

## Gary Sung

---

**From:** Hannah Bowles on behalf of Planning  
**Sent:** 14 October 2013 12:10  
**To:** Policy  
**Subject:** FW: LDP Response

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Completed

Hannah Bowles  
Administrative Officer  
Tel. 01621 875733 | [www.maldon.gov.uk](http://www.maldon.gov.uk)  
[dc.planning@maldon.gov.uk](mailto:dc.planning@maldon.gov.uk)

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 14 October 2013 10:56  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** FW: LDP Response

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 13 October 2013 20:09  
**To:** Customer Services  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** LDP Response

To the Chief Planning Officer:

Dear Sir,

I write to comment on the latest version of the LDP as follows:

In summary, I OBJECT to the proposals for Fambridge and consider them to be ill judged and directly contrary to MDC's criteria for policy and decision making regarding the LDP, which in isolation, I support.

I would comment specifically in relation to Fambridge in bold type as follows:

- 1) Ensure a healthy and competitive local economy by providing sufficient space, flexibility and training opportunities for both existing and potential businesses in line with the needs and aspirations of the District;
- 2) Deliver a sustainable level of housing growth that will meet local needs and deliver a wide choice of high quality homes in the most sustainable locations; **Fambridge is not a sustainable location; it is unsustainable on ecological, landscape and environmental grounds. Fambridge is badly served by road. Existing usage of the railway station is limited; most commuters drive on congested roads to Wickford to ensure flexibility on return**

- 3) Promote the effective use of land and prioritise development on previously developed land and planned growth at the Garden Suburbs and Strategic Allocations; **The use of land in Fambridge is not efficient as it is currently undeveloped and subject under current planning guidelines to a number of protective measures because of it's visual and ecological importance. Less sensitive land should be considered in preference**
- 4) Support growth within the environmental limits of the District; **debatable because of the risk of flooding. Much of Fambridge is at or around sea level**
- 5) Emphasise the importance of high quality design in all developments;
- 6) Create sustainable communities by retaining and delivering local services and facilities; **Fambridge is unsustainable on ecological, landscape and environmental grounds. Fambridge is badly served by road. Existing usage of the railway station is limited; most commuters drive on congested roads to Wickford to ensure flexibility on return**
- 7) Enable and adapt to the effects of climate change by limiting greenhouse gas emissions through the efficient use of energy and use of renewable alternatives, coastal management, and mitigating against flooding; **Fambridge is unsustainable for reasons given above; poor roads, poor train service, in the flood zone, subject to coastal management. It's hard to think of a worse site from a sustainability perspective**
- 8) Conserve and enhance the natural environment, by providing protection and increasing local biodiversity and geodiversity, and effective management of the District's green infrastructure network; **Fambridge is a location with a number of protected sites; RAMSAR, Essex Wildlife Trust, MDC's own planning policies. Again it is hard to think of a worse site to develop from the perspective of the natural environment than Fambridge**
- 9) Conserve and enhance the historic environment by identifying the importance of local heritage, and providing protection to heritage assets in accordance with their significance;
- 10) Identify the capacity and constraints of local infrastructure and services, and seek to mitigate identified issues through developer contributions including Section 106 agreement and/or Community Infrastructure Levy and other funding sources; **the local infrastructure in Fambridge is poor and at capacity in terms of roads and drainage. The train service is insufficient to encourage most commuters to not drive to Wickford**
- 11) Maintain the rural character of the District without compromising the identity of its individual settlements; **the identity of Fambridge will be severely compromised by these proposals**
- 12) Minimise the need to travel and where travel is necessary, prioritise sustainable modes of transport and improve access for all in the community; **there is a lack of facilities in Fambridge; no shop, poor buses, no school, a poor railway service, poor roads. Virtually every journey in or out of Fambridge is and will be by road. It is hard to consider a worse site than Fambridge for this scale of proposal**

I take the view that the rural communities, including Fambridge, should all "do their bit" by adopting a policy of proportionate growth across the District, ie, the rural allocation of 420 should be distributed more equably in line with MDC's very sensible criteria for development.

MDC has provided no statement as to why it is not proposing an equable distribution of housing across the District. This is a necessary first step in proposing a planning policy with integrity and logic and certainly is required if a less than equable distribution is proposed. In the absence of this justification please register this note as an OBJECTION to the plan in relation to Fambridge,

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]



Sent from my iPad