



10 October 2013

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

Dear Sir,

Re: Local Development Plan 2014-2029 Second Consultation

I wish to object to the proposal identifying 75 new houses to be sited within the village of North Fambridge within a 5 year span. As a resident of North Fambridge, I strongly believe that this proposed development in the village, albeit reduced from the original scheme, is still not sustainable for the following reasons: -

1. Highways - the B1012 is the only road into the village. This stretch of road is know locally to be dangerous with several recent accidents and a fatality only a few months ago. Any development in North Fambridge would create a significant road traffic danger. The combination of an additional 75 houses in North Fambridge and 450 in Burnham would seriously increase road usage and accidents. Since any upgrades would be at the expense of the developer, can we really expect this to be achieved within the case of economic viability and any developer's need to make a profit? The turning in to North Fambridge is already widely recognised as an accident reduction zone and is incapable of improvement according to the Parish Council.
2. Transport and Sustainability - despite having a train service, transport and sustainability is poor. Links to workplaces in Chelmsford and Basildon require a car, as indeed do those further afield. It is a well known local fact

that despite having the station, many London commuters from the village actually drive to Wickford! The cost of an annual railcard to London Liverpool Street is in the region of £3,500 plus, thus requiring a relatively well paid salary. The bus service in the village is extremely poor and this has been looked at by the village recently, but it is my understanding that it was not found to be economically viable for a provider of public transport to consider an increased service for North Fambridge.

3. Schools - Our primary schools are already oversubscribed. Our catchment school is oversubscribed. The proposal to use Latchingdon, a **faith** school, will be unacceptable to many residents. With regard to Secondary Schools, with Burnham allocated an additional 450 houses, it is extremely doubtful that the area would have adequate school places, let alone the possibility of choice or suitability for parents and pupils to decide.

4. Medical Provision

a. G.P. Provision - The Local Development Plan accepts that G.P. Services are oversubscribed and admits that this applies to the surgeries at Burnham and Maldon. If one accepts that medical provision is oversubscribed, then one must accept that there is no medical provision for any further number of dwellings, even your reduced quantity of 75. This would not equate to an additional G.P. and would create too much pressure for existing medical practices. It is difficult to envisage the nature of the enhanced medical provision stated in the consultation document.

b. Hospital links - Our community is already suffering with the unacceptable distance to Broomfield Hospital and lack of transport links. Most villagers rely on transport by car because of the ridiculously lengthy bus journey, not to mention the number of changes required (at least 2). This will only be made worse by even more traffic on the road between South Woodham Ferrers and Maldon. I also have concerns about the implication of additional population and traffic on emergency medical services.

5. Flood Risk - since much of North Fambridge is within the flood zone, an additional 75 houses would significantly increase the risk of surface water flooding even if the Sustainable Urban Drainage System approach is used. I

6. Sewerage - Anglian Water have accepted that the current sewer system in North Fambridge is problematic to upgrade. Since as long ago as 1974, the Parish Council and residents of the village of North Fambridge have been in dialogue with the Member of Parliament, Maldon District Council, Anglian

Water and OFWAT regarding the inadequate sewage system in North Fambridge. Flooding and backing up have occurred because of the inadequate infrastructure. This village cannot take any more properties for this reason alone! **ANY MORE HOUSING WILL INCREASE PRESSURE ON AN ALREADY OVERLOADED SYSTEM AND WILL MAKE IT "NOT FIT FOR PURPOSE"**. Surface water issues cause backing up of the sewer system and flooding of gardens at Franklin Road causing a **HEALTH HAZARD** and damage to property.

7. Lighting - I am aware that any new development would be required to install street lighting. This would not be in keeping with the rural identity of our village.

8. Environmental Issues - North Fambridge has extensive Sites of Special Scientific Interest, a Ramsar site and an Essex Wildlife Trust reserve. The development of 75 dwellings would impact upon the area's wildlife due to the loss of agricultural land. The Local Development Plan Preferred Options and the Local Development Plan fails to mention the specific environmental significance of these sites in North Fambridge.

9. Lack of Amenities - North Fambridge only has a small area of open space for children to play as befits the size of the village! There are no cycle paths and these would need to be extensive and linked to key areas because any such development would create an unsafe level of traffic for villagers, especially children. However, it is difficult to envisage how one could include cycle paths alongside the narrow roads and particularly narrow footpaths and pavements, which struggle to hold the width of a pushchair along certain areas. Such amenities would need to be included at the expense of the developer which would impact on the project's economic viability, something which needs to be realistically considered.

10. Parish Plan and Village Design Statement - It is not evident that any reference has been made to these documents.

11. Housing density - Although the consultation discusses a diversity of housing, the focus is given to 1-2 bed properties. At 30 per hectare, this would mean terraced housing. And at 50 per hectare, this could only mean flats. This is totally out of keeping with the village and, thus, does not comply with the stated objective to "retain the identity of our villages".

12. Employment - There is little opportunity for employment in North Fambridge. There is very little demand for unskilled labour, meaning that those seeking such work would need to travel, which would be both

difficult and expensive. There is no provision for the expansion of employment opportunities in the Local Development Plan Preferred Options.

13. Lighting - any new development would be required to install street lighting which would not be in keeping with the rural identity of our village, nor its special environmental significance.

It has been stated that the reason for the allocation of 75 houses in North Fambridge is due to its proximity to a higher level of services in South Woodham Ferrers, North Fambridge's railway station and access to employment in South Essex. I reject this because it needs to be stated that many of these additional facilities are only accessible by car or an unreasonably long walk or bike ride along a dangerous stretch of road, which neither has a pavement nor a cycle lane.

I object to the proposal for all the reasons I have stated. This proposal is not sustainable.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]