



Chief Planning Officer
LDP Preferred Options Consultation
Maldon District Council
Princes Road
Maldon
CM9 5DL

1st October 2013

Dear Sir / Madam,

RE: PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT OF 75 NEW HOUSES @ NORTH FAMBRIDGE, ESSEX.

I write to formally object to the above proposal. The level of this proposed development is just NOT sustainable on the following grounds:

1. TRANSPORT

Despite a train service, transport links are poor. Shiftworkers cannot use the train as the last train from London Liverpool Street is 2200hrs. Many workers from the village who go to London drive to Wickford to catch the train. Links to workplaces in Chelmsford and Basildon require a car as do those in the further reaches of the country. The cost of an annual ticket to London is @ £ 3500.00 and rising & requires employment in a relatively well paid occupation.

2. EMPLOYMENT

There is very little employment in North Fambridge and even less opportunity for the unskilled and they would have to seek positions outside of the village which would involve difficult and expensive travel. There is no provision in the draft local development plan for any expansion of employment opportunities.

3. SCHOOLS

The current catchment School for primary/juniors is in Purleigh. Children are bussed to and from this school which is already oversubscribed. The proposed catchment school is in Latchingdon, which is a 'faith' school and may not be acceptable to some residents. Children of secondary age would have to be bussed over 7 miles to Ormiston River Academy in Burnham on Crouch. Burnham is already allocated an additional 450 houses and it is very doubtful that the secondary school would be able to cope with this let alone another 75 houses in North Fambridge.

4 HOSPITAL LINKS

Transport links to Broomfield hospital are extremely poor and even with the provision of an 'on demand' bus/taxi service, long journeys by bus with at least two changes are required. Most villagers rely upon transport by car. It is also very difficult to access St Peters Hospital in Maldon, again requiring the 'on demand' service and then a change in Althorne for a bus.

5. G. P. SERVICES

The LDP has already admitted that GP Services in the Maldon District is already oversubscribed, despite this, it states that 'there appears to be existing capacity to accommodate demand for medical provision'. Clearly this is not the case for 75 extra dwellings. This is an insufficient number for an additional GP and would be far too much pressure for existing medical practises.

6. **HIGHWAYS**

The B1012 is already a dangerous road with several recent accidents including a fatality only just last month. The turning into North Fambridge is recognised as an accident reduction zone and is incapable of improvement. The combination of 75 houses in North Fambridge and 450 in Burnham would inevitably serious increase road usage and accidents.

7. **HOUSING DENSITY**

Although the consultation discusses a diversity of housing, the focus is on 1-2 bedroom dwellings, 40% being 'affordable housing'. The density is 30-50 per hectare. At 30 per hectare, this would provide terraced houses or flats. At 50 per hectare this could only allow flats. This would be totally out of keeping with the rest of the village and certainly does not comply with the stated objective of, " retain the identity of our villages ".

8. **SEWARAGE AND SURFACE WATER**

There is already an inadequate sewerage system in North Fambridge. Flooding and/or backing up has occurred because of the inadequate infrastructure. Any more housing would obviously increase pressure on an already overloaded system and would make it even more ' not fit for purpose'. Also, surface water issues cause backing up of the sewer system and flooding of gardens in particular in Franklin Road causing a health hazard and damage to property.

9. **FLOOD RISK**

Much of North Fambridge is within the flood zone, an additional 75 houses would increase the risk of surface water flooding even if the sustainable drainage system approach is used.

10. **ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES**

North Fambridge has extensive SSSI sites, a Ramsar site and an Essex Wildlife Trust reserve. The building of 75 houses must impact on the wildlife in the area with the loss of agricultural land. The draft LDP does not appear to mention any environmental significance of these areas in North Fambridge.

11. **LACK OF AMENITIES**

Parks, open spaces, footpaths, cycle paths, bridleways.

12. **LIGHTING**

Any new development would be required to install street lighting, there is none at present.

In addition, There appears to be NO reference to the village plan and the village design statement.

Furthermore, the reason for the allocation of 75 houses is stated to be because of its proximity to a higher level of services in South Woodham Ferrers, North Fambridge's railway station and access to employment opportunities in South Essex. Many of these additional facilities are only accessible by car or a long walk from South Woodham Ferrers railway station.

I hope the above reasons go some way in explaining why a development of this size is just not sustainable in North Fambridge.

Regards

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]