

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 on of 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 ? <i>(please tick one box)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 , the following distribution is now proposed.

Do you support the proposed distribution of new housing ?

Settlement	Total number of dwellings	<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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Heybridge	1,000	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Burnham-On-Crouch	450	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- Q3 If you disagree, is there an alternative distribution of new housing which you would prefer?

Advantage should be taken to extend the current Lakes development, and to the West of the Mariners development, and all existing brown field sites before considering any possible use of Green Belt, or Agriculture land

- 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 ? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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 ? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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 ? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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 ? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input 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 ? | <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 ? | <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 ? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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 ?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 ?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q13 The Council has produced an updated to support the Draft LDP which is available on the Council's website. Do you have any comments on this?

Sustainability should always be a considered option, but this should not be at the expense of existing facilities, nor should it be utilised as a method to drive forward the Draft LDP, as sustainability of the existing infrastructure, agricultural land, and the existing rural communities must also be given due consideration

Q14 Do you wish to comment on the *proposals map* or any other policies in the Draft LDP?

If so, please enter here which *Policy / Paragraph number(s)* you refer to **S4 & S5**

Please enter your comments in the box below

The map is considerably lacking in detail, and with particular reference to the flood risk areas, and the various facilities that the proposed development will provide, nor is there any evidence of any proposals to improve transport links, and proposals. There is also no evidence as to any improvements to the existing roads, etc, nor any links that the proposed relief roads will provide with both the existing road infrastructure, and the the proposed development areas

Q15 If you wish to make any other comments on the Draft LDP, enter your comments in the box below

Whilst these proposals are limited to the Maldon District Council area, there is no evidence as to the possible impact that the proposed developments will have on the adjacent council areas, the infrastructure links, which are already heavily utilised, into the Maldon area, via South Woodham, Danbury, and the A12. No suggestion as to any improvement to the rail service from Hatfield Peveral, which is already overcrowded, and infrequent. I can see no evidence as to any significant improvement to address the already known significant flooding risk to Holloway Road. It is totally unacceptable, having attend Planning meetings, that Councillors are only prepared to accept these proposals if they do not have an impact on their Parishes

Gary Sung

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 08 October 2013 12:44
To: Policy
Subject: Fwd: Maldon District Council - Local Development Plan - Proposed Development North of Holloway Rd

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

FAO Mr David Coleman

Dear Mr Coleman

I have very serious concerns, with reference to the above, the most significant of which relates to **flooding**

As you know, the whole of the area where this proposed development is being considered, has been highlighted as a CAT 5 flood risk, which I understand is the highest in the whole Eastern England, and, as no action has been taken to mitigate this very substantial risk, and I cannot understand as to how it can even be considered as an area for development, without having a massive impact on existing properties.

The whole area, which already has a very high and critical water table, of this proposed development, currently acts as what could be described as a natural sponge, so, in the event of heavy, and persistent rainfall, absorbs rainwater, as do the crops, which in turn then allows water to run off into the local drainage ditches, and whilst these, on a number of occasions reach critical levels, do assist in preventing more flooding to the flooding that we already experience. So with these fields, the natural drainage, run offs, and the like, being replaced with impervious materials, which most certainly do not absorb water, and will in fact lead to a concentration, and build up of flood water, I quite honestly cannot understand as to how this area can be considered for development, when common sense tells me it will be certainly increase the risk of flooding.

I am also aware that there has been 2 developments to the south of Holloway Road, both of which were approved subject to substantial anti flood measures being undertaken, but whilst I understand that measures were put in place for 1 development, this has proved to be a complete waste of time, and money, as the measures have been totally ineffective, they basically do not catch any water – the ponds created are basic dry pits in the ground. With regards to the second development, I understand that no actual flood protection measures have been undertaken, even though they were part of the approval process, and, as such, I have very little faith in any enforcement of an agreement that may be required of any developer to provide flood protection measures.

I also note with interest that a Northern relief road is proposed, and whilst it has been suggested that this road could be utilised for the proposed development, which should at least avoid an increase in Holloway Road traffic flows, and also avoid the need for any changes to the existing road, this relief road will not lead to any improvement to the existing traffic flows, within the Maldon area, as the Council has already indicated that all the keys junctions are at maximum capacity. So if this proposed development were to go ahead, I would suggest that the increase in traffic could quite literally lead to gridlock during peak periods.

This proposed development, whilst having a negative impact on the local infrastructure, will almost certainly have an impact on the surrounding infrastructure, as the same existing roads will still have to be used to gain access to the Maldon area, from the A12 and A130, and with the increased traffic flows along the existing roads, there will most certainly be a negative impact on the surrounding areas, such as Hatfield Peveral, Danbury, South Woodham Ferres, Bickenacre, and Wickham Bishops.

This proposed development would also have an impact on local bus services, which I consider almost non-existent, and the rail link to London from Hatfield Peveral, which is already infrequent, and overcrowded, and I have not seen any proposals as to how these transportation issues may be addressed. Maldon, unlike a number of other areas, which this LDP covers, where proposed developments are actually being reduced, and no advantage is being taken as to the possible utilisation of existing rail links, does not have a station.

Whilst I understand that it has been recognised that the local amenities, are already at breaking point, as there are not enough doctors, school places, etc, available, and that any developer will be expected to make a contribution to providing another doctor's surgery, and a school, I understand that this would be subject to there being a demand, and suggest that this is most certainly not a given, as various surveys and studies would have to be undertaken, and by the time that these have been completed, it is most likely that the proposed development, if approved, would have been completed, so this requirement is likely not to be met. So we will have to continue to suffer with a lack of sufficient amenities.

It has also been suggested, that this proposed development will lead to businesses moving into the area, giving more job opportunities, but I would suggest that this is most unlikely, as it is usually the other way round, people having to move, or commute, to where the work is, which is why Hatfield Peveral station is so heavily used, unless there is a very skilled local work force available, which is very unlikely in what is currently a rural community, which may well be destroyed by these proposals.

Whilst I consider that the issues that I have raised must be considered and addressed, before any possible planning applications are considered, and that is assuming that the Government actually accepts the LDP, I would welcome your comments.

Your sincerely



[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]