

P	S	C					/		
---	---	---	--	--	--	--	---	--	--

## Part 2 - Regulation 19 and 20 Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 "Pre-Submission LDP" consultation

Please note that all comments on the Pre-Submission LDP consultation should be provided by completing Part 2 of this form. A separate completed Part 2 should be provided for each comment made within a representation.

**2.1.** To which part of the Maldon District Pre-Submission Local Development Plan (LDP) does this representation relate?

- |   |    |  |        |
|---|----|--|--------|
| a. Paragraph<br>(please specify paragraph number) | S2 | b. Policy<br>(please specify policy reference) |        |
| c. Proposals Map                                  |    | d. Other section<br>(please specify)           | EB004b |

**2.2.** Do you consider the Maldon District Pre-Submission LDP to be (tick as appropriate):

- a. Legally compliant** Yes ☐  
To be 'legally compliant' the LDP has to be prepared in accordance with the Duty to Co-operate and legal and procedural requirements. This is required by Government guidance No ☒
- b. Sound** Yes ☐  
To be 'sound' a Local Plan should be positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy. This is required by Government guidance No ☒  
(if you **do not consider the LDP to be sound**, please complete section 2.3. below)

**2.3.** Do you consider the Maldon District LDP to be unsound because it is not (tick as appropriate):

- a. Positively prepared** ☒  
To be positively prepared the plan should be prepared on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements
- b. Justified** ☒  
To be justified the plan must be:
- Founded on a robust and credible evidence base;
  - The most appropriate strategy when considered against the reasonable alternatives.
- c. Effective** ☐  
To be effective the plan must be:
- Deliverable;
  - Flexible;
  - Able to be monitored.
- d. Consistent with National Policy** ☐  
The Plan must be consistent with Government guidance as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework

On the following pages, please explain why you think the Plan is unsound or not legally compliant, and set out any changes you feel should be made to the Plan to make the Plan sound or legally compliant.

**Please note:** As there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on your representation at this stage, please include all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify your representation and the suggested change(s) to the Plan. After this stage, further submissions will only be invited at the request of the Planning Inspector, based on the matters and issues the Inspector identifies for examination.

**2.4.** If you consider the Maldon District LDP to be unsound or not legally compliant please explain why in the box below.

Please be as precise as possible. Please also use this space for any comments in support of the LDP.

Further to the previous comments sent by Danbury Parish Council, I would like to register further comments on behalf of the Parish Council. The Parish Council has had sight of the ECC Highways Technical Note - Impact of Proposed Development Sites in Heybridge and South Maldon on Wider Highway Network dated December 2013 under reference EB004b regarding predicted traffic flows on the A414 through Danbury specifically at Eves Corner. The Parish Council has been notified that Chelmsford City Council (CCC) has employed an independent traffic consultant to consider the Technical Note prepared by ECC Highways. The statement highlights areas of the Technical Note showing that insufficient traffic survey information or capacity analysis has been provided. In addition the survey carried out by CCC's traffic consultant was completed during half term which would have greatly reduced the amount of traffic flow and is not representative of an average day. There are three schools in Danbury, one on Little Baddow Road which joins with Eves Corner, one on Eves Corner itself and the third on the A414 adjacent to Well Lane. These are all extremely well used and busy junctions during the day with increased congestion during peak times. The Parish Council wish to reinforce the following points noted by Chelmsford City Councils Traffic Consultant: The Technical Note does not provide any traffic survey information for Eves Corner or any information relating to the capacity analysis other than a summary of results. • No existing queue length surveys have been undertaken so comparison with the current situation cannot be made. • No adjustments to the capacity of the A414 arms have been made to more closely represent the actual situation on the site. • No plans of the alternative options (other than for pre-signals) have been provided particularly for the traffic signal option. • No capacity assessment had been undertaken for the pre signals option which is the option being recommended. Further on site studies/experiments should be undertaken. • No capacity analysis has been undertaken at the other critical junction in Danbury the A414 Well Lane mini roundabout. This is already a congested area, especially at peak times and is of concern to residents, particularly as there is a primary school nearby. • No detailed information has been provided in relation to potential traffic generation. • The assessments that have been undertaken for the other options and existing layout refers to 2026 with the developments in place. In order to assess the impact of the proposed developments, it is necessary to compare with and without development situations. This does not appear to have been done so the impact of the development on the A414 through Danbury cannot be assessed. •

It appears that all the solutions are likely to still have significant queuing through Danbury in 2026 even without the developments. With the additional development it will extend the queuing even further. In addition the Parish Council would like to make comments as follows: There are inconsistencies and omissions on the Technical Note. No information has been given in relation to how the existing and design year traffic flows have been calculated so it cannot be confirmed if this is a realistic assessment of situations. The approach to Eves Corner is already at capacity and extensive queuing occurs in both directions. Once the development in the Maldon district is completed, these queues will become more extensive, leading to residents using less suitable local roads as a rat run around the A414. There has been mention of using land to the side of Dawson Memorial Field to widen the area to make a right hand turn. This verge is designated as an area of scientific Interest with Wild Orchids and should not be touched. The Parish Council would be opposed to green space/verges being used for additional highway as this would urbanise the village and cause further pollution. A new Medical Centre is to be situated on the main A414 adjacent to Danbury Mission and this will also increase the amount of traffic through the village. In the process of acquiring planning permission for the Medical Centre there were traffic predictions and there was to be a safe right turn made across the A414 and a crossing so that pedestrians from the other side of Danbury could access the centre. Again none of this has been taken into

account in the traffic assessments. The Parish Council is also concerned regarding the resulting increase in pollution that will occur with an increase in the amount of traffic travelling through the village. The A414 is in close vicinity to shops, schools, a playing field and play area and additional pollution would be detrimental to residents quality of life. As shown in Diagram A there are already significant problems in Little Baddow Road. There is a high volume of traffic due to Eves Corner shops, the bank, St Johns School and the current Medical Centre. If a car is parked in the wrong place in this location it can significantly block the traffic and completely block the road. This occurs particularly at school times. Unless solutions to these problems can be found, significant hold ups would occur. The installation of pre signals will only cause total gridlock around Eves Corner and Little Baddow road and will not address the problems created by the developments in the Maldon District. Further analysis needs to be done on the effectiveness of this and other options. The further developments at Maldon and Heybridge would put a considerable strain on the access routes to the town and in Danbury would make the traffic unbearable. Rat runs around the village would be used more which would significantly affect local residents. Rat running is a major concern to Danbury residents as this is already an issue on local roads that are not suitable for this volume of traffic. The Parish Council is concerned that the increased traffic as a result of the additional dwellings in the Maldon District will add to the current problem.

**2.5.** Please explain in the box below what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Maldon District LDP legally compliant and sound.

Please be as precise as possible. Please explain why this change will make the Maldon District LDP legally compliant and sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward any suggested revised wording of the policies or supporting text.

A survey needs to be done to determine the effect of the rat running problem in Danbury and the effect that changes to the major junctions in Danbury will bring to the minor routes especially Little Baddow Road, Mayes Lane, Well Lane and Woodhill Road. Consideration has not been given to buses which regularly have to turn around the junction at Eves Corner from the A414 to Mayes Lane and Little Baddow Road. Danbury prides itself as a location for walkers and has pretty countryside. There is already constant traffic including HGV's through the village all day. With the increased traffic flow from the Maldon/Heybridge development it will make the queues longer and effect Well Lane Junction as well as Oak Corner. These have not been considered in the Technical Report. Options have been discussed in past years for a bypass to be created from Heybridge Approach to form a new junction with the A12. The Parish Council would support these options as this would divert traffic away from the A414 and could enable the road to be downgraded to a B road. A bypass would also benefit Hatfield Peverel and Boreham who will also see increased congestion as a result of new development in the Maldon District. Danbury Parish Council is requesting that a review of the number of houses for development is considered and that other, more suitable options for reducing the impact of the additional traffic at Danbury be considered.

**2.6.** Do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing part of the examination? (tick as appropriate)

**No**, I wish to communicate through written representations ☒

**Yes**, I wish to speak to the Inspector at the hearing sessions ☐

**Please note:** The Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the hearing part of the examination

- 2.7.** If you wish to participate at the hearing part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary.

--

**This is the end of Part 2 (Regulation 19 and 20) of the response form. Please complete this form for each representation you wish to make. You only need to complete Part A once. Please submit all of your response forms together.**

**Diagram A**

