

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.

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 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.

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)?

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

SIGNIFICANTLY FEWER HOUSES THE SUPPORTING INFRASTRUCTURE IS BARELY SUSTAINING WHAT IS CURRENTLY HERE

THE INITIAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE FIRST WAVE OF HOUSES DOES NOT COME WITH ANY SUBSTANTIVE FLOOD DEFENSE SYSTEMS OR ACCESS THAT WOULDN'T COMPLETELY IMPACT ON MOVEMENT THROUGH HEYBRIDGE.

SO IN ABSENCE OF ANY SATISFACTORY ROAD NETWORKS TO LEAVE ALL OF THESE SITES + SURROUNDING AREA

NO!!

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 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 (Policy S6)? <i>(please tick one box)</i>	<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.

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

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

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

	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Do you agree with the local requirements for affordable housing provision (Policy H1)? <i>(please tick one box)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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

	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
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

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

THE SA ~~IS~~ IS SET OUT IN A WAY THAT INITIALLY HIGHLIGHTS THE PROBLEMS + THAT THESE ARE NOT RESOLVED BY THE LDP BUT BY THE END OF THE DOCUMENT, + FOR NO APPARENT EVIDENCE BASED REASON THIS HAS CHANGED. THERE ARE NO 'SPECIFICS' ANYWHERE AS TO HOW THE LDP WILL ACTUALLY ALTER ANY OF THE H1 I1 ITEMS IDENTIFIED AS PROBLEMATIC IN THE SA - IT IS ALL CONJECTURE + WISHFUL HOPING - NOTHING BASED IN 'FACT' -

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]

IDENTIFIED PROBLEMS AS BOTH THE REASON FOR THE LDP + SA HIGHLIGHTED ARE SEVERE + SIGNIFICANT BUT NOWHERE IS THERE AN ACTUAL 'SPECIFIC' REGARDING HOW THESE WILL BE RESOLVED
LEVEL OF CAR USAGE WILL NOT GO DOWN BUT UP + ACCESS OUT OF THE AREA IS ALREADY GRID LOCKED - THERE IS ABSOLUTELY NO REF ANYWHERE AS TO HOW DANBURY; HATFIELD; WITHAM ARE GOING TO BE AFFECTED + ESSEX COUNTY COUNCIL APPEAR TO BE NON EXISTANT IN TAKING OVER ALL RESPONSIBILITY FOR THIS EMPHASIS ON BUILD BUILD BUILD BUT DO NOTHING ELSE

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

MALDON COUNCIL CLEARLY HAVE TO DO SOME THINKING, BUT THEY SEEM TO HAVE ENDOWED THEMSELVES WITH SOME GRANDIOSE ABILITY TO SORT GLOBAL WARMING; FLOODING; CO2 EMISSIONS; EMPLOYMENT FOR YOUNG ADULTS; THE DIABOLICAL BUS SERVICE; PEOPLES ATTITUDE TO GIVING UP THEIR CARS; BUILDINGS WITHOUT AFFECTING + EFFECTING RURAL LOCATION ISOLATION; REVERSING OUTWARD MIGRATION + GETTING MAJOR COMPANIES TO INVEST IN A TOWN THEY CAN'T DRIVE THEIR 40 TON LORRIES THROUGH. WELL DONE!! NOW HOW ACTUALLY ARE YOU GOING TO DO ALL THIS ???

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.



14/10/2013

Maldon District Council

Council offices

Princes Rd,

Maldon CM9 5DL

Dear Mr Coleman

I would like to raise my concerns regarding the proposed Local Development Plan for Maldon and surrounding district. As I am sure a long letter would not be looked at I will attempt to keep my incredulity in check and stick to the point. I would primarily like to say that the scale of this proposal is alarming, concerning and actually I think potentially irresponsible given the environmental factors that it relates to.

I am shocked by the sham of the Sustainability Appraisal, that does a reasonable job of highlighting the real problems that are emerging for our small community and which I agree with, in their entirety. However, by the end of this very expensive document it reaches the rather bizarre conclusions that the LDP will resolve the issues and there is no real problem. Reading this several times brings me no closer to understanding exactly how both the documents arrive at this state and how exactly the LDP resolves the issues highlighted very succinctly in table 4.1!?.

This is also my conclusion of the LDP itself. It is in my view a complete nonsense to base an LDP on the 'pressure' from central government. The uniquely problematic aspect of Maldon/Heybridge is also its strength. We are a small rural community, with no train link, an estuary bisecting a peninsula and three access routes out of the community.

Again I have read and reread the LDP and whilst there is a lot about the problems, and of course the resolution regarding need for houses has its solution but in respect of all the other strategic difficulties I can find no real robust or rigorous conclusions as to how the issues raised in the SA are going to actually be achieved. In fact in the absence of these actual solutions i.e if we do **a** then **b** will occur as measured by **c**. I do consider on this scale of planning specifics should be included, the '**how**' of what is being proposed as well as the why. These need to be linear and causal and with clear detailed plans of actions to achieve the proposed outcomes. I was left feeling that the lack of specifics represents incredible naivety; wishful aka or a lack of reality in the thinking and therefore

delusional thinking and not based in any reality, or is a complete disrespect for the individuals that live in this area and already struggle with the current lack of key infrastructures and services, such as schools, police ; Dr's and time to get to A&E. I came down on the side of delusional, as I would hate to think it was the former or latter.

The key delusions I consider from the LDP document are highlighted below, although not in any sort of priority.

Delusion number 1. That public transport will be so efficient people will stop using their cars, walk cycle and meander in great satisfaction and contentment around their 'garden village'. Unless there is some way of stopping people using their cars, when there really is no other form of transport, and I really am very sceptical whether public transport actually will be improved and even if it was it has been demonstrated so clearly now that people prefer their cars that all that is likely to happen is if the buses are increased they will be removed x number of months later because no one is using them.

Delusional number 2: That Maldon councillors have the power, the authority and the capacity to stop the migration of young people out of the town. How on earth the councillors will do this is never actually stated and most of our youngsters seem to have learnt very early on there is nothing for them in Maldon/Heybridge so are desperate to leave as soon as they can find the means out of here. There is no reinforcement for them to stay or indeed services provided for them in their young lives to encourage them to see the place as rewarding!

Delusion number 3: How actually are they going to attract industry to the area without a) selling us probably down the river and b) not bringing in another quantity of CO2 into the area via 40 ton lorries on what are still effectively country roads and people (in cars) who live outside of Maldon/Heybridge?

Delusion number 4: Seriously, building 4,000 extra houses and thinking CO2 levels will go down, as the cars on the road actually will go up with 4,000 plus new houses being built ...how they are going to curb CO2 omissions and protect the biodiversity of our uniquely rural area.

Delusion number 5: That water will flow away from all our homes and this area, a flood plain by all accounts, will be controlled by man and we will have no more flooding and the ground raising ideas for Heybridge will resolve all the difficulties that we are facing year on year. A class action suing may well be very expensive when this turns out to be the delusion it probably is.

Delusion number 6: That we welcome the opportunity to swap our lovely fields and woods with Stepford type 'garden villages'. Seriously!!

It is also a very sad state of affairs that there is nowhere in this LDP or SA regarding the impact on our neighbour communities as if we stand alone somehow. Essex County Council should be ashamed if they are letting this run in any of the form it currently is. Hatfield Peverel; Witham and Danbury can barely bare the strain of the traffic as it is, and country routes are fast becoming the means to leave and enter Maldon in an attempt to not spend leisure time in the car in a traffic jam.

So in the end I don't agree with the scale of what is proposed or that this area can sustain such development. I think there has been a significant amount of money spent and I am sure there will

3246

be significant amount of money earned (the rumour currently circulating around our small community, if you like to attend to such things of £17,000 per house built) for the Council from this project.

As a resident of 20 years I don't want the developers money if it brings with it a significant change in the place I live and love that is not for the good of the majority. At a personal level I don't want sterile Stepford 'garden villages' near to my home, or to spend my working day sat in a traffic jams leaving and coming home because no one has considered the main junctions that tributary out of this relatively constricted access community, or to lose the opportunity to walk in the country, five minutes away from my front door and see deer and bats (which I understand are endangered and protected and 2,000 house probably will disturb!) as I do now. I don't want the risk of flooding to continue because some plan might work but has to be implemented to ensure the houses get built. I don't want a bypass at the cost of 2,000 new houses that at the best takes traffic off 'the street' in Heybridge and dumps it back less than two miles away in an area that will in itself become congested because at the worse it has increased the car population by hundreds!.

My apology for the length I hope this has been read to the end and that it is taken seriously. I am trying to be proactive and acknowledge there are difficulties but, apart from the building of a lot of houses, I see no real solutions here other than to create even bigger traffic jams, even greater GP congestion, increase in crime; poor provision of secondary education; no reduction in Co2 omissions or in people's attitudes and behaviour to driving their cars, and an unlikely change in the behaviour of water! .

Thank you for listening.

Yours sincerely

[Redacted signature]

[Redacted name]

cc Mr Rodney Bass

Mr John Whittingdale