

24 October 2016

Mr Adrian Tofts  
Strategic Planning Manager  
Maldon District Council  
Princes Road  
Maldon  
CM9

Dear Mr Tofts

## **MALDON LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN - CONSULTATION**

I am responding to the consultation on the proposed amendments to the Local Development Plan (LDP). My comments relate specifically to the inclusion at item S34 of Land at Wickham Bishops in the Assessment of Alternative Sites in Appendix C.

You should already be aware that an application has been made for the development of part of this site. MDC's planning reference was 15/01342. The application was refused and is now the subject of an appeal to the Planning Inspectorate under reference APP/X1545/W/16/3152640. Given that MDC's Planning Committee has already refused planning permission at this site, it is perverse that it should now be included in your proposed Alternative Sites. Its inclusion potentially undermines MDC's defence to the appeal. In my view, it should be removed from the list of alternative sites.

On the assumption, however, that you will leave this site in the list, I have the following comments on the specific Site Assessment Objectives noted below.

### SA1

The site is outside the settlement boundary at almost the furthest point from the main services in Wickham Bishops, viz. bus stops, local shops, pubs. The primary school is even further away, in the next parish. Should the site be developed, the majority of residents would drive to those services. The main doctors' surgery in Witham which provides the satellite surgery in the village is closed to new patients, as are the two main surgeries in Maldon. The scale of effect should be negative, not positive.

### SA2

The comment "would be distant to amenities and infrastructure" contradicts the assessment in SA1. This scale of effect should also be negative.

### SA4

The suggested additional 94 dwellings for this site would increase the number of dwellings in the village by over 10%. There is already a viable and vibrant community in Wickham Bishops. Such an increase would be unsustainable and would not "contribute to strengthening the existing community"; quite the reverse, given the size of the local opposition to the planning application referred to above. Again, this scale of effect should be at least moderate negative impact.

### SA5

It is unrealistic to assume that there will only be "some element of dependency on private vehicle use". Given the site's position, there would be a great deal of such dependency, as I

have noted in respect of SA1 above. In this part of the village, most parents with children at the primary school drive to the school. It is not unrealistic to expect that the majority of the dwellings would be occupied by two car families. Given the current bus timetables, those who commute to work, either from Witham rail station or to nearby towns, will do so by car. This should be at least a moderate, if not major, negative impact on your scale of effect.

SA11, SA12

As set out above, I believe the increase in private vehicle transport would be greater than "small scale". Both these Objectives should be a higher negative impact scale of effect.

SA14

The loss of many trees on this site and its development cannot in any shape or form meet this Objective. This scale of effect should also be assessed at least as moderate, if not major, negative impact.

In summary, there are no positive impacts from the development of this site as proposed in the LDP. Its retention in the list of Alternative Sites would be in contradiction to the decision already reached by your Planning Committee and potentially be detrimental to the defence of the appeal. If it must be retained, the scale of affect assessments as noted above should be reconsidered.

Yours sincerely

Ian Wardrop