



1st October 2016

Adrian Tofts
Strategic Planning Manager
Maldon District Council
Princes Road
Maldon
CM9 5DL

Dear Mr. Tofts,

**Response to Maldon District Local Development Plan Consultation
September/October 2016 by North Fambridge Parish Council**

1. Schedule of Main Modifications

1.1 Page 3 Rural Allocations

The reference to North Fambridge including allocations of 75 houses (page 3) should be removed as being in conflict with the agreement with the original examining inspector and conflicts with the removal on page 4 under Rural Allocations and para 095 on page 18. There is no allocation of 75 houses to North Fambridge.

Para 094 p.19 also removes any reference to North Fambridge. North Fambridge is not one of the more sustainable rural villages and suffers from a lack of facilities and infrastructure.

2. Sustainability Appraisal Report Update Following Inspector's Report

2.1 Page 16 para 3.1.1 identifying additional sites for consideration, Table 6 North Fambridge extension is identified. In the light of the removal of North Fambridge as suitable for the allocation of 75 houses it is impossible to conceive that the provision of 850-1,250 houses is possible. It also contradicts S46 the provision of 75 houses. In either event the allocation is considered to have neutral/no impact when measured against the criteria under the SA Objective as judged by Key Indicators (KI).

2.2 On further analysis under para1 (KI) the nearest post office is at Cold Norton. There is a railway station but negligible bus service. There are no crossings for disabled persons and inadequate, narrow and bumpy pavements. The village is very difficult to access if you are disabled.

KI 2, the housing is predominately large, expensive family homes with some smaller bungalows and approximately 8 semi-detached homes. There is no affordable housing.

K1 3, although the village does promote a healthy lifestyle with many opportunities for walking, sailing and cycling the medical provision is poor with new occupants finding it difficult to register with a doctor. The surgery in Burnham on Crouch is full and will be overwhelmed by the requirements from the allocated housing provision in the LDP. The position is similar in Maldon and the surgeries in South Woodham Ferrers are short of doctors and are full. The nearest A & E is in Chelmsford and is very difficult to access without the use of a car which takes a 45 minute journey in any event. There are reductions in the emergency services including the ambulance and fire service. There is no direct bus service to Chelmsford.

KI 4, there are a number of active groups within the village and these take place in the village hall. There are no other rural facilities save the pub, a restaurant to service the marina and the church. There are no shops within the village.

KI 5, there are no cycling routes but a number of footpaths. Employment is accessed either by car or by train (a branch line). Trains run once an hour out of peak time and roughly every 40 minutes at peak times. The vast majority of villagers rely on cars for transport. There have already been a number of accidents on B1010 which will only increase with the number of houses allocated to Burnham and therefore the number of vehicles using the road. The exit and entrance to the village is dangerous with limited visibility.

2.3 Environmental SA objectives (ESA)

ESA 7; there are a number of SSI and Ramsar sites within the village as well as the Essex Wildlife Trust reserve (Blue House Farm). The addition of a large number (850-1,250) houses must have an impact on the wildlife in the village. None of the new developments have included any ecological enhancement.

ESA 9; planning permissions recently granted have a negative condition in relation to SUDS. Houses at the top of Franklin Road and a property on Fambridge Road have sewage back up problems during times of heavy rainfall. Both pumping stations suffer from flooding. The coastal defences are currently in fair to good order but there is a planned retreat from areas outside the actual village.

ESA14; as stated above there are a number of SSSI and Ramsar sites and the village is a special landscape area and is within the coastal zone. No additional developments demonstrate that they maintain or enhance the quality of the countryside etc.

3. General Comments

In relation to Burnham in P7 Para 089 it states it is considered to be inappropriate to add 1,150 dwellings for a number of reasons, including the relatively limited availability of local services and facilities. Burnham also has a train station and in addition bus services, a doctor's surgery, schools and shops; if it is inappropriate to

add additional housing to that already allocated it is even more inappropriate to allocate 850-1,250 houses to North Fambridge where the only identified facility is a train station. North Fambridge currently is a village of c.330 houses.

On the examination of documents mentioned in the Sustainability Appraisal Report Update following Inspector's Report (ref I&BR001D01) the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment Part 2 Selection of sites, North Fambridge is included in both the Appendix from 2012 and the Appendix from 2014 in the Site Schedules. In both cases all sites are identified as not being deliverable during the first 5 years of the plan with recognition that the timescale reflects the sewerage capacity issue. The problems with the sewerage capacity were identified in 2012. It was therefore never appropriate to include 75 houses in North Fambridge for the first 0-5 years of the plan and given scheduled development of a large scale identified in the Chelmsford BC LDP the solution to sewerage has still not been determined.

P29 para 069 identifies protection of local nature reserves etc. such an increase in housing would indirectly affect the nature reserves and change the whole identity of the village.

The above comments are submitted as the response of North Fambridge Parish Council to the LDP Consultation.