



4 March, 2014

Dear Planning Policy Team,

Maldon District Pre-Submission Local Development Plan Representation.

Reference. Your letter to me dated 28 February 2014 from Ms Emily Hall.

Thank you for your letter.

I apologise for the fact that my response was not in the format required by the Council, but frankly I could not see how my more 'generalised' comments could be made to fit the rather prescriptive format defined. I appreciate that Council Planning staff must have spent many thousands of hours developing the plan, and are completely 'au fait' with the plan and their process needs. However, to a layman such as me, doing a thorough review and providing meaningful comment at all is a daunting task, let alone providing them to what I felt was an incomprehensible format.

I note you have kindly offered to re-process my comments into the approved format on my behalf. This is a very generous offer, and I wish to take advantage of it please. In an attempt to help you in this regard, I wish to make the following clarifications:

- All of my comments apply only to the Heybridge North garden village element of the plan. (I did try to indicate this in my response at para 2.1.c) I am not commenting on the Maldon, Burnham or any other elements.
- I am certainly not against the plan per se. I appreciate people need houses, the Council is under various pressures from Government, potential buyers and others to provide or resist development, and that the professional Council staff are doing their utmost to satisfy all those (sometimes conflicting) pressures.
- My comments were aimed only at ensuring that important open, or unaddressed issues, are actually addressed prior to submission for approval, or at least before final approval.

For the avoidance of doubt, I wish to summarise my comments as follows:-

Re 'legality' of the consultation process.

I do not consider that the consultation process can be considered to have met legal requirements (or even 'common sense' requirements), when a key element of the plan – the proposed route of the new northern boundary road – is not defined. From this route, including its proposed junctions with Langford Road, Maypole Road, and Broad Street Green Road, would flow comments regarding likely traffic and resident safety, traffic nuisance as regards nearby affected residents, and general feasibility. It is only a **partial** plan at this stage, and so consultation on the whole plan cannot be deemed to have been carried out.

Re 'soundness' of the plan.

The above point (the lack of definition of the new road) also goes to the 'soundness' argument. The plan cannot be 'sound' when a key part is missing.

Please see also my earlier response at para 2.4 (ii) regarding identified and potential traffic problems. I consider this a key point.

See also my earlier response at para 2.4 (iv) regarding building the newly added 335 houses on part of a previously identified flood management area.

Re changes I consider necessary to make the plan compliant and sound.

Please see my earlier response at para 2.5 bullet points 1 to 3.

In conclusion, I wish to thank you again for your offer to reprocess my response into an acceptable format. Would you also kindly send me a copy of that when complete, for my file.

If you have any questions at any time, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours Sincerely,

