

**PART B -**

Reference is made to the appropriate Policy/Appendix numbers in the Draft LDP.

**Q1 The overall vision is to improve the quality of life for people living and working in the District and to provide the new homes, jobs and infrastructure required to meet identified needs and support the local economy, whilst protecting the District's heritage and environment.**

	<i>Strongly Agree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>No Opinion</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>
Do you support the overall vision for the District set out in the Draft LDP? <i>(please tick one box)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Q2 In order to ensure the LDP will meet the requirements set by Government, the Council has reviewed the amount of development required to meet identified housing and employment needs over the next 15 years. As a result, it has been necessary to increase the proposed number of new homes from 3,000 to 4,410 and to allocate 8.4 hectares of additional employment land.**

	<i>Strongly Agree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>No Opinion</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>
Do you support the proposed level of growth in the District (Policy S2)? <i>(please tick one box)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Q3 The main urban areas of Maldon, Heybridge and Burnham-on-Crouch are considered to be the most appropriate locations for new housing. Following consideration of alternative options which are detailed in the Draft LDP (Appendix 6), the following distribution is now proposed.**

Do you support the proposed distribution of new housing (Policy S2)?

<i>Settlement</i>	<i>Total number of dwellings</i>	<i>(please tick one box per line)</i>				
		<i>Strongly Agree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>No Opinion</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>
Maldon	1,830	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Heybridge	1,000	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Burnham-On-Crouch	450	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**If you disagree, is there an alternative distribution of new housing which you would prefer? [Please use **BLOCK CAPITALS**]**

- Q4 **It is proposed to develop two Garden Suburbs in Maldon and Heybridge which will be comprehensively planned to ensure the provision of a mix of housing, community and educational facilities, open space and new transport provision.**

	<i>Strongly Agree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>No Opinion</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>
Do you agree with the proposals for development in Maldon and Heybridge (Policy S4)? <i>(please tick one box)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- Q5 **The distribution of new housing in Burnham-on-Crouch has been reviewed in response to comments received during the last consultation. It is now proposed to distribute the new housing between three smaller sites instead of one large site.**

	<i>Strongly Agree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>No Opinion</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>
Do you support the strategy for housing development in Burnham-on-Crouch (Policy S6)? <i>(please tick one box)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- Q6 **In response to comments made during the last consultation, the number of new dwellings to be accommodated in North Fambridge has been reduced from 300 to 75.**

	<i>Strongly Agree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>No Opinion</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>
Do you support the strategy for housing development in North Fambridge (Policy S7)? <i>(please tick one box)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- Q7 **In order to provide for local housing needs and support local services, it is proposed to make provision for a total of 345 new dwellings in other rural villages in the District. A Rural Allocations Development Plan Document will be produced after completion of the LDP in consultation with local communities to identify appropriate sites for development.**

	<i>Strongly Agree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>No Opinion</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>
Do you support the strategy for housing development in other rural villages (Policy S7)? <i>(please tick one box)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- Q8 **A policy has been included in the Draft LDP to ensure that the use or display of advertisements do not have an adverse impact on amenity and public safety.**

	<i>Strongly Agree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>No Opinion</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>
Do you agree with this approach (Policy D6)? <i>(please tick one box)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Q9 The Draft LDP seeks to provide adequate land to promote employment development, job creation and to allow for the expansion of existing businesses.**

	<i>Strongly Agree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>No Opinion</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>
Do you support the proposals for new employment development in Maldon and the extension to the Burnham Business Park (Policy E1)? <i>(please tick one box)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Q10 Increasing the supply of affordable housing is one of the Council's key priorities.**

	<i>Strongly Agree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>No Opinion</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>
Do you agree with the local requirements for affordable housing provision (Policy H1)? <i>(please tick one box)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Q11 The Council is committed to working with our partners to improve healthcare facilities within the District**

	<i>Strongly Agree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>No Opinion</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>
Do you support development on an appropriate greenfield location at the edge of Maldon if it were to deliver a new Community Hospital or similar healthcare facilities (Policy I2)? <i>(please tick one box)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Q12 Primrose Meadow is an area of green space situated off Mundon Road, Maldon**

	<i>Strongly Agree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>No Opinion</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>
Do you support the production of a Primrose Meadow Planning Brief to manage the future use of the site (Policy I3)? <i>(please tick one box)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Q13 The Council has produced an updated Sustainability Appraisal to support the Draft LDP which is available on the Council's website. Do you have any comments on this? [Please use BLOCK CAPITALS]**

**Q14 Do you wish to comment on the Proposals Map or any other Policies in the Draft LDP?**

Please enter here which Policy Number / Paragraph number you refer to

H6

Please enter your comments in the box below [Please use **BLOCK CAPITALS**]

I DO NOT CONSIDER THE PROPOSALS MADE UNDER POLICY H6 TO BE REASONABLE OR APPROPRIATE. THE POLICY TO CONSIDER EXTENSION AND INTENSIFICATION TO EXISTING SITES FOR GYPSY AND TRAVELLERS AS A FIRST PRIORITY IS GREATLY FLAWED. IT EFFECTIVELY DENIES MEMBERS OF THE TRAVELLING COMMUNITY THE OPPORTUNITY TO LIVE OUTSIDE THESE LOCATIONS. FURTHERMORE IT PROVIDES PRECIPITANT ADVANTAGE TO THOSE PRIVATE LAND OWNERS WHO ALREADY OWN THE EXISTING LOCATIONS AND THE SURROUNDING LAND. THIS POLICY DOES NOT COMPLY WITH GOVERNMENT GUIDANCE AND IS EFFECTIVELY NOT DELIVERABLE.

**Q15 If you wish to make any other comments on the Draft LDP, enter your comments in the box below [Please use **BLOCK CAPITALS**]**

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire. Your comments are important and will be fully considered. Please see Maldon District Council's website for future information about the progress of the LDP.

If you need further assistance please contact the Planning Policy Team by email at [policy@maldon.gov.uk](mailto:policy@maldon.gov.uk) or by telephone on 01621 876202

This document can be made available on request in larger print, braille and audio and in languages other than English. To obtain a copy in an alternative format please contact the Planning Policy Team on 01621 876202.

**Gary Sung**

---

**From:** William Hopkins <wrhopkins@dial.pipex.com>  
**Sent:** 10 October 2013 18:59  
**To:** Policy  
**Subject:** LDP Consultation

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

W R Hopkins  
Broomfields Farm  
Lea Lane  
Great Braxted  
Essex  
CM8 3ER

Dear Sirs,

I write with regard to the proposed H6 Gypsy & traveller provisions policy. The Policy Committee should be fully aware of the history on the sites at Lea Lane and the repeated criticism by Planning Inspectors regarding the lack of local adopted policy for more than 20 years.

Having read and reviewed the proposed policy, I consider it to be a simplistic solution to a politically difficult subject which wholly fails both residents in Great Braxted and the other wards with existing sites, as well as the Gypsy and Traveller community. Furthermore the policy does not appear to take fully into consideration the published Government guidance "Planning policy for traveller sites" published 23/3/12 (ISBN 978140983052). Having sat in a number of Planning Enquiries & hearings, I am aware of the weight placed on adherence to the published guidance by inspectors. To ignore this legislation in the development of the emerging LDP is very short-sighted, as future inspectors will remain free to overrule any locally determined decisions due to the policy failure. This would consequently keep local planning control for Gypsy & traveller sites in Maldon District policed by the Inspectorate in Bristol as it has been for many years. This clearly does not encapsulate the "localism" intent of the recent Government legislation. It seems obvious that this opportunity to develop a strong, fair and integrated policy should not be overlooked or dismissed due to the difficulty of the challenge. Surely the role of the council is to approach these difficult issues and address them to the benefit of both the settled & traveller communities and also avoid further financial losses in defending appeals, which are indefensible, due to the repeated failure to address the problems proactively.

With regard to the policy "sequential approach proposal" , I make the following comments some of which are general and some relate to Lea Lane Great Braxted

Approach 1 "Intensification of existing sites" & approach 2 "appropriate expansion of existing sites"

This is a poor route to providing additional plots. Increasing the density of population or footprint of any one group in a particular location leads towards isolation and separation from the local community increases. The policy risks producing sites which due to size & density become

socially self sufficient, removing the general aim of all planning policy which is to improve social and economic integration between all racial & socio-economic groups. This policy effectively breaches the requirement of PPT B11a which requires the adopted policy to encourage integration between the communities.

For the Lea Lane site the continued intensification on the original sites and the recent site expansion has left the entire location out of balance with the local settled population. This is out of line with Planning Policy for Travellers sites policy H para 23 regarding domination of local environment. To implement the proposed policy would provide the route to further plots being applied for and placed at Lea Lane, increasing the imbalance and now palpable animosity between communities. A further valid point are the views of many of the Gypsy & Traveller population. There is a well documented case in Cambridgeshire, where a settled group of travellers objected to local intensification themselves, as they felt it would cause friction with the local population. My wife also spoke with a number of Gypsies during government Gypsy & Traveller consultation process in London, many of them expressed the same view, that small sites were fine, but larger intensified sites risked social and integration issues.

It could also be argued that this policy effectively places the opportunity for future new Gypsy and Traveller sites mainly in to the hands of a very few fortunate individuals who already own land at or around the existing approved locations. This situation can only increase the value of this land within the Gypsy community and consequently excluding those individuals of lower economic status from the opportunity to find somewhere to live. It should be remembered that the advantageous planning policy offered to this community is due to the Government determination that they are economically disadvantaged with respect to the settled community. I fail to see how this situation can be deemed fair and "deliverable" as is required by Government guidance.

#### Approach a) & c) and Policy Clarification notes 5.49 & 5.50

This policy is failed by the primary preferred route to providing additional plots by intensification. Intensification of sites within small rural communities as existing in the Maldon District causes imbalances between the traveller and settled community. Consideration could be made for encouraging small family groups of perhaps 2-3 plots on a site. Sites with multiple plots and unrelated occupants risks isolation & tension with the settled community.

In Lea Lane the policy has already failed with regard to local environmental quality. In this location there is a continuing situation of burning garden business waste, noise from dog breeding pens and reported raw sewage in the ditches. Despite all of these issues having been referred historically to the various regulatory bodies and council departments, they continue. It would appear that to control these problems is considered too challenging. As a consequence there is a real loss of amenity to the settled community in Lea Lane.

#### Policy Clarification note 5.51

This policy severely fails the requirement of the Planning Policy for Travellers legislation. The requirement of PPT B9a requires councils to indentify a deliverable 5 year supply of additional plots. As far as I am aware all of the sites identified excluding Woodham Walter are privately owned. I cannot see how the council can suggest any plots are "deliverable" on private sites, unless they have entered into contract with those land owners. PPT H25 Clearly states that failure to provide a clear deliverable 5-year supply will be held strongly against any decision taken at appeal. Again adopting a weak policy leaves the Planning Inspectorate a clear route to overturn any local decisions. Furthermore the policy takes no account of the provision for travellers who are unable to provide their owns sites as detailed in PPT D13, & leaves the permissions effectively

only open to wealthy individuals to promote their own traveller development schemes on the land they own and which is already identified within the policy plans.

The following further requirements of PPT 23-3-12 are not addressed within the document

Sustainability - The policy does not detail the necessity of sustainability as required in PPT B7 & B11. Sustainability is probably the most discussed planning issue presently, there at the very least should be a paragraph within in policy document requiring real sustainability. On Lea Lane we have seen a number of appeals where the sustainability was accepted unchallenged, even though there are no facilities, limited water & electricity services, no bus route, no mains drainage. In real terms every resident in the area drives to work, the shops etc. I cannot see how further intensification of any residential occupation within such a rural location could be determined as sustainable.

Joint development plans - PPT B9c requires councils to discuss with neighbouring districts joint planning policy. No such planning is detailed in the policy nor is any consultation detailed with the County Council, who I am led to believe are responsible for publicly owned and operated sites.

Harm – This is a difficult issue as any comment on harm potentially risks comment of racism, however having lived in the community for 19 years, having moved in to our house with the knowledge of the original travellers site and having had our children go to school and also play with children from the adjacent site, I would hope that these comments are taken as a subjective consideration. The basic premise of planning policy is that no permission or group of permissions should cause harm. Lea Lane would now appear to be blighted by the recent spate of applications, appeals & permissions, which have allowed the site to become out of balance with the local settled community. Unfortunately in the real world where people make individual choices, the existence of a large intensive Gypsy site in any location has an immediate negative impact on desirability. There are presently a number houses on Lea Lane that have been for sale for a reasonably long period & no sales have been possible. More importantly I have been told that the old school house on Braxted Park Rd last year had two sales fall through after local searches revealed the local Gypsy planning history, the potential purchasers being wary of further expansion. Clearly harm has occurred to all property owners in Lea Lane & also the sphere of influence of this site extends nearly ¾ mile. In consideration of small sites with only a couple of plots, this harm effect would obviously be much less. As a proof of this situation, we had no concerns in 1994 in buying our house in the full knowledge of the existing Lea Lane site, which at that time only had 2 plots.

A further serious implication of the policy as proposed is the possibility of a challenge by the use of the Race Relations and Human Rights Acts. The policy as proposed effectively removes the choice of any member of the Gypsy or Traveller community from living in the Maldon District anywhere other than those already designated existing sites. This is enforced by the sequential route for approval of sites with "other sites in the district" as a fourth option. Considering that in Essex most Gypsy and Traveller locations tend to be rural and green field, the third alternative is in real terms automatically removed from consideration. This onerous position would not be acceptable to any other racial or socio-economic group, why does the Council consider it acceptable for the Gypsy and Traveller community?

With the proposed MDC LDP Policy H6 alternative options, I would also make the following comments regarding the delay in preparing and adopting the local plan. As the council had no adopted policy for Gypsy & Traveller sites since the 1999 document, it is ludicrous to suggest that

this opportunity to make a real and proper change to policy should be overruled on a time basis. Should this occur and the proposed policies be adopted the only beneficiaries will be the council members & officials, who could no longer be criticised for having no policy. No benefit to either settled or traveller communities would be gained, other than those fortunate individuals with spare space on the existing sites. Policy should be for the benefit of the local community not self serving.

From LDP documents there are 30 wards in Maldon District, presently only 8 wards have registered traveller sites. With a view to low level development, the low level of demand as identified with the LDP proposal document and a more effective integration of communities, I would suggest the following action be taken;

MDC should pro-actively seek out suitable sites within all wards in the district, it must consider making provision for those travellers who are not wealthy enough to provide for themselves, if necessary in conjunction with the County Council, this has occurred previously with the Woodham Walter site. It must identify sites which are deliverable either by approaching land owners or offering incentives/requirements within other planning schemes. This concept is not new, there has been a clear policy for social housing inclusion within large or exclusive housing schemes for many years, why not for traveller provision? Particularly as the planning system identifies them as being disadvantaged and requiring special treatment. I realise that all Councilors will react by wanting to protect their electors, however if a policy was developed to require all wards to provide and accommodate a small quota of the required additional plots, then no one ward or district would have to suffer an unnecessary development burden or would be in a position to complain about being unfairly dealt with. If we are to live in a democracy it is an inherent requirement to accept some perceived detriment rather than only benefit. By developing small sites the probability of acceptance and integration by and with the settled community would be much greater. This policy would require strong commitment and leadership from the elected members, new thinking, which could however be seen as truly being progressive for the entire community. There is a well publicised Government scheme with £60M funding available to assist this, somewhat surprisingly for central funds this has a very low subscription rate from councils, perhaps Maldon could apply for this and make a real attempt at solving what has been a very long term failure in both policy and provision.

In conclusion should the policy be passed as proposed the continuing issues on policy failure at appeals will continue, the only difference being the criticism of poor policy rather than none.

Most sincerely

W.R. Hopkins