drawing Numbered 2693.01 entirely at their own expense.

But looking at the email from [REDACTED] today it states that our response is that it: *does not result in the need for improvement works to the Barrack Street/Steam Mill Road junction.*

You email stated that you had:
originally requested a junction realignment from Barrack Street j/w Steam Mill Road and that was accepted. The PO cannot include that realignment in the Conditions now.
The crux of the matter is as you see it, the junction realignment was desirable from a planning perspective but NOT essential to the success of the proposed development.
It was proposed and designed by the applicants agents and accepted as being ok to be provided.

Please can you give a full update on this one as it left us confused and on the back foot with members and the public present last night?

Best Regards

[REDACTED]

Transport Strategy & Engagement Manager
Economic Growth and Development
Essex County Council. | telephone: [REDACTED]
| mobile: [REDACTED] | email [REDACTED]

PLEASE NOTE MY NEW TELEPHONE NUMBER