

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
(please specify paragraph number) | 2.25-2.27; 2.63-2.66
and 2.70 | b. Policy
(please specify policy reference) | S2 (Strategic Growth) and S4 (Maldon and Heybridge Strategic Growth) |
| c. Proposals Map | | d. Other section
(please specify) | |

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 (if you **do not consider the LDP to be sound**, please complete section 2.3. below) No ☒

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

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

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.

Chelmsford City Council welcomes the opportunity to comment on Maldon District Council's Pre-Submission Draft Local Development Plan (January 2014). Chelmsford City Council's (CCC) representation on these Policies and paragraphs comprises the comments below together with the attached 'Statement Considering the Essex Highways "Technical Note – Impact of Proposed Development Sites in Heybridge and South Maldon on Wider Highway Network" Dated December 2013 in relation particularly to the A414 through Danbury'. This Statement has been prepared by Rowland Bilsland Traffic Planning Ltd on behalf of CCC. This is referred to as the 'Consultant's Report' for short. Chelmsford City Council acknowledges that new development in neighbouring authorities will have impacts on Chelmsford's area. However, MDC has failed to fully recognise and adequately mitigate the potential highway impacts of their planned growth on the residents of Danbury and Little Baddow. The 'Technical Note – Impact of Proposed Development Sites in Heybridge and South Maldon on Wider Highway Network, Essex Highways December 2013 (the Wider Study, 2013 for short) and Consultant's Report indicate that planned growth in Maldon and Heybridge is likely to have significant adverse impacts on the A414 Eves Corner. Table 4-1 of the Wider Study, 2013 shows that in the 2013 base in both peak periods the junction is already over capacity with long queues on the eastern arm (AM) and western arm (PM). In the 2026 scenario with the Maldon growth factored in, both peak periods will see a significant increase in delays on the A414 – a queue length of over 750 vehicles in the AM peak (eastern arm) and over 558 vehicles in the PM peak (western arm). Both arms are predicted to have queue lengths 3 times as long as they estimate now. This would have significant adverse impacts for residents and businesses using this junction. It would also result in a loss of amenity for existing residents surrounding the junction due to increased noise, congestion, vibration and air quality impacts from queuing traffic at peak periods. It could also increase capacity issues at the Well Lane mini-roundabout and other rat-running routes through Danbury and Little Baddow. However, the full effects of the proposed developments remain unclear given a lack of published traffic surveys, modelling and capacity analysis. CCC consider it is imperative that MDC publish/commission traffic survey information for Eves Corner, the results of a full capacity analysis and existing queue length survey data. Capacity analysis should also be undertaken at the A414 Well Lane mini-roundabout to assess its operation in the current situation and in 2026 with and without the proposed developments. In addition, a Danbury 'rat-running' study is required to fully assess the implications of proposed growth in Maldon and the potential mitigation measures. In respect of the potential junction upgrades at Eves Corner, it is critical that MDC provide plans of all the options. It is considered that MDC has not adequately demonstrated that the preferred option of pre-signals on Little Baddow Road and Mayes Lane will provide suitable mitigation of these impacts, limit rat-running through Danbury or that bus priority opportunities can be provided at Eves Corner. Paragraph 3.44 of the Consultant's Report indicates that the effectiveness of pre-signals at Eves Corner is debatable and not a proper long term solution to the problem. Paragraphs 3.36 and 4.9 indicate that although there will be cost implications, a signalised crossroads option appears to have considerable merit as a technical solution and would significantly reduce queues. Further assessments of the pre-signal and signalised crossroads options are therefore considered essential. Clarification should be provided as to whether pedestrian flows across the existing crossings have been considered in the analysis undertaken to date. Detailed information should also be provided in relation to the potential traffic generation/assignment for the proposed developments. The assessments that have been undertaken for the other options (Staggered Priority and Signalised Crossroads) and existing layout only refer 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 should be published/ undertaken so the impact of the development on the A414 through Danbury can be assessed. Section 5 of the Wider Study, 2013 considers car-based trip numbers to the proposed north-east Chelmsford Rail Station. It indicates that the new station would not attract large numbers of trips from the proposed Maldon and Heybridge developments based on Essex Highway's spreadsheet model assessment. It is acknowledged that it may be difficult to accurately predict trip numbers to the planned new rail station from the proposed new developments. However, concerns are raised that the findings appear to be based on a number of assumptions with a lack of supporting evidence e.g. modelling data. Further clarification on this issue is necessary. CCC request that all new information/studies should be published for consultation prior to

Submission of the Maldon LDP in order for this authority and other interested parties to fully evaluate and comment on their findings. This Council needs to carefully assess all new information/studies together with the Wider Study 2013 before it can agree the contents of a Statement of Common Ground (SCG) and Explanatory Note (Note) in respect of strategic highways issues associated with the Maldon District LDP. If it is possible for CCC to agree mitigation measures to overcome the significant impacts at Eves Corner junction (and potentially A414 Well Lane mini-roundabout) with MDC and ECC, the LDP should be more robust and provide greater certainty about the delivery of these mitigation measures for negotiations with developers. Given the Maldon District's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) specific reference to the requirement for traffic mitigation measures at the A414 in Danbury, this should be included as a Section 106 requirement in Policy I1 and Table 1 of the LDP of at least the strategic sites S2 (a) South of Limebrook Way and S2 (d) North of Heybridge rather than be left for potential CIL funding. This will ensure that highway mitigation measures in Danbury become a requirement of the planning permission and that financial contributions are ringfenced for this specific purpose. This will ensure delivery of the highway mitigation scheme in Danbury, whereas, because CIL is not ringfenced for any particular project there is no certainty of delivery. Please see also CCC's response to Policy I1, Table 1 and paragraphs 8.2-8.13.

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.

See 2.4 above

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 aspect of the Maldon Local Development Plan (LDP) has direct implications for Chelmsford City Council's Area. It is not certain if any changes will be made to be LDP before it is submitted or if Chelmsford City Council's objections/ concerns will be overcome. Therefore, this authority requests the opportunity to appear at an Examination and to take part in a round-table discussion of this issue.

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.