

2351

# Draft Local Development Plan



## Public Consultation Questionnaire

Following consultation on the preferred options last summer, Maldon District Council has prepared a Draft Local Development Plan (LDP) which will help shape the future of the District over the next 15 years. The Council now wants to hear what *YOU* think about the main proposals in the Draft LDP. Information is provided in the leaflet and copies of the Draft LDP, Proposals Map and Sustainability Appraisal, are all available online at [www.maldon.gov.uk](http://www.maldon.gov.uk) and at the Council Offices. A series of exhibitions will be held throughout the District in September.

Comments should be made by completing this questionnaire and returning it to the Council in the attached stamped addressed envelope.

If you prefer, you can complete the questionnaire online on the Maldon District Council website at [www.maldon.gov.uk](http://www.maldon.gov.uk)

**All responses must be received by 5pm on Monday 14th October 2013**  
[late responses will not be considered]

### **PART A** - Your details (*anonymous responses cannot be considered*)

[Please print clearly in all written responses using **BLOCK CAPITALS** and **BLACK INK** else your data may be lost]

Name	<input type="text" value="CML MICROSYSTEMS PLC"/> <input type="text" value="c/o DAVID MAXWELL"/>	Address	<input type="text" value="CROXTON'S MILL"/>
		Line 2	<input type="text" value="LITTLE WALTHAM"/>
Company <i>(if applicable)</i>	<input type="text" value="CAPITA"/>	Line 3	<input type="text" value="CHELMSFORD"/>
		Line 4	<input type="text" value="ESSEX"/>
Email address:	<input type="text" value="david.maxwell@capita.co.uk"/>	Postcode	<input type="text" value="CM3 3PJ"/>

If you would like to be added to the Local Development Plan mailing list to receive updates on the progress of the Plan, please tick here (*please ensure your details are written clearly above*)

**PART B -**

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

2351

**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.**

Do you support the overall vision for the District set out in the Draft LDP? (please tick one box)

	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SEE ATTACHED

**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.**

Do you support the proposed level of growth in the District (Policy S2)? (please tick one box)

	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

SEE ATTACHED

**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)?

(please tick one box per line)

Settlement	Total number of dwellings	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Burnham-On-Crouch	450	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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]**

SEE ATTACHED FOR COMMENTS

22551

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.

Do you agree with the proposals for development in Maldon and Heybridge (Policy S4)? (please tick one box)

Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
<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.

Do you support the strategy for housing development in Burnham-on-Crouch (Policy S6)? (please tick one box)

Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
<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.

Do you support the strategy for housing development in North Fambridge (Policy S7)? (please tick one box)

Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
<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.

Do you support the strategy for housing development in other rural villages (Policy S7)? (please tick one box)

Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SEE ATTACHED COMMENTS

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.

Do you agree with this approach (Policy D6)? (please tick one box)

Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

2351

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

Do you support the proposals for new employment development in Maldon and the extension to the Burnham Business Park (Policy E1)? *(please tick one box)*

<i>Strongly Agree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>No Opinion</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SEE ATTACHED COMMENTS

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

Do you agree with the local requirements for affordable housing provision (Policy H1)? *(please tick one box)*

<i>Strongly Agree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>No Opinion</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SEE ATTACHED COMMENTS

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

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)? *(please tick one box)*

<i>Strongly Agree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>No Opinion</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Strongly Disagree</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**

Do you support the production of a Primrose Meadow Planning Brief to manage the future use of the site (Policy I3)? *(please tick one box)*

<i>Strongly Agree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>No Opinion</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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]**

SEE ATTACHED COMMENTS

22551

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

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

SEE ATTACHED COMMENTS

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

SEE ATTACHED COMMENTS

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.



2251

# CAPITA

Property and Infrastructure

On behalf of our client, CML Microsystems PLC, we hereby submit representations towards the draft Local Development Plan (LDP), August 2013. This document should be read alongside the completed draft LDP Public Consultation Questionnaire.

**Q1:** Do you support the overall vision for the District set out in the draft LDP ?

3

**A1:** Disagree

**Comment:** The Council's proposed Spatial Vision seeks to provide growth in the most sustainable and accessible locations within the District taking into account constraints and the need to protect valued local countryside. Whilst this vision is supported generally, the vision set out by Maldon Council within the draft LDP fails to allow for existing allocated employment and previously developed land to provide sustainable residential or mixed use development. Consequently, the draft LDP provides for development of more Greenfield land than is actually necessary. By failing to recognise the potential for existing employment sites, such as Oval Park, Langford, to deliver residential and mixed use development the draft LDP fails to comply with paragraph 22 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which states that:

*"Planning policies should avoid the long term protection of sites allocated for employment use where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for that purpose. Land allocations should be regularly reviewed. Where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for the allocated employment use, applications for alternative uses of land or buildings should be treated on their merits having regard to market signals and the relative need for different land uses to support sustainable local communities."*

2351

Q2: Do you support the proposed level of growth in the District (Policy S2) ?

9 A2: Strongly Disagree

8 **Comment:** The Council's emerging draft LDP indicates a requirement for a minimum of 4,410 dwellings to be provided over the next 15 years, between 2014 and 2029, together with the allocation of 8.4 hectares of additional employment land. The minimum requirement of 4,410 (294 dwellings per annum) is considered to represent an appropriately assessed housing need. However, the case made by MDC (paragraph 2.34 of draft LDP) that the District does not have a persistent record of under delivery of housing is not considered appropriate or accurate. MDC's housing completions for the last 5 monitoring years 1<sup>st</sup> April 2007 / 31<sup>st</sup> March 2008 to 1<sup>st</sup> April 2011/ 31<sup>st</sup> March 2012 were 29 dwellings below the East of England annual target of 120 per annum. Notably, the annual target has not been achieved within the last three monitoring years. It is unclear why Figure 4 of the draft LDP has not identified the actual housing delivery figure of 86 dwellings for 2011/12. It is therefore submitted that the draft LDP is inconsistent and non-compliant with paragraph 47 of the NPPF which states that:

*"To boost significantly the supply of housing, local planning authorities should:....*

*identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide 5 years worth of housing against their housing requirements with an additional buffer of 5% (moved forward from later in the plan period) to ensure choice and competition in the market for land. Where there has been a record of persistent under delivery of housing, local planning authorities should increase the buffer to 20% (moved forward from later in the plan period) to provide a realistic prospect of achieving the planned supply and to ensure choice and competition in the market for land".*

There is very little prospect of 294 dwellings being delivered within Maldon District during the 2012/13 or 2013/14 monitoring years. It is also submitted that the delivery targets set out in Table 4 for the years 2014/15 – 2018/19 are overly optimistic, especially in the light of the past 3 years actual delivery. These targets are reliant predominantly upon strategic land allocations coming forward and delivering houses for occupation, when the realistic situation is that the process of design development, securing planning permission, construction and delivery makes these targets unrealistic. It is submitted that MDC should provide for greater windfall allowances and make clear through the emerging LDP that the authority will increase the housing land supply buffer to 20% until such future time that housing delivery keeps pace with the annual requirement, reflecting the realistic position of under delivery in recent years and significant lead-in to strategic allocations providing actual occupied dwellings on the ground.

2351

**Q3:** Do you support the proposed distribution of new housing (Policy S2) ?

Maldon 1,830 dwellings  
Heybridge 1,000 dwellings  
Burnham on Crouch 450 dwellings

11  
14  
17

**A3:** Agree

**Comment:** The three proposed growth locations are logical and represent sound planning to deliver new homes, communities and employment land. The sustainability credentials of each of these growth locations are similar to the sustainable credentials of land at Oval Park for residential development. However, land at Oval Park has the added benefit of representing previously developed land and delivery of a mixed-use scheme at Oval Park would not result in loss of Greenfield land as would be the case in each of the Council's three proposed growth locations. Clearly, the identification and allocation of land at Oval Park for a residential and mixed use scheme would reduce the quantum of Greenfield land required elsewhere within the District and so help to meet the final housing land requirement, with either a 5% or 20% housing land supply buffer.

125

**Q4:** Do you agree with the proposals for development in Maldon and Heybridge ?

**A4:** No opinion.

**Q5:** Do you support the strategy for housing development in Burnham-on-Crouch ?

**A5:** No opinion.

**Q6:** Do you support the strategy for housing development in North Fambridge (Policy S7) ?

**A6:** No opinion.

**Q7:** Do you support the strategy for housing development in other rural villages (Policy S7) ?

111

**A7:** Strongly Agree

**Comment:** The proposed strategy of providing housing development in other rural villages is supported. Indeed, paragraph 55 of the NPPF states that:

*"To promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities."*

2351

It is submitted that Langford represents more than a small rural village. Langford provides significant existing employment opportunities through CML's operations at Oval Park, as well as the Langford Waterworks, existing housing and some community uses within Langford itself. Langford is also in close proximity to other existing and planned land uses at Heybridge. Even where Langford is classed as a small village by the Council, then it would be appropriate for Oval Park to deliver new housing to include market and affordable homes. The new homes at Oval Park could be provided as part of a strategic allocation – the site is far larger than many of the strategic greenfield allocations promoted in the LDP and should not be excluded on the basis it has an employment consent. It is eminently suitable for residential use as well in a mixed use scheme. We consider that the failure to allocate the Oval Park site as a strategic allocation makes the LDP unsound, bearing in mind that the site is previously developed land, as acknowledged by the LPA at the recent planning inquiry (appeal ref. APP/X1545/A/12/2183335, July 2013), is capable of delivering housing development, as was accepted by the Planning Inspector, and would safeguard existing and committed employment land.

The Oval Park site is and should be recognised as a strategic mixed use employment and housing allocation. Indeed it exceeds the majority of other strategic land allocations, being 11.5 ha in size, with commitments for 6,000 m2 employment and the ability to deliver new housing.

The failure to recognise this and allocate the site as mixed employment and residential use means that the Council is prioritising greenfield land over PDL, and also following the Inspector concluding:

*"given that there would still be land available at Oval Park for employment use, should it be required, and there would be other sites able to be developed for high tech industrial and office development (as confirmed in the Council's draft Economic Prosperity Strategy) I consider that it is no longer necessary to safeguard the whole of the remainder of the Oval Park site for that use and this should not be a reason for refusing planning permission for the appeal proposal."*

She also stated that:

*"However, while the employment contribution would no doubt be helpful to the Council's economic strategy as a whole.....I do not consider it is necessary[,] given my findings that there is no need to retain more land for B1 use on the site than is included in the appeal proposal."*

We fail to comprehend why MDC has chosen to completely disregard the Inspector's findings in this regard. This directly contradicts the NPPF paragraph 160, which advises that LPAs should:

*"work closely with the business community to understand their changing needs and identify and address barriers to investment, including a lack of housing, infrastructure or viability."*

In this situation, the landowner and local employer has provided significant evidence of the lack of market demand and need for the entirety of the site, and the need to secure alternative means of investment, through land disposal for residential development, the latter of which accords with NPPF paragraph 22. The LDP is therefore considered unsound in this regard.

2351

**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.

**A8:** No opinion.

**Q9:** Do you support the proposals for new employment development in Maldon and the extension to the Burnham Business Park (Policy E1) ?

**A9:** Agree.

**Comment:** The allocation of additional land at Burnham Business Park and Wyke Hill is supported, providing for possible future employment growth within the District immediately adjacent the two principal settlements of Maldon and Burnham-on-Crouch.

Nevertheless, the retained allocation of Oval Park for B1 or B2 uses under draft policy E1 (i) is not supported. Firstly, Oval Park is unsuitable for B2 uses as such uses may result in detrimental impacts to neighbouring residential properties, and also contrary to the requirements of CML Microsystems as an existing high tech business within the site. Secondly, larger and heavy goods vehicle trips that are likely to arise from B2 uses are unlikely to be suitable to the local road network including the Hatfield Road. It is recommended that Oval Park is identified and allocated through the emerging LDP policy E1 as a strategic mixed use development site to provide for up to 6,000m<sup>2</sup> additional employment floorspace together with residential (market and affordable) development.

**Q10:** Do you agree with the local requirements for affordable housing provision (Policy H1) ?

**A10:** Disagree

**Comment:** The affordable housing requirements have been set at a very high, pre-recession, rate. It is not envisaged that the affordable housing requirements will be achieved. Furthermore, the high affordable housing requirements are likely to further dampen the delivery of housing within the District adding to the persistent under deliver of housing over the last three monitoring years. It is submitted lower affordable housing targets should be identified within the emerging LDP alongside a much stronger indication of a need for flexibility on a site by site basis, and the need to take into careful consideration the impact of affordable housing on the viability of residential schemes being brought forward. The failure of the policy to provide for viability to be taken into account fails to accord with the

2351

approach of the NPPF, whereby viability is a consistent theme and specifically required to be considered by LPA's in both plan making and decision taking (paragraphs 173-177). Paragraph 173 states:

*"Therefore, the sites and the scale of development identified in the plan should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened. To ensure viability, the costs of any requirements likely to be applied to development, such as requirements for affordable housing, standards, infrastructure contributions or other requirements should, when taking account of the normal cost of development and mitigation, provide competitive returns to a willing land owner and willing developer to enable the development to be deliverable."*

**Q11:** 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).

219 **A11:** Agree.

**Q12:** Do you support the production of a Primrose Meadow Planning Brief to manage the future use of the site (Policy I3) ?

224 **A12:** Agree.

**Q13:** The Council has produced an updated Sustainability Appraisal to support the Draft LDP. Do you have any comments on this ?

**Comments:** The Sustainability Appraisal assesses the impacts arising from the proposed growth locations. As considered above, the proposed quantum of Greenfield land that may need to be released for development could be reduced through re-allocation of previously developed land at Oval Park for residential and mixed use development.

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

**Comments:** Within the recent appeal decision relating to Oval Park, Langford, the Inspector stated (paragraph 42 of appeal decision ref. APP/X1545/A/12/2183335) that:

*"However, given that there would still be land available at Oval Park [ to deliver 6,000m<sup>2</sup> B1 floorspace ] for employment use, should it be required, and there would be other sites able to be*

225

*developed for high tech industrial and office development (as confirmed in the Council's draft Economic Prosperity Strategy) I consider that it is no longer necessary to safeguard the whole of the remainder of the Oval Park site for that use and this should not be a reason for refusing planning permission for the appeal proposal".*

The Inspector also stated (paragraph 49 of appeal decision):

*"...given my findings that there is no need to retain more land for B1 use on the site than is included in the appeal proposal".*

Taking the above into account, together with the recommendations of NPPF paragraph 22 for local planning authorities that 'planning policies should avoid the long term protection of sites allocated for employment use where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for that purposes', it is recommended that Oval Park is identified by the Proposals Map of the emerging LDP as a strategic residential and mixed used site providing for up to 6,000m<sup>2</sup> additional B1 floorspace and residential development.

**Q15:** Any other comments on the draft LDP ?

**Comments:** The Evidence Base to the draft LDP includes a Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA), June 2012. In order to prepare an update of the 2012 SHLAA, Maldon Council invited comments on the SHLAA over recent months. The enclosed response to the SHLAA update was submitted in July 2013 to Maldon Council by CML Microsystems PLC and Countryside Properties UK Ltd identifying inaccuracies in the SHLAA relating to Oval Park. Taken together with the Inspector's findings in the recent planning inquiry, that:

*"I consider that the fact that the site is previously developed land and has an extant permission for employment development indicates that a housing proposal could also be considered acceptable ... I consider that the sustainability of the site would be improved to a degree that would indicate that the appeal should not be dismissed solely on the ground that the site is in an unsustainable location.";* and

*"I consider that it is no longer necessary to safeguard the whole of the remainder of the Oval Park site for that use and this should not be a reason for refusing planning permission for the appeal proposal."*

In conclusion, it is submitted that the SHLAA table should be amended with reference to Oval Park to state "suitable, available and deliverable as a residential and mixed use development".

228

**Capita Symonds  
October 2013**



2351  
(LDP ref no)

# CAPITA

## Property and Infrastructure

On behalf our client, CML Microsystems PLC and Countryside Properties UK Ltd, we hereby provide further information towards the MDC SHLAA update relating to land at Oval Park, Hatfield Road, Langford.

The SHLAA, prepared by URS on behalf of MDC and issued in May 2012, identifies Oval Park as site ID 2075. There are a number of inaccuracies within the URS relating to the assessment of Oval Park and we set out below corrections to those inaccuracies. Our comments below are set out under the heading used within the SHLAA assessment tables. We trust that the SHLAA update will be amended accordingly.

### CURRENT AND SURROUNDING USE

The URS table is inaccurate in stating: "industrial/ business on the west; agricultural use/ green space on the east".

**Recommended wording:** The SHLAA table should be amended to state: "The south-western part of Oval Park is occupied by a high-tech light industrial use with associated car parking, with an extant planning permission for additional major light industrial development. The site forms previously developed land originally part of the wider Langford Waterworks site".

### AVAILABLE

The URS SHLAA is incorrect in stating that Oval Park is not available. The URS SHLAA states that the test of 'Available' is as follows: "This indicates whether the ownership of a site is known and whether there is some indication that a landowner or developer has an intention to develop now or at a known point in the future. If ownership is unknown or there is no evidence of an intention to develop, it is marked with a 'No' ".

CML Microsystems submitted details of Oval Park towards the Call for Sites in 2008. CML also submitted to planning officers on 13th December 2010 a 'SHLAA proforma' as part of the pre-application consultation. CML and Countryside Properties have also submitted representations towards each stage of the emerging Local Development Framework. All submissions to MDC since 2008 relating to Oval Park therefore confirm that the SHLAA is factually incorrect and should indicate that Oval Park is available for residential development. It is unclear why the SHLAA prepared by URS stated that Oval Park is not available for development.

**Recommended wording:** The SHLAA table should be amended to state 'Yes', the site is available.

#### **VIABILITY**

The URS SHLAA does not provide a High (H), Medium (M) or Low (L) response for Oval Park. However, the SHLAA indicates at page 17 of the Viability Assessment prepared by HDH Planning and Development that a scheme of 139 dwellings at Oval Park would result in a negative residual land value of £1,834,453.

The planning application (MDC ref. FUL/MAL/12/00313), and recent planning appeal for Oval Park for 146 dwellings was brought forward by an established housebuilder, Countryside Properties, with extensive experience within Essex on the basis of a deliverable and commercially viable scheme. The SHLAA is quite clearly incorrect in assessing the site as being unviable.

**Recommended wording:** The SHLAA table should be amended to state 'H' (High) viability.

#### **DELIVERABILITY (Yes/Yes\*STP/No)**

The URS SHLAA is incorrect to state 'No' the site is not deliverable. The URS SHLAA states that if a site is assessed as being both suitable and achievable it is considered to be deliverable.

As set out above, the planning application (MDC ref. FUL/MAL/12/00313), and recent planning appeal for Oval Park for 146 dwellings was brought forward by an established housebuilder, Countryside Properties. Countryside Properties fully intend to deliver housing at Oval Park should the recent appeal be allowed.

**Recommended wording:** The SHLAA table should be amended to state Yes\*STP.

#### **Estimated Capacity**

The URS SHLAA fails to provide an estimate of the potential capacity at Oval Park.

The recent planning application (MDC ref. FUL/MAL/12/00313) has demonstrated that Oval Park is able to provide residential, along with public open space and retained land for 6,200m<sup>2</sup> employment floorspace.

**Recommended wording:** The SHLAA table should be amended to state residential and mixed use development.

#### **TIMESCALE**

The URS SHLAA fails to provide an estimate of timescales for delivery of housing at Oval Park. There are no constraints that would prevent housing being brought forward speedily at Oval Park.

**Recommended wording:** The SHLAA table should be amended to state '0-5 year'.

**JUSTIFICATION AND REMARKS**

The URS SHLAA simply states "Employment Site under policy E1 in RLP. Potential loss of employment land or relocation needed".

Whilst it is correct that the site is identified by the Proposals Map of the 2005 Local Plan for employment uses, it is submitted that these 'justification and remarks' are inadequate and misleading. The justification and remarks should take into account that the site is previously developed land, the site is suitable, available, viable for residential and deliverable.

**Recommended wording:** The SHLAA table should be amended to state "suitable, available and deliverable as a residential and mixed use development".

**Capita Symonds**

**October 2013**

