

## **Parish Council Response to Points for Clarification**

### *Policy 2 – Protecting and Enhancing Biodiversity*

As submitted the policy would have a universal effect for all development proposals irrespective on their size or impact. I am minded to recommend a modification so that it is applied proportionately taking into account the scale and nature of the proposal concerned.

Does the Parish Council have any observations on this proposition?

*Disagree: A number of properties with land in the Parish have changed hands over the last 18 months and some of the new residents do not appear to be aware of the laws and necessary permissions required regarding protection of wildlife and trees. Recently, the Parish Council wrote to all property owners within the Conservation Areas to provide information on carrying out work to trees due to the fact that on several occasions, unauthorised work to trees had been carried out. As the policy stands, the scale and nature of the proposal concerned would effectively be self limiting on its effect on biodiversity.*

### *Policy 4 – Footpaths and Bridleways*

This policy has a similar approach to that of Policy 2

In this case I am minded to recommend a modification so that it is applied where it is practicable to do so and proportionately taking into account the scale and nature of the proposal concerned.

Does the Parish Council have any observations on this proposition?

*Agree*

### *Policy 8*

This is a very appropriate policy in the Covid-era. Langford and Ulting NDP –

*Agree*

### *Policies 10 and 11*

These policies are well-developed in their own right and reflect the importance of community facilities to the well-being of the neighbourhood area.

Does paragraph 4.57 of the Plan provide a schedule of the community facilities intended to be safeguarded by Policy 11

*Yes*

## *Section 6*

The three aspirations are appropriately distinguished from the land use policies in the Plan. This is best practice.

### **Representations**

Does the Parish Council wish to comment on any of the representations made to the Plan?

#### *Essex County Council*

##### ***Policy 2 Protecting and Enhancing Biodiversity***

*Criterion e is amended to better reflect policy in the NPPF:*

*e) providing a net biodiversity or environmental gain; and*

*Agree*

##### ***Policy 4 Footpaths and Bridleways***

*Amend the title to read:*

*Policy 4 Footpaths, Cycle Routes and Bridleways*

*Agree*

##### ***Policy 6 Historic Environment***

*ECC recommend paragraph 2 regarding non-designated heritage assets also makes reference to their setting, as referenced in paragraph 1 to designated assets.*

*Agree*

*In addition, ECC recommend the following wording for the policy to be consistent with NPPF, paragraph 192 as outlined above.*

*'When assessing applications for development, the parish will place great weight on the preservation or enhancement of designated and non-designated heritage assets and their setting. The Council will encourage applicants to put heritage assets to viable and appropriate use, to secure their future preservation and where appropriate enhancement, as appropriate to their significance.'*

*No comment*

### ***Section 6: Proposals Not Forming Part of the Plan***

*Please note that the Parish Council recently submitted a request to the Local Highways Panel for a reduction in the speed limit on Maldon and Hatfield Roads.*

#### ***Suggested additional Policies***

##### ***Flood Risk and Sustainable Drainage***

*It is not necessary for the Neighbourhood Plan to have a Flood Risk policy as this is covered by the Local Development Plan which is being reviewed and updated.*

**Additional Objective (page 5)**

*ECC recommends the following objective be considered for inclusion within paragraph 3.2.*

- *to meet the principles of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) and natural flood management techniques, including the multi-functional use of green space*

*Agree*

**Green Infrastructure**

*It is not necessary for the Neighbourhood Plan to have a Green Infrastructure policy as this is covered by the Local Development Plan' existing policy which is being reviewed.*

**Climate Change and Renewable Energy**

*It is not necessary for the Neighbourhood Plan to include a generic policy. Renewable Energy is covered by the Local Development Plan and there are policies which deal with climate change. These are being reviewed and will be updated.*

In particular does it wish to comment on the representation made by CML Microsystems?

*It should be noted that CML Microsystems were consulted at every relevant stage of the Neighbourhood Plan. Responses were received for the Business Survey and first Regulation 14 consultation. No reply received from letter sent to landowners asking them to outline what future plans they had for their land or the Call for Sites. Comments were submitted to Maldon District Council for both Regulation 16 consultations.*

**Employment Policy**

*At an early stage of the plan development, it was agreed that the Neighbourhood Plan had no need to repeat Local Development Plan employment policy for Oval Park. The site is ideally suited for employment uses.*

*Suggested changes to Policy 7 Supporting and Encouraging Small Business are not required. Covered by Policy E1 Local Development Plan which prioritises employment on designated sites and in the case of mixed-use development on existing employment land would only be considered appropriate where it includes a substantive Class B employment element that would support economic growth within the District. Subject to viability and deliverability, the Class B employment element proposed would need to be delivered alongside or in advance of any proposed nonemployment uses.*

*Disagree*

## **Housing Policy**

*The Parish Council has objected to housing development on this site on each occasion that planning permission has been sought. A residential development on this site would be a gated community, separate from the village, outside Langford settlement boundary and in an unsustainable location. It should be noted that an application for 146 residential dwellings was dismissed at appeal July 2013, (12/00313/FUL). A further application for 45 residential units was dismissed at appeal July 2016, (14/00788/FUL). An outline application for 6 houses to the rear of 11-16, Ulting Lane with access onto Ulting Lane was refused September 2017, (17/00820/OUT). Two further outline planning applications for Business Park extension and 60 residential units were submitted in 2020, (20/00427/OUT) and 2021, (21/00143/OUT). These were both withdrawn by the applicant. The proposed changes to the Housing Policy would be contrary to Policy S8 Settlement Boundaries and the Countryside. Disagree*

*Two Housing Needs surveys were carried out by the RCCE which both resulted in a need for a small number of additional dwellings in the Parish. Following a Call for Sites consultation, the results were analysed independently by AECOM and the Parish Council has been discussing the possibility of building a few affordable units on a site owned by Northumbrian Water in conjunction with the RCCE Rural Housing Enabler and a representative from Hastoe Housing Association. This is still under investigation and the Parish Council decided at an earlier stage of the plan development that this could be progressed, if it is a viable option, through Policy H5 Rural Exception Schemes (Local Development Plan). Furthermore, the new Heybridge Garden Suburb development will provide a substantial number of affordable homes now that building work has commenced.*