

I have the following comments on Maldon Council's recently published Local Development Plan Preferred Options Consultation.

- The document does not give any detail as to why Land around North Fambridge has been included as an area for the proposed 75 homes.
- North Fambridge published a Village Design Statement in 2011 (<http://www.essexinfo.net/northfambridgeparishcouncil-2/assets/documents/vds-3>). This has not been referred to. The Village Design Statement was built from the North Fambridge Parish Plan questionnaire to which 90% of the households in the village responded. The Rural Community Council of Essex (RCCE) stated "This is a fantastic achievement – this level of engagement is exceptional and will give great weight to the resulting Parish Plan actions". Why has this document not been taken into account?
- North Fambridge is a small village with a population of around 700 people. The proposed development of 75 houses will significantly increase the size of the village, destroying it forever against the wishes of the residents.
- A development of 75 houses will generate the need for school places. Both local schools (Cold Norton and Purleigh) are currently at capacity. Other schools are outside the recommended 2 mile distance for walking/cycling and would require parents to drive children to school.
- Local pre-schools are at or close to capacity.
- There are no employment opportunities in the village. Use of the train service to London for employment is expensive (annual cost over £3500). Any local employment will therefore require the use of a car which is not sustainable.
- Access to the major road network is poor. Access to the nearest A-road (the A130) is 8 miles away and takes 30 minutes at peak time due to the bottleneck at South Woodham Ferrers. Access to the A12 is approximately 15 miles away and takes 30 minutes (up to 45 minutes at peak times).
- There is no shop in the village. The nearest supermarkets are at South Woodham and Maldon, both requiring access by car. Note the supermarket at South Woodham is not close enough to the railway station for shopping by train to be feasible.
- There are no restaurants (excluding the local pub) in the village, or takeaway restaurants that deliver to the village. The use of a car is therefore required for these services, which is not sustainable.
- There is no mains gas connection to the village. Most of the houses use oil for heating, which is not a sustainable long term energy supply.
- Broadband speeds to the village are too slow to be usable for any home workers.
- Sewerage facilities are already at capacity.

There are therefore numerous and significant reasons why North Fambridge is not a sustainable location for significant development and the proposal is completely against the wishes of 99% of the residents.

People choose to live in North Fambridge precisely because it is a small rural village – they do not want the development and services associated with larger villages/towns.

Most importantly of all, the proposed development will destroy the beautiful countryside and wildlife that surrounds the village – in my mind if the proposals go ahead it will result in nothing more than the vandalism of the countryside and the district's heritage.

Yours Sincerely

██████████  
██████████  
██████████  
██████████