

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

4.2 and 8.8ii

b. Policy reference

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 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.

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

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.

Soundness Paragraph 8.8ii (or in this case, Lack of Soundness)

“The Plan should be the most appropriate strategy when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence.”

Perhaps the Secretary of State should be made aware of some inappropriate local planning. In Langford, Essex CM9 4SS, we have been obliged by the powers that be to build a £30 million road to service that part of “Heybridge Garden Suburb” which is inside the parish boundaries of Langford and which incidentally ends the life of the village of Langford making it merge into Heybridge.

There is a roundabout with an obvious space for an exit immediately next to Langford Rectory. Since we are going to have this road, this is the only place once can swing off the A414/Heybridge Approach Road which leads to this roundabout.

However, a Conservative Councillor, David Sismey, lives in Langford Rectory. He and his chums want future Garden City planners to create a dangerous bend off the B1018 next to a huge hump of a railway bridge. This nonsense plan will kill motorists off in their droves.

I know new roads are not nice. However, our Tory Councillor David can sit in the Rectory as his new Garden City neighbours whizz past his lounge window on a daily commute to London, he can contemplate how studiously ignored out-of-control immigration by him and his cohorts in the fast-asleep alliance has trashed the Rectory’s once green and lovely garden. However, the sad fact for David is that lives will be saved by enforcing the exit at the roundabout facing the Rectory garden. There is no other place for it.

Considerations of personal favour influencing the LDP do not engender trust. To this end, robust action by an appointed officer will allay local fears that maladministration of the local LDP is going to cost lives and limbs.

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

- 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.**

From paragraph 4 of the Maldon District Pre-Submission LDP 2012-2029

4.2 A number of alterations have been made to the Pre-Submission LDP as a result of the responses and base updates; the most significant changes relate to:

- A redistribution of 335 dwellings ^{BACK TO} from the South Maldon Garden Suburb ~~to the North Heybridge Garden Suburb~~

The North Heybridge Garden Suburb? That's our turf here. All of a sudden, 335 unwanted from South Maldon are to be chased out of their patch by South Maldonian Nimbys (ie the not-in-our-back-yard set). Do we object? Of course we do. The base document outlining this part of the Maldon District LDP 2014-2029 is designated ECC 20146 which means this transfer of South Maldonian unwanted is very recent. There has been scant consultation and the feelings of locals has been ridden over rough shod. I wish to object and request that the examiner appointed by the Secretary of State use the powers vested in him to look into the way the sleepiness of the Heybridge Tories has been taken advantage of, enabling a transfer of 335 unwanted from a more street-wise lot of South Maldon to sneak their unwanted into Heybridge with scant valid discussion.

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

2.6 Do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing part of the Examination-in-Public? (✓ 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-in-Public, please outline why you consider this to be necessary

Paragraph 8.8ii on Sound Planning

- (1) Given the secretary of the unsound planning of the new road through Langford, Essex, CM9 4SS, I would have thought that a face to face communication would clarify the issue of whether access goes through the logical place at the roundabout on the end of the A414/Heybridge Approach as opposed to creating a dangerous bend off the B1018 just before the railway bridge.

Paragraph 4.2

- (2) That the South Maldon Garden Suburb planners should be allowed to off-load an obligation to create 335 homes on to the North Maldon/Heybridge Garden Suburb is incomprehensible. My contention is that this off-load is unreasonable, should be undone and done so in the public gaze at one of your Examinations in Public. If the South Maldonians have any case whatever beyond Nimbyism to off-load their unwanted onto us, let us have the privilege of hearing them put an overwhelming logical case in favour of their good selves.

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.