

**Examination of the Maldon District Local Development Plan****Agenda for 10.00 hours Tuesday 27 January 2015****DAY 4 - Matter 4: Strategic Housing Growth – South Maldon Garden Suburb  
+ Park Drive + Heybridge Swifts****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 – South Maldon Garden Suburb + Park Drive + Heybridge Swifts**

*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 – What is the current planning application / permission status on this site, particularly that submitted for site S2(a) south of Limebrook Way?
2. Council – do you agree with Linden Homes' suggested modification to raise the numbers of housing units for site S2(c), and the other suggested modifications in its Statement table at paragraph 6.2?
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? Council – please talk me through this first.
4. Will all these sites come together to deliver a comprehensive Garden Suburb at the right time (Plainview's concern)?
5. 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 North Heybridge Garden Suburb when they are fully developed?  
In the light of this should the development contribute financially?

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 4 Statement and DOC118 (Statement of Common Ground). I note that Chelmsford may not be completely satisfied – please explain – and that some are concerned about the potential roundabout 'pinch-points' on the strategic roads (Mr Ballinger). Any others? Council - what happens in the longer term if this is only a "short-term" solution (Council 4.23)?
7. Council – why does this Garden Suburb not need to contribute to the Hatfield Peverel highway improvements (Council 4.24)?
8. What do participants and the Council think about Chelmsford's suggested modifications to the Plan about highway improvements?
9. Should any of the points made in the Council's Matter 4 Statement (and elsewhere) about the above the highway improvement schemes be incorporated in the Plan's policies? What exactly? (Chelmsford's point).
10. Are there any other highway concerns that are not resolvable?
11. Council – what do the flood reports and assessments in 4.40 say about flood risk?
12. 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?
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 and talk me through it?
14. Does the viability testing deal with the concerns of the Commercial Estate Group (CODE) at its paragraph 1.4. Does the Council agree with its suggested modifications at 1.6 and if not, why not?
15. What does the Council say in reply to criticisms of viability made by Dartmouth Park estates (NLP) on affordable homes and its suggested modification (penultimate paragraph); and also Planview's viability concerns, especially its education infrastructure evidence?
16. 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