

**Examination of the Maldon District Local Development Plan****Agenda for 10.00 hours Wednesday 28 January 2015****DAY 5 - Matter 5: Strategic Housing Growth – Burnham-on-Crouch  
Strategic Allocations****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 – Burnham-on-Crouch Strategic Allocations**

*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 there a DOC114 Statement of Common Ground, or any partial information from it, that would assist me and other participants?
2. Council – please explain the infrastructure constraints that limit the number of dwellings that can be allocated in Burnham. Is it just educational constraints? Can any of these be mitigated and, if so, how and what number of dwellings would be required to fund the mitigation?
3. Council – are the above infrastructure constraints the reason why housing development has been restricted in Burnham, or are there other reasons for not allocating more development either around the strategic sites or in other parts of Burnham? Do other participants agree with these restrictive reasons? If not, why not?
4. Do the allocations meet Burnham's own needs as stated in para 2.81 of the Plan?
5. Council – have other 'reasonable alternatives' in this area been examined in the SA – Plainview says not (1.3).

6. Council – are there landscape, historic environment and coalescence constraints on the development of sites S6(j) and S6(k)? (see Evolution 1.5)
7. Could some of the allocated sites logically be expanded or take more dwellings than stated in the Plan? [e.g. Boyer at site S2(j)]
8. Are participants satisfied that the new Infrastructure Phasing Plan (Council's Statement Appendix 4) shows that the allocations can be delivered at the times shown? If not, why not?
9. Council – what new public transport provision is required and why?
10. In view of the Council's Statement at its 5.27, should the mention of a local centre be taken out of policy S6?
11. Is the Plan sufficiently clear about any other infrastructure concerns and does it have robust solutions?
12. Is policy S6 clear in answering the "what, where, when and how" questions for future planning applications?
13. Are the infrastructure requirements in the policy directly related to the allocations and fulfil the Regulation 123 (CIL Regulations) tests?
14. 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'?
15. Can the three allocations be delivered with pooled contributions?
16. Are there any other respects in which the allocations would not be sound that have not already been discussed here or previously?

### **Any Other Matters**

- Any other points representors wish to make