

PART B -

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

21/05

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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.

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"/>

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)?

Settlement	Total number of dwellings	(please tick one box per line)				
		Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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

ASSUMING DEVELOPMENT IN BURNHAM-ON-CROUCH IS ESSENTIAL (I.E. NEEDED) THEN A MAXIMUM OF 200 SHOULD BE CONSIDERED. - 60 OF THESE "AFFORDABLE" I NOTE THERE ARE PLANS TO DEVELOP LAND W. OF SOUTHMINSTER (100+) NOT ON L.D.P. "DISCUSSION STAGE" DEVT OF LAND @ RICE & COLES, BURNHAM NOT ON L.D.P.

10/10/2015

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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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"/>

5090205

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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]

PLEASE ATTACHED.

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**]

PLEASE SEE ATTACHED.

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

① FAR TOO SHORT TIME TO CONSIDER THE L.D.P e
ITS FAR REACHING IMPLICATIONS.

② POOR PUBLILITY
ONE PER HOUSEHOLD, SHOULD HAVE BEEN

③ ONE PER REGISTERED ELECTOR - MANY WERE
NOT AWARE THEY COULD OBTAIN MORE

④ WHY NOT 2 DOLLUMENTS - ONE IN PLANNING
SPEAK (i.e. 156 PAGES) AND ONE OUTLINE DOCUMENT
EXPLAINING THE MOST IMPORTANT ASPECTS.

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 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.

SUSTAINABILITY

Identified as 'central to the LDP'- in total agreement.

2:6 ' Key dimensions', *economic*- provision of infrastructure, not demonstrated in Policy S6

social- supplying housing to meet needs, accessible local services reflecting community needs- health, social, cultural well-being, not demonstrated in Policy S6

environmental- protecting, enhancing natural built and historic environment; improvement in bio-diversity moving to a low carbon economy, not demonstrated in Policy S6

Key Principles 1-13

2. I dispute that the level of housing growth will meet local need: I suggest that the 450 homes planned for Burnham is developer led rather than meeting an existing or forecast need.
3. Development will not be on previously developed land, but on farmland/land in horticulture.
8. Development will destroy an area of bio-diversity not protect or enhance it.
11. The proposed 450 homes have the potential to increase Burnham's population by 20% and risks altering the character of the town irreparably. As there is no housing need identified this will almost certainly attract inward migration that have no links with our community.
12. The proposed development is isolated from the current town centre by over a mile. There is little opportunity for work locally. Development will not be able to minimise the need to travel, either within the town or to work; it will create a need to travel. Access for all in the community is difficult when one considers distances involved accessing the town's services and the paucity of affordable public transport- our bus service ends at 9 p.m. and we have no Sunday service at all. 'First' have indicated that they are planning to reduce our bus service interval to Burnham.
13. High speed broadband will not be available in Burnham until 2016- one of the last rural areas to be connected.

POLICY S2 STRATEGIC GROWTH

2:12 Inward migration does not demonstrate a local need as outlined in the Sustainability key policy. An ageing population will demand suitable, affordable housing. Reduction in household size indicates that we might expect smaller housing units. No housing built in Burnham in the last fifteen years has reflected the need for smaller, more affordable housing. What guarantee do we have that any future development will reflect that which is needed rather than that which is speculatively built?

2:14 I refute that the planned development in Burnham can meet the NPPF guidelines. The town centre is isolated from the development. Public transport is infrequent and unreliable, and due to be reduced. People will drive into the town.

2:15 What job opportunities? The majority of people living in Burnham do not work locally- they commute, many of them driving in and out of the town each day. Is this sustainable?

2:27 Please see detailed comments in S6 et. al.

2:30 I refute that 'windfall' will only generate 300 extra dwellings over the Plan period. There are already preliminary consultations being undertaken to develop the land currently occupied by the Sea end Caravan Park/Rice and Cole Burnham. This seems to be a large development.

POLICY S3 PLACE SHAPING

Fully support all the key principles in S3, who wouldn't want to live in this planned Nirvana? But, is it all based on fact or hyperbole?

POLICY S4 AND POLCY S5

No comments offered as this is specific to Maldon and Heybridge.

POLICY S6 BURNHAM-ON-CROUCH

What reassurance do we have that all the provisos will be met before there is any development permitted?

1. The road network is inadequate to support the increased road transport that the development will generate. The Maldon District has proportionately more road accidents than the national or county average. The roads are poorly maintained. The B1010 is narrow- in places impassable for two vehicles and it has numerous dangerous bends and junctions. It is used by extensively by large agricultural vehicles. Green Lane, Burnham will be used as a 'rat run' to avoid Maldon Road/ Church Road junction to access the new developments, as will Old Heath. The new estate roads are near to the junction of Marsh Road/ Southminster Road where two schools are located. I note that traffic surveys were NOT conducted at a time when the schools were finishing for the day- it's chaos on that junction! Crossing patrol lost several years ago. We need a second access into Burnham.
2. First Bus is planning to reduce our inadequate bus service. There is no Sunday service and none after 9 p.m. Greater Anglia rail has frequent delays due to poor signalling. Weekend services are frequently disrupted by engineering work. People have no choice but to drive for business and pleasure.
3. Where will these safe cycle tracks go to link these developments to the town centre?
4. What provision will be made? All the major development in Burnham in the last fifteen years has been north of Marsh Road. There are no recreation spaces despite demand. My son asked for this when he was 12- he's now 32 (and given up on the UK).
5. How can development that removes rural land and trees, disrupting the biodiversity possibly enhance our environment?
6. All community facilities are located in the town centre, a mile away.

2905

8. What provision will be made for enhanced medical facilities? Who will pay for these? Our GP Surgery is overstretched.
9. No comment
10. I am concerned that our sewerage infrastructure is already inadequate. I am concerned for the River Crouch ecosystem. If our current system can cope why are there so many tankers carrying away sewage excess on at least a daily basis? Where does it go?
11. See comment on Policy H1
12. See comment on Policy H3 & T2
13. No comment
14. Two of the proposed developments are situated on land which formed the original settlement of Burnham, near Pannel's Brook and the parish church. Any development should be sensitive to this and archaeological survey must be undertaken prior to any land development.
15. See 14.

2:74 Burnham cannot support its own needs currently. An increase of 450 dwellings will increase road traffic as its residents travel from its 'relatively isolated' situation to seek employment, retail and leisure services putting more pressure on the road network.

2:75 Improvement in medical services is essential as it is barely adequate currently. If, as anticipated, there is a growth in the elderly population, either by natural demographics or by migration, this need will be magnified.

2:78 Enhancement of the sewage treatment plant will be necessary. As this may involve considerable investment and forward planning can we be assured that improvements will be in place prior to development taking place?

2:79 Essex County Council must be the only people who have no concerns over the road infrastructure. Residents who use these roads regularly are alarmed that there is no proposed improvement. Any changes at the Maldon Road/ Church Road junction must not result in the loss or damage of the heritage tree on the site. Will the improvements include provision for the pedestrians who cross here, especially the pupils at the primary school in Marsh Road and at Ormiston River's Academy?

POLICY S8 SETTLEMENT BOUNDARIES

2:92. Burnham is defined as a 'large settlement'. I refute this description in the context of the Plan as this identifies it as being on a par with the larger, better served communities of Maldon and Heybridge. It is not. It does not have the same range of retail, employment or education services. It does not have the advantage of the road infrastructure around Maldon. It is isolated. It has no regular police presence. It has a retained fire service. It is remote from medical services. It is badly served in terms of response times by East Anglian Ambulance Service and we have no ambulance. How can this 'large settlement' possibly support another 450 houses?

POLICY D1 DESIGN QUALITY AND BUILT ENVIRONMENT

Any development must support the key recommendations, especially 2. The provision of open space.

2905

POLICY D2 DESIGN, CLIMATE CHANGE & ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

3:10 New development will increase the need to travel, not decrease it. There will be more cars and more carbon emissions from residents travelling to the town centre and out of town to shop and work. Our local public transport provision is inadequate.

3:11 New development will have a negative environmental impact.

POLICY D3 CONSERVATION & HERITAGE ASSETS

Proposed new development is isolated from the heritage centre of Burnham.

3:22 I consider the London Plane Tree situated at the junction of Church Road/ Maldon Road to be a heritage tree as it fulfils the criteria 'cherished and precious reminder of the past and provides a 'sense of place, pride and identity' It must remain. 'Loss of a listed building or other highly valued designated heritage asset should be wholly exceptional'

Archaeology: Proposed development is on the site of Burnham's original settlement, which may date from Roman times. Can we be assured that any development will not compromise historically important sites?

POLICY E1 EMPLOYMENT

I refute that business will be attracted to Burnham. The isolation, transport infrastructure and distance from major trunk roads does not support business growth in Burnham. There is no passing trade. There are few employment opportunities, existing or proposed, to attract young people to settle or remain. They move to work and move away to live. This further upsets the demographic balance. An additional 450 homes will not result in increased employment opportunity, just more people commuting to work by road or rail.

POLICY E2 RETAIL

4:18 The Retail capacity Update 2009 identifies that 'some local residents' travel outside the area for retail provision. Most local residents have to. Use of the internet for shopping may reduce that need but will increase road transport and carbon emissions. There are woefully few shops providing anything other than groceries. When shops close they are replaced by cafes and restaurants. I do not believe that additional housing will encourage more retail outlets- just more car journeys out of town.

POLICY E3 COMMUNITY SERVICES & FACILITIES

4:30 450 new dwellings will certainly require additional services. What guarantees are in place to ensure that developers make contributions to this?

POLICY H1 AFFORDABLE HOUSING

I agree with the proposed provision of affordable housing at the level of 30% on all development sites. Assuming that there are 450 homes proposed we can expect 135 units that are affordable. Will these be incorporated into each development? How will the Council ensure

2905

that the developer will commit to this? Will they be able to sell homes on sites which include houses for rent? Will inclusion of affordable homes lower house values on the sites? People who live in these homes can expect to either be elderly or in lower income brackets. What provision will be made for transport to the Town Centre?

POLICY H2 HOUSING MIX

Agree with the need to provide a mix of housing. In the last ten years all housing development in Burnham, apart from a few infill developments, has been of three and four bedroom houses.

POLICY H3 SPECIAL NEEDS HOUSING

5:21 and 5:22 supported in principle but with regard to the key principles:

I dispute that the development in Burnham meets social as well as housing need due to its geographical isolation from everyday services. Walking to the town centre services is not feasible for those with special needs and there is inadequate public transport provision.

An increase in provision of accommodation for those with special needs will have a detrimental impact on the capacity of public services to cope with the extra demands for health and social care provision.

POLICY N1 GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE NETWORK

The proposed development sites are to be sited on areas of diverse ecology. This seems to refute the policy for enhancing the green infrastructure by actually destroying it and then suggesting that the developer be required to provide green infrastructure!

POLICY N2 NATURAL ENVIRONMENT & BIODIVERSITY

6:12 If this is to be supported, why are developers being encouraged to develop three greenfield sites in Burnham?

POLICY N3 NATURAL ENVIRONMENT & GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE

6:21 New development must include open space provision for north Burnham, irrespective of any further development. There is an existing need.

6:26 In the Maldon District Green Infrastructure Study why are school playing fields included as 'public open space'. They are not. There are insurance implications involved with using school premises for public use.

The Targets and Indicator figures (Implementation & Monitoring) for green space provision, hectares per 1000 head of population, do not take account of the location of these spaces and their accessibility. Historically, such measures have failed to ensure adequate provision of public open space for the north of Burnham. The Riverside Park and Millfields recreation area are a mile away from the proposed development sites.

POLICY T1 SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT

7:1 Location of the new estates will not minimise the need for public transport, especially if there is a proportion of special needs housing.

[Type text]

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO LDP

7:2 'First' bus are in negotiation to reduce the hourly bus frequency serving Burnham. There is no service in the evening and none on Sunday. Does this support Policy T1 key principle 4?

7:3 Greater Anglia face regular disruption in service. There is a bus service in operation many weekends of the year. There is no late evening service – the last connecting service leaves London at 22.15. People drive to Wickford to ensure that they can connect to London. There are no disabled facilities at Wickford- and a passenger footbridge to cross.

Key principle 8 endeavours to explore and sort 'hot spots'. According to consultation with EEC Highways there would appear to be none of these affecting development in Burnham since there are to be no road improvements. Really?

T2 TRANSPORT & ACCESSIBILITY

7:10 The location of the proposed homes will not permit people to reach key services and facilities with ease, especially the elderly and those with reduced physical ability. The key services are located up to one mile away. This is not in line with local or national policy.

7:12 The location of the proposed new development and the lack of public transport services means that the aims of the strategy cannot be met.

POLICY I 1 INFRASTRUCTURE & SERVICES

8:1 What is an 'appropriate level of infrastructure'? When is it appropriate for the Council to implement infrastructure? Whilst the principles are admirable it's all much too vague to be of any value

8:2 I have concerns that there is insufficient infrastructure in all three domains to support the level of new development.

8:3 What is actually meant by 'timely provision'?

8:4 'Developers will be encouraged to liaise with infrastructure providers' Is this a statutory requirement? Is it enforceable?

8:12 When can we expect the Infrastructure Delivery Plan? Surely this should be published at least in conjunction with the LDP, if not before. The perceived lack of infrastructure to support our current needs let alone support another 450 dwellings and a possible 20% population increase is the main reason for objecting to further development. Infrastructure proposals are just that – there is nothing concrete to assuage our fears. Why does infrastructure *follow* development, never precede it?

POLICY I2 HEATH & WELLBEING

8:15 This can be expected to increase with the location of affordable housing. Will health and social care keep pace?

[Type text]

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO LDP

2905

8:18 GP provision is 'insufficient'. Can we be assured that provision will be provided by CIL or similar? None of Burnham's residents can access general hospital facilities in under an hour. There is increased pressure on Broomfield Hospital from development across Essex.

8:22-27 are fully supported in principle. Will it all be put in place?

CONCLUSION

The LDP appears not to have moved much further forward from the Preferred Options Consultation. This I identified as long and complex but notably light on meaningful detail. It remains full of hyperbole. There are a plethora of really good intentions and many words of comfort. These are not matched by definite assurances. The LDP does not follow the SMART principle.

I remain to be convinced that 450 new homes in Burnham-on-Crouch are desirable or sustainable. Since sustainability is at the heart of the Plan the argument is lost. The vague promises of enhanced infrastructure provision at an unspecified time are no more meaningful than 'jam tomorrow'. I've heard it all before. 'Desirable' is less easily measured, it comes from the heart.

In view of my comments I ask Maldon District Council to reconsider the LDP as it affects Burnham-on-Crouch. I suggest that the size of the development is disproportionate.