

**Examination of the Maldon District Local Development Plan****Agenda for 10.00 hours Thursday 22 January 2015*****DAY 3 - Matter 3: Strategic Housing Growth – North Heybridge Garden Suburb*****Three Rivers Golf & Country Club, Stow Road, Cold Norton, Purleigh, Essex CM3 6RR**

*Discussions will focus on whether the District Local Plan is legally compliant and sound (positively prepared, justified, effective, and consistent with national policy) and, if not, how it should be modified to make it so*

**Opening Announcements**

- Health and safety, people present, and attendance list
- Purpose of the hearing sessions
- Conduct of the hearing session
- Inspector's report

**Consideration of any site visits**

- Suggestions from representors & from the Council
- Can an agreed site visit programme be given to me later?

**Late evidence**

- Any queries or issues of concern?

**Strategic Housing Growth – North Heybridge Garden Suburb**

*Note: this session deals with the detail of the development. The strategic principles (numbers and distribution) were discussed at the Matter 2 hearing.*

1. Council – is the suggested modification to paragraph 2.67 at 1.5 of DOC117 to be included in the Appendix 2 modification schedule?
2. Council – are the suggested modifications at 1.6 of DOC117 to be included in the Appendix 2 modification schedule?
3. Are participants satisfied that the new Infrastructure Phasing Plan (Council's Statement Appendix 4) shows that the allocation can be delivered at the times shown? If not, why not?
4. What extra percentage of traffic will be placed upon the Hatfield Peverel B1019 / B1137 junction and the A414 in the Danbury area that can be directly attributed to this Garden Suburb and the South Maldon Garden Suburb when they are fully developed? In the light of this should the development contribute financially (Council's 3.14)?
5. Are the participants satisfied that the highway concerns raised about Hatfield Peverel have now been resolved as set out in the Council's Matter 3 Statement, DOC116 and

DOC117 (Statements of Common Ground). If not, why not?

6. Are the participants satisfied that the highway concerns raised about Eves Corner, Danbury have now been resolved as set out in the Council's Matter 3 Statement, DOC117 and DOC117 (Statements of Common Ground). I note that Chelmsford is not satisfied – please explain why. Any others?
7. Should any of the points made in the Council's Matter 3 Statement (and elsewhere) about the above two highway improvement schemes be incorporated in the Plan's policies? What exactly? (Chelmsford's point).
8. Are there any other highway concerns that are not resolvable?
9. Should any of the guidance in the Masterplan be included in the Plan? Or has the Council got the balance right with its suggested modifications and provided sufficient 'policy hooks' for the Masterplan? Overall, is the policy sufficiently clear?
10. Is the Plan sufficiently clear about flooding and sewerage issues with robust solutions?
11. Why should the development contribute to flood alleviation if that is to resolve a pre-existing problem (Council's 3.27 and 3.29 of its Matter 3 Statement)? Given that this is funded through a S106, does it meet the legal tests and NPPF (para 204) policy tests – especially: is it directly related to the development?
12. Similarly why should policy S4 specify a country park if its requirement is not related to the development? Moreover, is this requirement in the right part of the District – Countryside Properties' Statement Q13?
13. Is the development viable in the light of the Council's new information, particularly that in the IPP at Appendix 4 of the Council's Statements with its phasing 'tipping points'? Please would the Council explain where I find this updated viability information?
14. Are there any other respects in which the development would not be sound that have not already been discussed here or previously?

### **Any Other Matters**

- Any other points representors wish to make