



Chief Planning Officer
Local Development Plan Preferred Options Consultation
Maldon District Council
Princes Road
Maldon
Essex
CM9 5DL

12th October 2013

Ref: Draft Local Development Plan 2014-2029

Dear Sir

I am writing to object to the Draft Local Development Plan 2014-2029 second consultation proposing 75 houses be built in North Fambridge.

My objections are based on the following;

Hospital and GP services

Transport services to the local hospital is extremely poor, long journeys are required by bus or by train or both and there is no direct way short of driving or an extremely expensive taxi journey. The only choice for doctor surgery now is Maldon (no direct link) or Burnham (a train journey on a single track railway), South Woodham Ferrers surgery (actually the nearest) no longer takes on new patients outside its local area.

Schools

The current catchment school for the primary/junior children is Purleigh and is already oversubscribed. The proposed catchment school is Latchingdon, a faith school that may well not be acceptable to residents.

Secondary school children would have to be bussed seven miles to Burnham and it is already doubtful that the Burnham school would be able to cope with the influx of new children.

Sewerage

This proposal would place an unacceptable burden on the already inadequate sewer system (deemed by Anglian Water in the 1980s as 'not fit for purpose'). During 2012 and the current year, the pumping station has proved unable to cope with properties already in the village, having on numerous occasions required emergency call outs to attend pumping and repair. The addition of these dwellings would be totally unfeasible and simply add problems to a system that is already unable to cope.

Road Safety

The addition of these dwellings would add immensely to the pressure of our local roads, in some places (particularly the junction into the village with the B1012) the roads are extremely dangerous. Accidents, especially serious ones, are at too high a

3266

level already and any change which causes an increase in accidents would be extremely irresponsible.

The village is accessed by only one road. There is the risk that any incident causing a blockage of this access could prove fatal to another emergency simultaneously happening further along. An increase of this size in dwellings dramatically contributes to the possibility of this scenario becoming a reality.

Considering the lack of employment opportunities in North Fambridge, a substantial increase in the local population would naturally add to the road use, these roads are very narrow and were not designed or built with volume traffic in mind. Adding more vehicles would multiply road danger.

Flood Zone

The proposed draft would reduce natural drainage and increase the risk of surface water flooding the area. Much of the village is within the flood zone (causing a problem with insurance) and the additional housing would put existing properties at further risk unnecessarily.

Transport

Commuters who need to get to London from North Fambridge do not have an adequate service. The single track rail line is extremely limited and does not run late services, a commuting bus service to the nearest connection with dual rail track (Wickford, or Chelmsford) is non-existent. Rail travel cost is also very expensive. The cost of this

Amenities

North Fambridge does not have sufficient amenities for such a development. For example there are no parks, cycle paths, sports and recreation facilities or medical services in the village.

Natural Environment

North Fambridge has a Wildlife Trust reserve and extensive SSSI sites, the addition of these proposed dwellings and the loss of agricultural land would severely impact wildlife and the local environment. The draft Local Development Plan does not mention specifically the environmental significance of those areas in North Fambridge.

Housing Density

The consultation focusses on 1 – 2 bedroom dwellings, 40% being affordable. The density is 30 – 50 per hectare. At 30 per hectare this would be either terraced houses, or flats and some smaller houses. At 50 per hectare it would only allow flats. Both are out of keeping with the established village and therefore does not comply with the Maldon stated objective to 'retain the identity of our villages'.

I trust you will take my objections into account when making your decisions on the matter.

Yours faithfully

A black rectangular redaction box covers the signature area. There are some faint blue scribbles around the box.