

Adrian Tofts Esq
Strategic Planning Policy Officer
Maldon District Council
Princes Road
Maldon
CM9 5DL

25 October 2016

By email & hard copy by post

Dear Mr Tofts

Maldon District Local Development Plan: Main modifications to Policy H6

I have carefully studied the Schedule of Main Modifications to the Local Development Plan in respect of Policy H6: Provision for Travellers.

I welcome the clear and unambiguous inclusion of the exact number of new sites needed as 32 for the period 2013 to 2028.

I am pleased to see that the sites listed are now clearly shown to be existing sites and no longer as designated sites.

I am exceedingly disappointed that the proposed Site Allocation DPD has not been produced, and certainly not in accord with the timetable you gave me in July 2015 which stated that public consultations on it would be from late 2015 to early 2016, and submission to the Secretary of State in late 2016.

I hope that I have correctly understood the listed modifications (although I must say that the way they are set out in the document is a positive masterpiece of obfuscation for the uninitiated). Although I note that the criteria for assessing proposals for new sites have been moved to come before what is now only the 'preferred' sequential approach for considering such proposals, I do not believe that the new policy is fundamentally different from the previous policy. As you will doubtless remember, that policy was regarded by the earlier Inspector as unworkable in practice, and I consider that the same observation applies to your modified policy.

I, therefore, wish to maintain my objection to the Maldon District Local Development Plan in relation to Policy H6 for the following reasons:

[A] the Policy does not identify locations for new sites for travellers;

[B] the specific Site Allocation DPD which is mentioned several times in the body of the Policy has not been produced and a draft of it does not accompany the modified Plan;

[C] the criteria numbered (1) and (2) to be applied in assessing possible new sites (whether as listed in the actual Policy or referred to in para 5.45 under Policy Clarification) are discriminatory and unworkable in practice; and

[D] the random listing of existing sites without any explanation or clarification, particularly with regard to site H6(a), make any fulfilment of criteria (1) and (2) quite appallingly and unfairly onerous.

May I also refer you to my earlier letter of 18 April 2016, which once again set out my objection that Wood Corner is randomly listed as the first site to which criteria 1 and 2 would have to be applied.

I would be grateful if you would forward my views to Mr Berkeley – or please let me know if I ought to send them to him direct.

Yours sincerely

Patricia Herrmann