0090-5166-2.63-124 For official use only

P	S	C					/		

Part 2 - Regulation 19 and 20 of the 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 number	2.63	b. Policy reference	Highways
c. Proposals map		d. Other section (please specify)	

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

a. Legally compliant YES ☐ NO ☑

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.

b. Sound YES ☐ NO ☑

To be 'sound' a Local Plan should be positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy. This is required by Government guidance.
If you do not consider the LDP to be sound, please complete section 2.3 below

2.3 Do you consider the Maldon District to be unsound because it is not . . . (✓ 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, 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.

If the box is not big enough for your comments, please attach another page marked appropriately.

I am a Danbury resident and have only just become aware of this proposal 24 hours before the submission deadline. To my knowledge there has not been adequate consultation on road infrastructure issues of concern to (notably Hatfield Peverel, Danbury and Little Baddow) Parishes within the Braintree and Chelmsford Districts. Indeed from para.2.67 of the pre-submission Plan, and from my own lack of awareness, it appears they may not yet have consulted neighbouring districts on those issues.

The A414 in Danbury is already heavily congested at peak times of the day as it is the main thoroughfare between Danbury and Maldon. This is the main\only ambulance route between St Peter's hospital, Maldon and Broomfield hospital, Chelmsford. Further traffic volume to the level that could be generated by this new development, would compound and exacerbate the existing traffic congestion.

Further the pre-submission Plan now notes that what the LPA consider to be the most effective solution is not deliverable at this time, and no evidence is provided that it would be deliverable in the foreseeable future. And the main assessment into the wider transport implications was not completed until December 2013, meaning that the plan had been produced BEFORE the full impact assessments had been conducted, making the proposal unsound.

The plan also appears to contradict recent national policy announcements from the Planning Minister, Nick Boyles suggesting that planners will be blocked from building on areas at risk of flooding. Although the development zones are outside the current Environment Agency flood warning areas, they are extremely close so it is a high risk proposal if you take into account issues such as sea level rises and the level of run off from this level of development.

The plan suggests that there were no alternative or realistic options other than the plans ‘Preferred options’. But there are reasonable alternatives. For instance a settlement to accommodate the major requirement for growth in the District in the Crouch corridor between Woodham Ferrers and Althorne is a reasonable, achievable alternative for growth but appears not to have been adequately considered.

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.

If the box is not big enough for your comments, please attach another page marked appropriately.

* Adequate consultation period with the other affected parishes in the District.

* Evidence that those putting forward this proposal have developed a plan to address the recognised infrastructure weaknesses that will resolve the expected issues the increase in traffic will bring within both Maldon, Danbury and the other affected towns. Include the provision of a Danbury by-pass for example!!!!!

* Demonstrate that other locations have been considered that are seemingly more appropriate for this development (the Crouch corridor between Woodham Ferrers and Althorne is a reasonable, achievable alternative for growth but appears not to have been adequately considered).

2.6 Do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing part of the examination? (✓ 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

If the box is not big enough for your comments, please attach another page marked appropriately.

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.