

Colin T Sandy CTA

Chartered Tax Advisor

Telephone : 01621 858691
Mobile : 07860 435933
E-mail : colin.sandy@sky.com

"Smallfields"
53 Broad Street Green Road
Great Totham
Maldon
Essex
CM9 8NX

Mrs Andrea Copsey,
LDP Programme Officer Examination Office,
Longcroft Cottage,
Bentley Road,
Weeley Heath,
Clacton-on-Sea,
Essex,
CO16 9BX

24th October 2016

Dear Mrs Copsey

**Maldon District Local Plan Development Examination
S53 - Land East of Broad Street Green Road and North of Lofts Farm Drive, Heybridge**

I am writing directly in respect of Mr Nick Hughes and I in response to the comments and observations relating to the area classified as **S53 - Land East of Broad Street Green Road and North of Lofts Farm Drive, Heybridge** of which we are the principle landowners.

I note that in the Report prepared by Royal HaskoningDHV for Maldon District Council dated 8th September 2016 under Reference: I&BR001D01, they recommend on page 18 that our site is suitable as an alternative site for 545 dwellings in two villages, 28 dwellings infill, school, GP surgery, retail and business space. We welcome their conclusions which are in accordance with the points we have made previously in our submissions through our planning agents Andrew Martin Planning.

We do have comments on the points raised in Table S53 and will use the numbering as per the Table itself as follows:-

Social

1. Site S53 has a number of bus stops on Broad Street Green Road but public transport would be encouraged to enter and serve the site in a loop. The combination of a school, GP Surgery, retail and business space would mean that virtually all of the main amenities required would be present on site. Private vehicle use off site would be considerably reduced and be contained thus reducing traffic impact on Broad Street Green Road and the wider infrastructure.
2. Agreed.
3. Agreed. It would be our intention to provide cycle ways and there are public rights of way that pass through the site.
4. Agreed.
5. The SA/SEA Objectives are surely met as far as possible overall given the mix on the site.

Environmental

6. Agreed on listed buildings. It is stated that this land is agricultural land which is true in part but consideration has to be given as to its comparative quality as the bland statement itself could be considered misleading. A large part of this land has been subject to gravel extraction and is referred to by Ordnance Survey as "Damaged Land". In this regard I would refer you to the penultimate plan

in Appendix D – Alternative Site Sustainability Criteria Figures, of the Royal HaskoningDHV Report, where the quality of the land on our site has been considered. This plan shows that perhaps as much as 50%, is shown to be Non Agricultural, clearly as a consequence of gravel extraction, with most of the balance being Grade 3 with a small element amounting to maybe 6 acres to the south being considered to be Grade 2. Consequently, for that 50% of the site there will be no archaeological sites or finds as this work would have been carried out prior to gravel extraction taking place.

7. Agreed subject to the points made in 6.
8. Agreed.
9. Agreed. However, in addition, in our submissions we have suggested that we could perhaps aid surface and foul water issues elsewhere by providing access for surface water runoff through our lake system and we are one of the closest sites to the Sewage Works and discussions with Anglian Water and our topography suggests that a strategic pipeline to it would perhaps reduce the impact of works required through the centre of Heybridge.
10. Agreed on geological and mineral sites. The reference to agricultural land is misleading. I would refer you to the points made in 6 above.
11. The statement is misleading in that there are planned to be a school, GP surgery, retail and business space on site so although there may be a likely increase it will be mitigated as much as possible.
12. I restate 11 above.
13. The reference to agricultural land is misleading. I would refer you to the points made in 6 above.
14. This could be said to apply to all larger housing developments but the effect could be addressed/mitigated in the layout and mix of the development.

Economic

15. Agreed
16. Agreed.
17. Agreed.

As a point of note, the Inspector has again, specifically, requested that MDC submit base evidence in support of their SA regarding their site selection process. This base evidence has not been submitted with the latest SA submission by MDC, which would allow the inspector to understand how the LDP site selection process was made. If the SA site comparison evidence is not being made available, the inspector has some difficulty knowing that due process under the clear requirements of the NPPF have been properly adhered to!

I trust that the above is of assistance. Please let me know if you require any further information. I should be very happy to discuss my comments above further if that would be helpful.

Yours sincerely,



Colin T Sandy