

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

14<sup>th</sup> October 2013

Chief Planning Officer

Local Development Preferred Options Consultation

Maldon District Council

Princes Road

Maldon

CM9 5DL

Dear sir/Madam,

**Draft Local Development Plan 2014 - 2029**

I am writing to object to the Draft Local Development Plan 2014 – 2029 the second consultation identifying 75 new houses for North Fambridge within a five year span for the reasons listed below:

- Housing Density:  
Although the consultation discusses a diversity of housing the focus is on 1-2 bedroom dwellings, 40% being affordable. The density is 30 – 50 per hectare. At 30 per hectare this would provide terraced houses or flats and some other smaller houses. At 50 per hectare this could only allow flats. This is out of keeping with the rest of the village and does not comply with the stated objective to ‘retain the identity of our villages’. These dwellings are likely to attract younger families with very little infrastructure to support.
- Schools:  
The local school is oversubscribed. The proposed catchment school is Latchingdon which is a faith school and may not be acceptable to residents. Children of Secondary age group would have to be bussed seven miles to Ormiston River Academy School in Burnham. Burnham is allocated an additional 450 houses and it is doubtful that the secondary school would be able to cope with this and 75 houses at North Fambridge.

- Highways:  
 The B1012 is already a dangerous road with several accidents one of which included myself many years ago and recent accidents including a fatality in the last month and the turning into North Fambridge is recognised as an accident reduction zone. The turning is incapable of improvement. The combination of 75 houses in North Fambridge and 450 in Burnham would seriously increase road usage and accidents. Any upgrades would be at the expense of the developer.
- Transport and sustainability:  
 Despite a train service, transport links are poor. Shift workers cannot use the train as the last train from Liverpool Street departs at 22.00. Many workers from the village who go to London drive to Wickford to catch the train. Links to workplaces in Chelmsford and Basildon require a car as do those in the further reaches of the country. The cost of an annual ticket to Liverpool Street is circa £3,500 and rising and requires employment in a relatively well paid occupation. There are no regular bus services in North Fambridge making it necessary to use a car which again leads to more cars having to use the B1012 and other local roads. With 75 more residences and possibly 75 + more cars this would place more pressure on local roads as without a car residents may become isolated.
- Hospital links:  
 Transport links to Broomfield Hospital are very poor and even with the provision of an on demand bus/taxi service long journeys by bus with at least 2 changes are required, most villagers rely on transport by car. It is also difficult to access St. Peter's Hospital, again requiring the on demand service and then a change in Althorne for the bus.
- Employment:  
 There is little employment in North Fambridge with some positions in Deerlands Nursery, Yacht Haven, The Ferry Boat Inn, Roe's jetting services and some related to farming. There is very little opportunity for the unskilled and they would have to seek positions outside the village involving difficult and expensive travel. There is no provision in the draft Local Development Plan for the expansion of employment opportunities.
- GP services:  
 The Local Development Plan admits that GP services in the Maldon District area are oversubscribed, including the surgeries at Burnham and Maldon; despite this it states that in relation to North Fambridge "there appears to be existing capacity to accommodate the demand for medical provision". This is clearly not the case for the extra 75 dwellings. This is an insufficient number for an additional GP but too much pressure for existing medical practices. It is difficult to envisage the nature of the enhanced medical provision stated in the Consultation document.
- Flood risk:  
 Much of North Fambridge is within the flood zone. An additional 75 houses would increase the risk of surface water flooding even if the SUDS (Sustainable Drainage Systems) approach is used.

- Sewerage and surface water:  
Since 1974 the Parish Council/Residents have been in dialogue with MP/MDC/Anglian Water/OFWAT regarding the inadequate sewage system in North Fambridge. Flooding and/or backing up have occurred because of the inadequate infrastructure. 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 on the sewer system and flooding of gardens at Franklin Road causing a health hazard and damage to property.
- Environmental issues:  
North Fambridge has extensive SSSI sites, a Ramsar site and an Essex Wildlife Trust reserve. The building of 75 houses must impact on the wildlife in the area with the loss of agricultural land. The draft Local Development Plan does not mention specifically the environmental significance of these areas in North Fambridge.
- Lighting:  
Any new development would be required to install street lighting.
- Lack of amenities: Parks, open space, footpaths, cycle paths, bridle ways etc.
- No reference to the Village Plan and Village Design Statement.
- The reason for the allocation of 75 houses is stated to be because of its proximity to a higher level of services in South Woodham Ferrers, North Fambridge’s railway station and access to employment opportunities in South Essex. Many of these additional facilities are only accessible by car thereby putting pressure on already very busy roads. South Woodham Ferrers itself has very little to offer with regard to shops, Asda being the only supermarket, thereby offering no competition. No other shops appear to survive for long.

Yours faithfully

