

**GOLDHANGER PARISH  
COUNCIL**



Parish clerk: Miss V Banyard  
21 D'Arcy Way Tolleshunt D'Arcy  
Maldon Essex CM9 8UD

Tel: 01621 860265

Chair: Councillor J Bourn

17 Church Street Goldhanger  
Maldon Essex CM9 8AS

Tel: 01621 788298

Via Email: [policy@maldon.gov.uk](mailto:policy@maldon.gov.uk)  
Adrian Tofts  
Strategic Planning Manager  
Maldon District Council  
Princes Road  
Maldon  
Essex  
CM9 5DL

**GOLDHANGER PARISH COUNCIL**

**Comments on LDP Consultation October 2016**

Schedule of main modifications

Page 8 item 116 para 2.31

Updates to the SHLAA – where are these identified?

There were a number of SHLAA sites at an earlier stage of the Plan, which were commented on as part of the 'Parish Survey' completed Oct 2015, and Goldhanger Parish Council (GH PC) understands that the list of 'alternative sites' are a result of the "additional sites received....over the past 2 years since the last SHLAA report" and "call for sites" carried out last Oct-Dec 2015, (which was described in the Parish Survey under 'next steps'). Where is the total list of sites for 'consideration' documented?

MDC LDP website has a number of referenced documents, including letters from developers suggesting sites, but the evidence base of documents does not include the 'Parish Surveys' or an updated SHLAA, making the consultation incomplete and lacking clarity.

## **Five year Housing Land Supply Statement**

There is no mention of the new build under construction behind Hall Farm, Church St. (05/01119/FUL in progress and due to complete in 2017)

## **Sustainability Appraisal Report Update**

Para 1.5.1 Table 1 pages 4-7. For the 17 objectives there is no scoring matrix to show how the result is calculated.

There is no indication of each site's capacity.

From the 54 sites in Table 8 only 6 have a net positive sustainability figure, the average is – 7.76 and the worst case – 23. How will these scores be used?

Summary 6.3.1 p39 is difficult to understand as it appears to contradict the data in Table 8, please clarify.

## **Appendix C Alternative Sites Assessment Tables (S20 & 24 only)**

### S20 Goldhanger –North Maldon Growers

S20.2 No figures for site capacity given in this document, so how can a statement regarding potential contribution be assessed?

S20.5 There is no "major bus route" and the table is factually incorrect. The recently reduced 95 service goes from Tollesbury to Maldon, not Maldon to Colchester as the table states, and the 95 is subject to ongoing viability reviews and therefore at risk of being withdrawn..

S20.7 Not all of the land has been previously developed.

S20.9 SUDS has been proven NOT to work in the village, recent other schemes that have been connected to the existing surface water system that is already overloaded and has recently flooded existing dwellings downstream. The Environment Agency website shows significant surface water flooding in this area, which is borne out from experience and the assessment scoring should therefore be assessed more negatively.

S20.15 Within the context of a small village the loss of employment is high and should therefore be scored more negatively.

### S24 Goldhanger – Land South of the Allotments

It should be noted that this site has been subject to a rejected planning application and recent dismissal by Government inspectors. (14<sup>th</sup> September 2016) Therefore GH PC consider that this site should be removed from any future consideration or possible SHLAA allocation

MDC application ref: OUT/MAL/15/00982 & Appeal ref: APP/X1545/W/16/3147228

Specific comments to alternative site assessment tables as follows:

S24.2 No figures for site capacity given on this document so how can a statement regarding potential contribution be assessed?

S24.5 There is no "major bus route" and the table is factually incorrect. The recently reduced 95 service goes from Tollesbury to Maldon, not Maldon to Colchester as the table states, and the 95 is subject to ongoing viability reviews and therefore at risk of being withdrawn.

S24.9 SUDS has been proven NOT to work in the village, recent other schemes that have been connected to the existing surface water system that is already overloaded and has recently flooded existing dwellings opposite this site. The EA website shows significant surface water flooding in this area which is borne out from experience, the surface water system regularly floods the B1026 road immediately in front of the proposed site.

S24.6 & S24.7 give a neutral scoring to environmental impact "protect and enhance local townscape" whereas the Government appeal inspector (point 26) states "*fails to fulfil the environmental role of planning to protect and enhance the natural environment. These impacts would be contrary to both national and local policy. I therefore give them significant weight*" the appeal dismissal report discusses many points of unsuitability of the site, and includes (point 14) the fact that the site is adjacent to a public footpath which "*the view from the public footpath would be considerably altered*" GH PC would therefore suggest that the strong wording of this report warrants a more negative scoring on the table for these objectives, ie double negatives.

In conclusion, notwithstanding the above comments to the site assessment tables, GH PC consider that since the Government appeal has been dismissed, this site should be removed from any future consideration or possible SHLAA allocation.

Yours Faithfully,

Julia Bourn

Goldhanger Parish Council - Chair