

PART B -

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

295

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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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)?

(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]

Agree principles. Don't agree numbers.
SEE ATTACHED COMMENTS SEPARATE STATEMENT.

10/05/17

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

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

Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
<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.

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"/>

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 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

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]

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

SEE
ATTACHED

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

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]

SEE ATTACHED

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.

2951

**Comments on Draft Local Development Plan
Maldon District Council**

I have been resident in the above cottage (built in 1783) since 1977. I am a retired woman, well acquainted with the Maldon District where I professionally provided project development services for many years, primarily in community mental health. My commitment to the district was recognised when I was invited to attend a Queen's Tea party at Buckingham Palace in 2009. Amongst the numerous services that I created was the establishment of a mental health help helpline that served all 8 districts of North Essex and for which I won an award from the national Telephone Helplines Association, for Partnership Working which was presented to me at BT Telecom Towers in 2005. I mention this in order to emphasise the overall commitment I have personally made to the District and the creative, responsive awareness of local need. At one point I provided services in the overall delivery of 8 separate projects of varying size, all of which were inclusive of Maldon. The statutory, charitable, national and local funding for these schemes was sought by me and was successfully achieved because of the validity of intrinsic proposals for service delivery.

I mention the above only to illustrate that any comments that I make are based on a sound knowledge of someone who has both lived and worked in the District and who also has a knowledge of demographic issues and pressures, as well a responsible overview of the many factors currently influencing the draft plan.

I would also add that I was born in the USA, moved to the United Kingdom in 1972 and became a British National in 2011.

Comments

General and with reference to the consultation process

.....

1. On the whole, I feel the plan as it currently exists demonstrates an enormous amount of hard and well considered thought and planning. It is a credit to the various bodies that collaborated to produce it. Many residents living in the District are aware of the pressures of National Government to enforce a National Housing Policy and that local housing planning would not be facing some of the local current conflicts were "District" independent options available. However, being by origin American and not fully appreciating how UK National Government policy operates in insisting on very local policy, I would question to what real extent a "consultation period" actually holds any measure of free will in resisting enforcement of a policy that is virtually mandated for action.

What in real terms are the consequences? How much real influence does the "consultation" hold? Does the information and opinion of the public have sufficient gravitas to resist the appreciable changes as drafted or is it merely a question of locating dwellings within an area of least resistance? What would happen if after the huge sift of individual opinion, there was agreement only on the construction of 2,000 homes in the District? And much as the current government is the Conservative Party, what happens if a government changes during the relatively initial stages of implementation who have an altered or less rigid position of house quotas? Would it not have been helpful to have offered an explanation of these issues and possibilities to residents? Whether no future change is implicit in the current decisions to be taken, I feel the strictures of local choice and this gravitas is mystery to the general public and a consultation only becomes truly valid if it proposes real choice founded on full understanding and knowledge of process as well as numbers and locations.

2. Prior to the current consultation's local presentations, what opportunity has there been for representation by any residents to be present at the meetings which led to the decisions that have thus far been formulated? The buzz words that permeate culture are many- "sustainability" seems to be continually mentioned and rightly so. But what about "transparency"? Most boards and key groups are now obliged to include "lay" people, community representatives, not elected or position holding officers. Unwieldy, difficult and impractical as this might seem, nonetheless there is no reason as I can see it why local ears and eyes on the ground could not have been in place at meetings with developers, water authority bodies, highways and transport etc. Perhaps the "people representatives" could have been non- interventional, there solely as a presence, but naïve as this may seem, I feel this would have improved communication and promoted better understanding of the complexities facing planning decisions regarding this consultation if this approach had been implemented. With more informed understanding, they could have fed information back to interested bodies or individuals and this might have been helpful. Too often consultation is viewed merely as a public relations exercise and not as a dynamic process. I would like to add that although the questionnaire and specific resident responses will have been made by the 14th October, many months lie ahead and further meetings and discussion will follow until final decisions are reached. The inclusion of community representatives or advocates, even in at late stages would demonstrate inclusion and political correctness.

3. Good questionnaires are not only difficult to produce, but analysing the results properly requires skills that can be beyond the average marketing organisation- though one certainly hopes it does not. The demographic information used by the National Health Service requires dedicated health analysts- informed statisticians who mathematically can look at mean results and standard deviations Most community analysis results in broad sweeping conclusions, therefore statements like "75% of rural dwellers prefer....."- the obvious gets reported but never the trends or picking apart the relationships between objective questions and subjective response. Additionally, analysing subjective comments becomes as well increasingly difficult... so the organisation responsible for the analysis is highly important. There appears to have been no direct interface between respondents and the analyzing body- the objective service purchased by MDC. Without making the consultation exercise a mad paper chase, I think it would have been good practice if a time defined phone line had been set up, perhaps for a specific week, to enable residents who did not want the public presence of going to a meeting, the opportunity of expressing views. Phone response enables the democratisation of not merely the disabled but also the elderly, many of whom will never come forward in consultation but who need representation. As well, what about the residents who suffer from mental health issues? Recognising that at any given time, 20% of a population is experiencing some form of mental health distress makes unlikely their responsivity rate to conventional data collection. And finally, when the questionnaires are returned, will the public be made aware of the response data, for example 40% of 30,000 questionnaires distributed were returned, indicate one something quite different from 40% of 2,000 questionnaires were returned.

Comments

Specific and with reference to options for Great Totham

1. I am very disappointed that on the Appendix 3 map, there was no boundary shown for where Great Totham began and where Heybridge ended. It concerns me that Great Totham is in no way North Heybridge and although adjacent, should not be blurred into becoming what it clearly is not. It is and has always been a rural parish and although many years ago there were boundary changes made with regard to the two, it is a distinctly separate parish and the Broad Street Green area is very much

2951

within the rurality of the district. It should remain and be recognised as such. I am aware that the views of some developers assumed that the heart of this parish was so far removed from the outer edge of the parish that it would make little difference to attempt more intense development at this "edge"... This is a creeping intrusion and in my strongly held opinion, goes very much against the structure of the local plan and represents a bending of the rules of intent. This emphasizes why I feel the issue of transparency, as previously mentioned, is so very important at all levels.

2. It is unclear where the proposed new link road will join the Broad Street Green. I would like to point out that in the many years I have been resident along this road there have been some horrific accidents in which drivers, pedestrians and passengers have been killed. I have even had a car drive through my front gate and end up in my garden. It was perhaps 15 years ago when Essex County Council Highways Department decided that the B1022 from Colchester to Maldon was considered to be so dangerous, a campaign to improve road signs and pedestrian crossings as well as improved lighting was implemented for a distance of over 15 miles. This involved the painting red tarmac strips on the road itself indicating where pedestrians could cross. Overhead lighting was erected where there had been none. This made little difference and in fact a serious head on collision occurred not many years after that, killing the driver who was hit by an oncoming car that veered into the road because a police car was parked on the Broad Street Green almost at the point where Sains Farm track began. A few years before that, a car with 4 passengers heading northbound, on a clear Saturday late afternoon drove into a telephone pole resulting in the death of the driver. Although no other car was involved and it was presumed that speed caused the car to skid, it was yet another example of the dangers this stretch of road presents.

Additionally, planning has permitted the enlargement of some homes near the edge of Sains Farm track. These are family homes and there is now extremely limited parking facility for cars as space was removed to enable the increase in house size. . This can sometimes result in normal visitor parking spilling onto the pavement, blocking convenient pedestrian passage, or even parking on the paved walkway on the other side of the road where there are no homes and only farm field. The entrance to my home is from this track and has always been so historically over 230 years, long before cars were an issue. However now, even before new

development will further increase risk, it is currently dangerous for me to gain access to the Broad Street Green Road from Sains Farm track due to the speed (even at 40 mph which is not observed) but also because of the visual obstruction of vehicles that sometimes park along this road. Hence, vehicular risk may be considerably increased for me.

I saw no mention made in the documents regarding not only precisely where but how the link road would join up with the Broad Street Green and what traffic calming plans would be in place? This is not an industrial area like the Causeway, where major traffic flows bypass Maldon town. In our local paper we currently have been made aware of cars losing control and careering dangerously into business frontage, specifically at the Pine Factory, as they leave the bypass roundabout that merges with the Causeway. I would like to know what guestimates of specific increased traffic flow, Highways dept. has calculated for the new link road and its Broad Street green junction plans? And as regards lighting, this is a rural area and although I can only speak for myself, additional overhead lighting even if low level white lighting would not be welcomed, directly in front of the residential properties where this junction(s) eventually will become located. I would like to know why or how MDC intends to involve the properties eventually affected into a dialogue about this?

3. Finally, I would like to comment on design and layout of the development itself. All we have at present is a generalised physical plan and lengthy written details of what may happen. There is a lot of uncertainty regarding the specific detail. How is it possible to reflect an accurate personal view on something still relatively abstract? I am assuming there will be further consultation as things roll out? Issues like particular locations for schools, GP surgeries, industrial units, small business parks? Will residents be involved in this in any way? There is a terrible dearth of services for young people in Maldon District and I should know as I was responsible for establishing a project to deal with youths who were in emotional difficulty. With the changes undergoing Educational services and Youth Services I am very aware that these needs have not been adequately met, not will they be if they are glossed over. This concerns me not merely because of the wellbeing of young people themselves, whether NEET or those with emotional problems (CAMHS), but also because unless there is adequate and properly sustainable development of facilities and staffing to cope with youth, it is a great error of all those involved in planning to assume that Maldon being a rural area doesn't this face this rising problem.. It is this youth that are likely to become

involved initially in disruptive behaviour, then low level community crime and that affects us all. Their opportunities at early development will profoundly affect their sound future community participation.

In conclusion, like many who feel there is a strong case for farms remaining as working farms and not becoming part of the development feeding frenzy that seems to be ripping apart the British countryside, like the voices committed to the views proposed by the Campaign to Protect Rural England, I hope Maldon will remain the "countryside treasure" it has been and does not get plundered any more than is necessary in order to keep itself safe from the Government's hangman's noose. I read the views of economists regarding the intensification of housing development as the means-by-which the sorry state of the British economy now fallen, will recover. I cannot help but agree with some very learned thinkers that the housing industry may not be the end solution. The current housing fixation and its actions may well result in "overheating" the economy and in some not very distant years to come, these specific draft development plans, however well intended, may become a blueprint instead for rural sinkhole estates, many miles from the employment opportunities needed to support an overdeveloped residential community, one that cannot sustained by its local employment opportunities which it realistically requires and will not be able to create.

[Redacted signature and name]