

#### **Matter 4: Strategic Housing Growth – South Maldon Garden Suburb + Park Drive + Heybridge Swifts**

*Issue 1: Whether policies S2, S3 and S4 with their associated text dealing with South Maldon Garden Suburb + Park Drive + Heybridge Swifts is justified by the evidence, consistent with national policy, and effective*

1. Is the strategy for development for these strategic sites appropriate, justified, effective, sustainable, viable, soundly based and consistent with the Plan's strategy?

**The strategy remains inappropriate, unjustified, ineffective, unsustainable and unsoundly based because the LDP is founded upon :-**

- lack of weight given to the wider road infrastructure problems.
- lack of weight given to the threats to the spatial character and identity of both proposed and existing communities.
- lack of weight given to the risk of not meeting critical housing need.
- lack of weight given to the threats to achievement of infrastructure gains.
- lack of weight given to the alternative options and wider opportunities of making infrastructure gains .

**The LDP contains no really solid evidence that any of the 17 objectives outlined in its sustainability appraisal (SD03a) will be achieved in sufficient manner to justify the allocation of major housing provision in what the Council calls the "South Maldon Garden Suburb". Rather it looks to us like an isolated suburb not conducive to a strategy for Sustainable Development aimed at 'Securing the Future', neither in terms of the local economy or of community cohesion nor of the general well-being of our community.**

DUTY TO CO-OPERATE paragraph 2.67 notes that Maldon District Council will work with Essex County Council and Braintree District Council regarding the amount of traffic on the B1019.

HOWEVER There is no evidence provided of planned co-operation with Chelmsford City Council regarding the increase in traffic on the A414 between the A12 and Oak Corner.

**We, together with various other respondents, call into question both MDC's co-operation with other bodies and the lack of attention to assessment of road infrastructure problems.**

3. Bearing in mind my questions on Matter 1, Issue 3 on SPDs, should any of the information contained in the South Maldon Garden Suburb Draft Strategic Masterplan Framework (DOC97) be placed in these policies or IDP , particularly policy S4?

**As for North Heybridge Garden Suburb, looking at the current evidence base, we question whether many of the infrastructure issues are capable of resolution; but, certainly, unless such issues are resolved and placed within the Plan as legally constituted they present a threat to a properly planned future for Maldon.**

4. How much development can take place on each allocated site before a specified piece of infrastructure in CED10 Appendix 13 has to be provided?

**Again, we would also ask how infrastructure which is as yet not adequately specified can be agreed, allocated and secured within the Plan .**

6. I see at paragraph 2.17 of the North Heybridge Garden Suburb Position Statement (DOC103) that the Hatfield Peverel B1019/B1137 junction concerns affect all the principle developers in Maldon and North Heybridge. Is this correct? If so, should the costs etc. be included for the sites included under this Matter as well as North Heybridge? How does this affect the policies and the IDP

**Yes it certainly will be relevant to traffic loads from the South Garden Suburb and the policies and IDP should account for this.**

7. What further work has been carried out since DOC100 regarding highway improvements at Eves Corner at Danbury, and what does it indicate needs to be provided? Does this alter the IDP and CED10 Appendix 13?

**Inadequate work has been carried out and all the attempted solutions proposed thus far ignore or are based upon inadequate assessment . It is of course argued that sufficient improvement in order to avoid severe problems at Danbury is just not feasible.**

8. Should policy S4 refer to the above highway works?

**It certainly should, because the A414 and road communications through Danbury are crucial given the Plan positions for growth the MDC have opted for.**

9. Are flooding and sewerage issues now resolved?

**We would like to see evidence that measure for maintenance of drainage pathways into the estuary when tidal levels permit have been adequately secured; especially given the questionable efficacy of that historically (See 1980's history of expansion of South Maldon and the flooding at Park Drive last year).**

10. CD10 Appendix 13 shows new healthcare provision, presumably for GP surgeries. Where will these be provided? Please will the Council suggest a suitable consequential modification to policy S4 and paragraph 2.53.

**GP surgery provision is already under huge strain and the Plan is inadequate in its consideration of adequate siting and procurement of such provision.**

11. A In the policy S4 general development principles:

a. What new or enhanced public transport provision?

**We question the feasibility of reliance upon bus services, particularly subscription to it by the working population. Whatever money is available via CIL or section 106 agreement are one off capital sums whereas bus services require continual income or subsidy. In addition there are legislative limits to retention of the capital. The gathering of capital for not yet fully designed or determined infrastructure projects has in the past proved ineffective (see freedom of information enquiry by the local press on money returned to developers)**

b. Is the road network capacity capable of accommodating the developments?

**Most certainly not; to the extent that the negative consequences for the local economy as well as health and well-being will be severe.**

c. What mitigation measures and junction improvements?

**These are demonstrably inadequate.**

d. What form and scale of community hubs and local centres are needed?

**These, so close to the Morrisons supermarket, and superstore location present a possible problem for for any cohesive future relationship as between the South Garden suburb and Maldon Town Centre.**

f. What is meant by adequate provision for affordable housing?

**The emerging figures for the likely provision of affordable housing appear to be way below that required to meet the need.**

g. What proportion of housing for older people?

**As for North Heybridge we consider that these suburban fringes, arcadian 'gardens' or not, aren't going to be attractive, or function well, for people wanting to down-size and move nearer to central facilities and services; and perhaps a more immediate social infrastructure.**

13. Does the Housing Mix (policy H2) need altering to make the sites viable? If so, how?

**Given the demanding infrastructure requirements, and in the absence of specific prior assessment of viability, there is a significant risk that provision of the desired housing mix (providing the types of houses actually needed) will, in the event, be found not viable.**