

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|---|--|--|
| 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

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, 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.

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

Residents have been hoodwinked and kept in the dark from the very beginning.

The document posted through residents letterboxes said initially that there were to be 100 dwellings plus another 800 dwellings and based on this questionnaire people supplied their feedback. This was taken by MDC as the green light to sneak in a further 450 houses taking the new total up to 1350.

This increase was NEVER put to the public and just snuck in under the table. Nothing has been either forthcoming or transparent. It's totally undemocratic and it seems that 'listening' to objections has been simply a PR exercise. No one is listening to the requirements of the local people but rather being given what they "think" they need. Many people knew nothing about Heybridge being pinpointed for development until the consultation document landed on their doorsteps. Furthermore there was no public consultation regarding the much more suitable sites for the development that were already pre-dismissed without public consultation. People need a degree in planning to fill out this form that is clearly designed to make people give up on the idea of completing it. (I only moved here 3 years ago and this would have really made me think twice about my choice of location).

No reasons whatsoever have been provided as to why the other areas initially earmarked for development have been abandoned. There have been no tests as to the sustainability of Heybridge in comparison to alternative locations. The infrastructure costs have not been considered and no delivery of this has been issued. Is the infrastructure to be built first or last? Once the last house has been built what happens if the company folds or just moves on.

The consultation questionnaires had loaded questions and wide open to be spun in favour of the developments. PLUS ONLY ONE COPY WAS SENT PER HOUSEHOLD REGARDLESS OF HOW MANY OTHER ADULTS AT THAT ADDRESS OBJECTED. THIS IS NOT REPRESENTATIVE OR DEMOCRATIC. It's mis-representing people as it supposes that there is only one objection and that is from whoever happened to complete the questionnaire.

Another questionnaire provided was so loaded it stated: -

Question 1, are you against the development?

Question 2, assuming the development goes ahead regardless what type of housing do you think should be built?

This is totally open to be spun and already has been misquoted! MDC stating "When asked, local residents said there was a need for x, y, and x."

Paragraph 7.7 of policy T1 states that **rail transport is to be encouraged** that would be fulfilled with development in Althorne, North Fambridge and Southminster. However these locations were never brought up for public debate.

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|---|--|--|
| 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.**

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

We should have been given the correct total figures and it is this that should have been used for the public consultation.

Re-consider the other sites such as Southminster and Althorne where better infrastructure is already in place with direct connection to rail and a better road system.

Reduce the North Heybridge Garden Suburb or don't develop there at all as it's an accident waiting to happen. This field is often water logged. The Pitt report is based of old evidence (2007). We've had water up to our houses on 8 occasions in 3 years and 4 of these times were this year. Sandbags are a constant feature this year. We need a guarantee as otherwise we will all sue for avoidable damage to our properties. We need to know who will be held liable when our house actually floods inside as we are either going to flood deeper or more frequently once this field soak away just becomes concreted over. Someone has to be accountable as otherwise this would be direct damage to our property as a result of poor decision making from either the developers, MDC for giving it the green light or the planners as their non-existent flood alleviation scheme is not guaranteed. Bovis left the scene with a problem when they last developed here, as their efforts clearly didn't work. We need to know who to sue!

We don't need to build in the first place anyway!!!!

MDC should consider the huge amount of houses laying empty in the region. In 2013 there were 89010 empty houses in the South East of which 28470 were considered long term empty (0.78%). Building on Greenbelt against people's wishes is un-democratic as the only people to actually benefit are the developers and the bankers who make profits on the mortgages. It's these lobbying parliament to kick-start the economy that creates a false reason to build. Economic growth is measured in number of houses built which is NOT sustainable and so the whole point of development is unnecessary and based on mis-informing the public.

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| P | S | C | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

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.

As I am probably going to be most affected. Our cluster of houses are at most risk from flooding which never appeared on any flood reports and we're all on the cusp of a total disaster. This build will tip the balance.

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.