



**REPORT of
INTERIM HEAD OF PLANNING SERVICES**

to
COUNCIL
30 OCTOBER 2014

**NORTH HEYBRIDGE GARDEN SUBURB - CONSULTATION DRAFT
STRATEGIC MASTERPLAN FRAMEWORK**

1. PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

- 1.1 To seek agreement from Members to make the necessary amendments to the Draft North Heybridge Garden Suburb Strategic Masterplan Framework in response to public consultation.
- 1.2 To seek agreement from Members to endorse the amended North Heybridge Garden Suburb Strategic Masterplan Framework as a material consideration in the determination of planning applications within the area allocated for the North Heybridge Garden Suburb in the submitted Local Development Plan.

2. AREA FOR DECISION / ACTION

2.1 Role of the Strategic Masterplan Framework

- 2.1.1 The Local Development Plan (LDP) sets out important development principles to guide the development of the South Maldon and North Heybridge Garden Suburbs to ensure that they are planned and developed as high quality neighbourhoods that will enhance the character of the District and protect and enhance the environmental qualities of the surrounding area. Policy S3 sets out the requirement for a masterplan for each of the Garden Suburbs at Maldon and Heybridge to be prepared and developed in partnership between the Council, relevant stakeholders, infrastructure providers and developers / landowners. Policy S4 defines key infrastructure requirements and development principles.
- 2.1.2 Work on the masterplans for both Garden Suburbs is being progressed in advance of adoption of the LDP to enable key strategic issues such as infrastructure provision, flood risk mitigation and environmental protection and management to be addressed in a coordinated manner and to put in place a comprehensive framework for the preparation and determination of planning applications. This is particularly important given the following resolution of the Council on 10 July 2014 (Minute No. 245 refers):

“to invite the submission of planning applications and proactively encourage applications which are in accordance with the Submitted Local Development Plan including sites within the proposed North Heybridge Garden Suburb (LDP sites S2(d), S2(e) and S2(f)) in order to boost the five year supply of deliverable housing

land and demonstrate the deliverability of the LDP. Officers will work towards achieving compliance with the relevant Strategic Masterplan Frameworks and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan through the planning application process.”

2.1.3 The Strategic Masterplan Framework provides further supplementary guidance on the site allocations and policies in the submission LDP. The document is not intended to be prescriptive and does not seek to allocate land uses or provide allocation policies. It sets out how the vision and objectives and key infrastructure requirements set out in Policy S4 will be delivered in accordance with the LDP and Infrastructure Delivery Plan. This includes the following key infrastructure:

- A new one-form entry primary school;
- Two new 56 place early years and childcare facilities;
- Necessary contributions toward the sufficient expansion of the Plume School;
- Provision for youth and children’s facilities;
- A new outer relief road to the north of Heybridge between Broad Street Green Road and Langford Road;
- A country park focused to the west of Maypole Road; and
- A strategic flood alleviation scheme.

2.1.4 Provision is also made for the following key elements in accordance with Policy S4:

- New and enhanced public transport;
- New and enhanced walking and cycling routes and connections with the wider area;
- Improvements to the wider highway network to accommodate development;
- Enhanced medical provision in cooperation with the relevant health bodies;
- Community hub and local centre;
- Surface water mitigation and Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDs);
- Increased and enhanced green infrastructure network;
- A mix of housing to include affordable housing and housing appropriate to meeting the needs of an older population; and
- Protection, enhancement and management of Heybridge Wood.

2.1.5 Preparation of the Strategic Masterplan Framework has taken into account stakeholder and public consultation and further technical studies relating to drainage, landscape, ecology, transport and access.

2.1.6 If appropriate, the Council will consider the adoption of the Strategic Masterplan Framework as a Supplementary Planning Document following the adoption of the LDP.

2.2 Public Consultation

2.2.1 The Draft North Heybridge Garden Suburb Strategic Masterplan Framework was endorsed by the Planning and Licensing Committee for public consultation on 24 July 2014 (Minute No. 284 refers). Public consultation took place from 14 August to 30 September 2014 and a public engagement event was held in Plantation Hall, Heybridge on 16 September. The exhibition material was available to view in the

Council Offices, Maldon throughout the consultation period. In total, 35 responses were received to the consultation in a variety of forms, including completed questionnaires, letters and emails. This included a total of 17 responses from individual members of the public.

- 2.2.2 The consultation responses are summarised in **APPENDIX 1**. Copies of all responses in full are provided in the Members' Room and on the I drive. A number of the comments made relate to the allocation of the North Heybridge Garden Suburb for strategic growth in the LDP which is currently subject to Examination in Public (EiP). A number of the comments also relate to matters of detail which will be addressed through the planning application process and are not appropriate for inclusion in the Strategic Masterplan Framework. In both cases, the comments have been noted but no changes to the Draft Strategic Masterplan Framework are proposed. However, a number of comments have been made which have implications for the scope and content of the Strategic Masterplan Framework, and in this case, amendments to the draft document have been proposed. In particular, issues have been raised regarding the timing of provision of key strategic infrastructure, in particular the strategic flood alleviation scheme for North Heybridge and the view that this should be implemented before the commencement of development. Comments on the consultation responses and proposed changes to the Draft Strategic Masterplan Framework are summarised in **APPENDIX 1**.
- 2.2.3 **APPENDIX 2** provides a composite schedule of the proposed changes. The proposed changes are in accordance with the policies in the submitted LDP. They generally provide further clarification and guidance on the key principles and infrastructure requirements to be addressed in the preparation and submission of planning applications and reflect the advice and comments received during the consultation period. All planning applications will be subject to full consultation in accordance with the required procedures.

3. IMPACT ON CORPORATE GOALS

- 3.1 The endorsement of the North Heybridge Garden Suburb Strategic Masterplan Framework will assist the Council in determining planning applications for development within the Garden Suburb. It will also ensure that key strategic issues such as infrastructure provision, flood risk mitigation and environmental protection and management are addressed in a coordinated manner and the Garden Suburb is planned as a high quality integrated new neighbourhood. Progression of the Strategic Masterplan Framework will help to support and deliver the following Corporate Goals for the District:
- Meeting the housing needs of the District;
 - Protecting and shaping the District and balancing the future needs of the community; and
 - Enabling, supporting and empowering communities to be safe, active and healthy.

4. IMPLICATIONS

- (i) **Impact on Customers** – The submission of the Local Development Plan to the Secretary of State for Examination-in-Public has provided greater certainty to the local community, stakeholders and service providers on the future planning strategy for the Maldon District. Alongside the Submission of the Local Development Plan, the endorsement of the North Heybridge Garden Suburb Strategic Masterplan Framework will become a material consideration in the determination of planning applications for development within the Garden Suburb.
- (ii) **Impact on Equalities** – The endorsement of the North Heybridge Garden Suburb Strategic Masterplan Framework helps to provide sustainable and well planned communities which promote social cohesion and help to provide for the future needs of the local community.
- (iii) **Impact on Risk** – The North Heybridge Garden Suburb Strategic Masterplan Framework has been prepared in accordance with the Submitted Local Development Plan. From the day of publication decision makers may give weight to relevant policies in emerging plans according to the stage of preparation of the emerging plan. Therefore, the submission of the Local Development Plan provides a more up to date local planning framework in order to safeguard the District against speculative development. The Strategic Masterplan Framework will be reviewed and amended to reflect any changes in the LDP following the EiP and adoption.
- (iv) **Impact on Resources (financial and human)** – Without a framework for the determination of applications for development within the area allocated as North Heybridge Garden Suburb, each application will need to be treated in isolation which will have resource implications. The Council could also be at increased risk of planning appeals, which could potentially have significant resource implications.
- (v) **Impact on the Environment** – Endorsement of the Strategic Masterplan Framework will enable the Council to promote sustainable development, secure the necessary infrastructure to support new and existing communities and safeguard the local environment in accordance with the policies set out in the submitted LDP.

5. CONCLUSIONS

- 5.1 The Council is committed to sustainable development and to improving the quality of the built and natural environment and to sustaining and enhancing the local economy. The progression of the Strategic Masterplan Frameworks for the Garden Suburbs is fundamental to the policy requirements within the LDP and to the determination of planning applications for development of strategic sites.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

- (i) that the proposed amendments to the Draft Strategic Masterplan for the North Heybridge Garden suburb, as set out in **APPENDIX 2**, be agreed;
- (ii) that subject to (i) above, the Strategic Masterplan Framework, as amended, be endorsed as a material consideration for development management purposes in the determination of planning applications for development within the Garden Suburb.

Background Papers:

Draft Strategic Masterplan for North Heybridge Garden Suburb (July 2014)

Local Development Plan 2014 - 2029 as submitted for examination

Infrastructure Delivery Plan 2014

Enquiries to: David Coleman, Strategic Planning Policy Manager, (Tel: 01621 875731).

Draft North Heybridge Garden Suburb Strategic Masterplan Framework

Summary of Consultation Responses, Comments on Responses and Proposed Changes

Reference No	Name (source)	Summary of Consultation Responses	Comments on Consultation Responses/ Proposed Changes to Draft SMF
NHGS1	Councillor Alan Cheshire	<p>Section 4</p> <p>1) The objectives are a wish list which is not substantiated by a positive commitment.</p> <p>2) It is stated that ‘flood alleviation measures....will reflect environmental design influences, rather than have a heavily engineered appearance’. Details of the final scheme haven’t been approved by the EA. Nobody knows what will be proposed therefore how can this statement be fact.</p> <p>3) Countryside cannot commit to the Built Environment and Housing proposal. They have stated they do not know what’s intended for the site. It is unacceptable to agree to a masterplan without identifying the type of housing required ie sheltered, affordable, older person’s bungalows, self build and smaller bedroomed homes.</p> <p>4) Nothing to indicate delivery of this scheme will be visionary, economically viable and popular with the people of Heybridge.</p> <p>Section 5</p> <p>1) The comment that proposal ‘will significantly reduce the future risk of flooding in Heybridge’ (Para 5.1.8) is not an acceptable reason to allow this development.</p> <p>2) There is more than one reason for flooding.(Para 3.3.4 refers) The information made available concerning the run-off of surface water from the proposed new development considers storage areas within the site and not the surrounding area. Water table figures are not held by MDC, ECC or the EA but from local knowledge parts of the site are completely waterlogged during the winter months and SuDS will not provide a solution on saturated ground</p> <p>3) Sea level rise and Climate Change has been ignored. EA maps</p>	<p>Section 4 sets out how the vision and objectives for the North Heybridge Garden Suburb have evolved and been refined through on-going consultation between the Council, key stakeholders and the local community. These underpin the masterplan framework and reflect policies set out in the LDP. Further details are provided in Sections 5. Section 6 addresses issues of delivery and viability.</p> <p>The objective that flood alleviation measures should reflect environmental design influences reflects current good practice and requirements of the Environment Agency. This objective will be reiterated in Section 5.1.</p> <p>A key objective is to provide a mix of housing types and the text in para 4.3.3 will be</p>

Reference No	Name (source)	Summary of Consultation Responses	Comments on Consultation Responses/ Proposed Changes to Draft SMF
		<p>provide flood zones which may change significantly over the lifetime of this proposal due to Climate Change creating a probability for flooding. A further overall 11-16cm of sea level rise is likely by 2030, relative to 1990, of which at least two-thirds will be due to the effects of climate change.</p> <p>4) Construction impacts of flood storage embankments could require importation of large volumes of clay which would create significant increase in traffic movements. Water storage creates a possibility of contamination by blue green algae or eutrophication, which would be released downstream. Storage of water may have an impact on agricultural use where flooding of the flood storage area may be too frequent.</p> <p>Section 6</p> <p>1) The design guides are outdated reference manuals and development should embrace new materials and construction methods.</p> <p>2) When creating a high quality (urban) development, this should benefit the neighbouring community not create a heart to the new community.</p> <p>3) Two accesses 1. Holloway Road and 2. Broad Street Green have been included after it was agreed all access to the site shall be from the new road.</p> <p>4) No 'modest commercial facilities' are shown in the masterplan</p> <p>5) No 'housing for older people' is shown in the masterplan. No indication as to what is proposed such as residential homes and/or bungalow planned for older persons</p> <p>Section 7</p> <p>1) The Infrastructure & Delivery Plan shows the flood alleviation scheme being carried out as part of the phasing of the development. If the development is approved the flood alleviation scheme must be completed before any development takes place to safeguard existing</p>	<p>amplified to reflect this.</p> <p>Section 5 The issues raised will be fully addressed in the design, implementation and management of an appropriate flood alleviation scheme. Development proposals will be required to be accompanied by a site wide drainage strategy agreed with Essex CC and the Environment Agency. A detailed assessment will be required to be undertaken as part of the Environmental Assessment which will form part of any planning application.</p> <p>Section 6 paragraph 6.2.1 to be revised to include reference to other appropriate design standards including sustainable construction methods and principles set out in LDP Policy D2. Paragraph 6.1- Design Principles: amplification to highlight integration with neighbouring community and to make clear that 'heart of community' and facilities, services and green space will</p>

Reference No	Name (source)	Summary of Consultation Responses	Comments on Consultation Responses/ Proposed Changes to Draft SMF
		<p>homes.</p> <p>2) The relief road must be completed before any development takes place to provide access into the site.</p> <p>3) The community facilities and school should be programmed to commence with the first year start on site</p> <p>4) The Developer Contribution and Pooling Arrangement gives no details of adoption costs and any bonding arrangements.</p> <p>5) No Viability Model produced to show for example, registered providers costs, green infrastructure costs, land agents and local surveyors and valuers costs and estate agents valuations of completed houses together with maintenance agreement requirements.</p>	<p>be accessible to all.</p> <p>Modest commercial facilities are included in the local centre in the masterplan framework (see paragraph 5.8.1).</p> <p>New paragraph to be included under Section 5 Land Use to clarify requirement for a range of housing types in accordance with principles set out in LDP Policies S3 and S4</p> <p>Section 7- Comments noted. The Council will seek the earliest possible delivery of necessary infrastructure. Implementation of development and infrastructure provision will be regulated through the use of planning conditions and planning obligations. Furthermore major residential development proposals will be required to provide comprehensive and robust flood risk assessments to the Council's satisfaction at the planning application stage. In accordance with national planning policies development proposals (including the</p>

Reference No	Name (source)	Summary of Consultation Responses	Comments on Consultation Responses/ Proposed Changes to Draft SMF
			construction process) will need to demonstrate that they will not increase flood risk on site and to the surrounding areas.
NHGS2	Councillor Bryan Harker	<p>Questions why format of consultation document different to South Maldon Garden Suburb. Should topic 4 read "access and movement" for consistency. Document continues to ignore the aspirations of the majority of the residents of Heybridge on a number of counts as identified below:</p> <p>Topic1. "The vision and objectives" (section 4) Pages 24 to 35. Page 33, Q6. A Flood alleviation scheme delivery. Residents clearly want the scheme delivered BEFORE the new homes and infrastructure. No more houses should be built in Heybridge until a flood alleviation scheme is implemented and a winter passes with no flooding.</p> <p>Topic2. "Framework and Development", section 5. Para 5.14 page 52. Residents in Holloway Road have frequently requested that there should be NO access to the proposed development from Holloway Road. Once again the previous consultation request has been ignored.</p> <p>Topic3. "New Green Spaces". Section 5. Sports facilities in the area are desperately needed. The issue is, in what state will the land be made available? "Ready to play" or a piece of rough land that nobody can do anything with, and will cost a bomb to put right.</p> <p>Topic4. "Movement and Access", Section 5. The proposed link road should have a protected footway on both sides of the road. The proposed 17 balancing ponds are a health and safety hazard on a</p>	<p>Section 5- p42: amend heading to 'Access and Movement'.</p> <p>Vision and objectives for the North Heybridge Garden Suburb have evolved and been refined through on-going consultation between the Council, key stakeholders and the local community</p> <p>Topic 1: Comments noted regarding timescale of implementation of flood alleviation scheme. This is addressed in Section 7.</p> <p>Topic 2: Vehicular access is required from Holloway Road to serve site S2(e) to allow for the early delivery of housing. This has been accepted by Essex CC and details are set out in paragraph 5.5.1.</p> <p>Topic 3: Details of layout and future maintenance of the sports fields will be secured</p>

Reference No	Name (source)	Summary of Consultation Responses	Comments on Consultation Responses/ Proposed Changes to Draft SMF
		<p>number of counts:</p> <p>1) If the ponds are not fenced there is a serious risk to young children drowning.</p> <p>2) Stagnant water will be an ideal breeding ground for mosquitoes. Global warming makes this activity more likely.</p> <p>3) Toxic to pets and birds, Blue-Green algae will form on the ponds if car cleaning detergents seep into the ground water.</p> <p>No mention of the wider impact of commuting traffic from the proposed development on Hatfield Peverel, Danbury, Wickham Bishops and Tiptree, not to mention Maldon and car parking.</p> <p>Topic5. "Design Principles". Section 6. Looks good on paper but questions whether it will look like this when built</p> <p>Topc6. "Framework for Infrastructure". Section 7. Page 69, Para 7.2 "Development will NOT be permitted unless an acceptable flood alleviation scheme can be delivered." An "acceptable scheme" is one that is working and stops Heybridge flooding NOW.</p> <p>Topic6 continued Section 7 Table 7.1 The plan shows the primary school not being completed before 2019/2020. Heybridge needs a primary school NOW, not in 5 years time. Where will the primary school children from the first 438 homes go to go to school?</p> <p>What if the developer goes into liquidation after building the homes but before completing the infrastructure?</p>	<p>through planning applications and S106 agreement</p> <p>Topic 4: Design of the new relief road will be to standards required by the County Highway authority and will make appropriate provision for safe pedestrian movement. This will be clarified in Section 5.3.</p> <p>Topic 5: ECC has published the SuDs Design and Adoption Guide, December 2012, which outlines the requirements for sustainable surface water drainage in Essex. Paragraph 5.2 to be amended to include further details.</p> <p>The requirement for a Transport Assessment which takes into account traffic impacts and mitigation is highlighted in Section 7.7. The need for infrastructure provision including improvements to wider highways network are detailed in Section 7.3.</p>

Reference No	Name (source)	Summary of Consultation Responses	Comments on Consultation Responses/ Proposed Changes to Draft SMF
		<p>Will developers be required to lodge a Bond with Maldon District Council so that in the event of a developer going bust, Maldon District Council will have the money to complete the infrastructure.</p>	<p>Topic 5 The Council will require a high quality of design and sustainable development in accordance with the principles in Policy S4 and the masterplan. The masterplan will be a material consideration in the determination of planning applications.</p> <p>Table 7.1 and proposed timescale for infrastructure provision including new primary school reflects advice of Essex CC. Essex CC advise there is existing capacity for earlier development phases. Planning consent will be granted subject to conditions and a S106 agreement which will specify the timescale for infrastructure provision. Development will not be permitted to take place unless necessary associated infrastructure is provided.</p>
NHGS3	Danbury Parish Council	<p>The approach to Eves Corner is already at capacity and extensive queuing occurs in both directions. Once the developments in the Maldon district are completed, these queues will become <u>more extensive</u>, leading to residents using less suitable local roads as a rat run around the A414. Development at Heybridge would put a</p>	<p>The location of strategic growth is determined through the LDP which is currently subject to Examination-in-Public. The masterplan provides a framework for development of</p>

Reference No	Name (source)	Summary of Consultation Responses	Comments on Consultation Responses/ Proposed Changes to Draft SMF
		<p>considerable strain on the access routes to the town and in Danbury would make the traffic unbearable. Rat runs around the village would be used more which would significantly affect local residents. Rat running is a major concern to Danbury residents as this is already an issue on local roads that are not suitable for this volume of traffic. The Parish Council is concerned that the increased traffic as a result of additional dwellings in the Maldon District will add to the current problem.</p> <p>The Parish Council is also concerned regarding the resulting increase in pollution that will occur with an increase in the amount of traffic travelling through the village. The A414 is in close vicinity to shops, schools, a playing field and play area and additional pollution would be detrimental to residents' quality of life.</p> <p>There are three schools in Danbury, one on Little Baddow Road which joins with Eves Corner, one on Eves Corner itself and the third on the A414 adjacent to Well Lane. These are all extremely well used and busy junctions during the day with increased congestion during peak times.</p> <p>A new Medical Centre is to be situated on the main A414 adjacent to Danbury Mission and this will also increase the amount of traffic through the village. In the process of acquiring planning permission for the Medical Centre there were traffic predictions and there was to be a safe right turn made across the A414 and a crossing so that pedestrians from the other side of Danbury could access the centre.</p> <p>There is a high volume of traffic at Eves Corner shops, the bank, St</p>	<p>the North Heybridge Garden Suburb in accordance with the policies in the submitted LDP. The document makes it clear that where necessary the document will be revised following the EiP and adoption of the LDP.</p> <p>Maldon DC is engaged in an on-going Duty to Co-operate process with Chelmsford City Council and Essex CC including Eve's Corner and Well Lane.</p> <p>Essex Highways is working with Maldon DC to finalise details of proposed improvements to Eve's Corner and other highways improvements in the Maldon area. A comprehensive Transport Assessment would form part of a planning application and would set out how the development can be accommodated and the requirement for any necessary mitigation to the highway network.</p>

Reference No	Name (source)	Summary of Consultation Responses	Comments on Consultation Responses/ Proposed Changes to Draft SMF
		<p>Johns School and the current Medical Centre. If a car is parked in the wrong place in this location it can significantly block the traffic and completely block the road. This occurs particularly at school times. Unless solutions to these problems can be found, significant hold ups would occur. Consideration has not been given to buses which regularly have to turn around the junction at Eves Corner from the A414 to Mayes Lane and Little Baddow Road.</p> <p>Options have been discussed in past years for a bypass to be created from Heybridge Approach to form a new junction with the A12. The Parish Council would support these options as this would divert traffic away from the A414 and could enable the road to be downgraded to a B road. A bypass would also benefit Hatfield Peverel and Boreham who will also see increased congestion as a result of new development in the Maldon District.</p> <p>Request that a review of the number of houses for development is considered and that other, more suitable options for reducing the impact of the additional traffic at Danbury be considered.</p>	<p>The issue of improvements to the Hatfield Peverel junction is not a requirement solely of traffic generated from the Maldon and Heybridge Area, and needs to be seen in the context of strategic initiatives being developed to reduce pressure on the A12 corridor. On a long term basis a new junction to the A12 from the B1019 at Hatfield Peverel would provide an effective solution. It is recognised that this will require long term engagement between a number of organisations to develop this further. In the short term, to manage traffic, ECC is working with Maldon District Council and the principal developers in Maldon and Heybridge to finalise details of interim measures involving traffic management and bus-based public transport initiatives in order to manage traffic movements on this part of the network.</p> <p>The Infrastructure Delivery Timetable will be subject to</p>

Reference No	Name (source)	Summary of Consultation Responses	Comments on Consultation Responses/ Proposed Changes to Draft SMF
			review but the timely delivery of infrastructure in accordance with the LDP will be secured through legal agreements at the planning application stage.
NHGS4	Natural England	<p>Natural England welcomes the proposal for a new country park as part of the development proposal; this can contribute to alleviating areas of deficiency and provide local amenity and leisure opportunities. This new park can be linked to the new walking and cycling routes proposed also, promoting and encouraging sustainable transport.</p> <p>Paragraph 1.3.1 in respect of Principles refers to well managed open space and natural areas for amenity and wildlife which is welcomed and to be encouraged. Also the principle of a network of safe and useable paths, prioritising accessibility to open spaces, can also be linked to the Council's policies on sustainable transport- walking and cycling opportunities.</p> <p>Biodiversity and the natural environment can lead to various opportunities, not just for wildlife activity and connection, but also health, recreation, contributing to climate change adaptation and improving quality of life. The Council should seek to link and cross reference policies, where appropriate, strengthening the draft document and helping to ensure that area's green infrastructure, both current and planned are designed to deliver multiple functions.</p> <p>Chapter 2: Planning Policy Context There are clear links to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the Maldon local Plan. Policy S3 – Place Shaping Sub section (3) refers to well managed open space and natural areas for amenity and wildlife habitat; Sub Section (8) refers to useable paths</p>	<p>Support for Country Park welcomed.</p> <p>The Masterplan document provides supplementary guidance to the policies contained in the LDP. Cross references are provided to policies in the LDP. Further cross references will be added where appropriate.</p> <p>The Council recognises the need to protect the Best Most Versatile agricultural land in accordance with NPPF paragraph 112 and has taken this into account in the identification of land for development in the LDP.</p> <p>Policy I1 refers to all infrastructure including green infrastructure. Clarification is provided in para 7.1.5.</p> <p>Reference will be made to the</p>

Reference No	Name (source)	Summary of Consultation Responses	Comments on Consultation Responses/ Proposed Changes to Draft SMF
		<p>to prioritise access to open spaces; Both of these are welcomed and broadly supported.</p> <p>Policy S4 – Maldon and Heybridge Strategic Growth Provision of a Country Park focussed to the west of Maypole Road is to be welcomed and supported, as is the requirement for developments to be accompanied by a comprehensive and detailed ecological survey. The Council should use this requirement to remind potential developers of the requirement for the protection and enhancement of soils and agriculture, particularly Best Most Versatile land in accordance with NPPF paragraph 112. The Council should also give consideration to linking this section to the District’s Green Infrastructure Study (or subsequent document), seeking to include provision that enhances and creates green corridors and spaces that link with the existing urban areas. These green corridors could, where appropriate also be linked into the provision of walking and cycling routes, including Maldon Town Centre, as well as the wider countryside.</p> <p>Policy I1 – Infrastructure and Services Sub section (2) refers to appropriate levels and types of infrastructure to be provided, it is presumed that this includes green infrastructure, though it would be helpful to confirm this as normally this refers to utilities and hard built infrastructure provision.</p> <p>Chapter 3: Site and Surrounding Context Heybridge Wood identified as a local wildlife site and ancient woodland, Natural England acknowledges and welcomes the reference to our Standing Advice in respect of Ancient Woodlands. Consideration to the potential for impacts of increased usage and recreation pressure will need to be taken into account. Natural England would generally be opposed to development on the border of the Forest which could lead to the location of flood defence schemes within Heybridge Forest itself, which could be environmentally harmful. Natural England would like to</p>	<p>Maldon District Green Infrastructure Study (September 2011) and any subsequent document.</p> <p>Para 5.12.2 highlights the importance of Heybridge Wood as an amenity and ecological resource and the need for its protection. An Environmental Impact Assessment is normally required for large scale developments which will access in detail how the proposed development may have an impact on the local environment including biodiversity. A Management Plan will be required to explain how proposals for public access will be balanced against the maintenance and enhancement of its ecological value. Reference to be included to need to ensure that the Wood is not adversely affected by drainage measures. This could be achieved by the retention of ditches and incorporation of SuDS</p>

Reference No	Name (source)	Summary of Consultation Responses	Comments on Consultation Responses/ Proposed Changes to Draft SMF
		<p>see a policy in the Local Plan which protects the Forest from such schemes in future. This could be partially achieved by the retention of the ditches (paragraph 3.60 and the potential for Sustainable Urban Drainage systems (SUDs) as part of new development. This is acceptable, subject to the above comment.</p> <p>Chapter 4: Vision, Objectives and Consultation Paragraph 4.1.3 lists the Council’s key objectives for the area, eight objectives are listed which can be broadly supported, especially the provision of connected green spaces, including a Country Park, together with enhanced ecology and the natural environment with habitat opportunities.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.6.3 sets out objectives for the Heybridge Garden suburb, and lists nine bullet points under the Environmental Section, which can be broadly supported.</p> <p>Chapter 5: Developing the Masterplan Framework Section 5.1 the Strategic Flood Alleviation, refers to diverting and discharging the water – paragraph 5.1.7 refers. Discharge into the River Blackwater has the potential to impact and or affect the Blackwater Estuaries which are designated as Ramsar, Special protection Area (SPA), Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI).</p> <p>Any potential for impact on the designated sites must be consulted on with Natural England, the potential for Habitats Regulation Assessment and Appropriate Assessment will need to be discussed in respect of development proposal affecting the Blackwater Estuaries Paragraph 5.11 Green and Blue Corridors refer to the provision of supporting and enhancing the provision of these corridors.</p>	<p>Section 5.1- Reference to be added in relation to need to consult with relevant statutory bodies regarding potential impacts of water discharge on designated sites in Blackwater Estuaries.</p> <p>The landscape framework includes a range of green spaces including natural green space and habitats and connectivity to Maldon’s wider green infrastructure network and surrounding countryside. Add ‘accessible natural green’ space to paragraph 5.1.4 (second bullet point). Natural England’s standards for accessible natural green space are noted</p> <p>Amplify importance attached to local amenity and leisure opportunities and integration with new walking and cycling routes.</p>

Reference No	Name (source)	Summary of Consultation Responses	Comments on Consultation Responses/ Proposed Changes to Draft SMF
		<p>Considerations of the effects of light pollution are welcomed and Natural England acknowledges the reference to our advice and use of buffer zones around Heybridge Forest – see also our comments above.</p> <p>Also the need to consider the potential for impacts of water discharge on the Blackwater Estuaries designated sites will need to be taken into account.</p>	
NHGS5	Mr Trevor Knights	<p>Concern about existing traffic problem along Goldhanger Road through to the Causeway whereby access from Coopers Avenue and Lawling Avenue is at best difficult during peak periods and at weekends. It can take 20 minutes sometimes to get to the junction of Colchester Road. Essex Council representatives seemed unaware of this problem and impacts on local residents. The creation of a new road across from Broad St Green to Langford will create further issues and encourage rat running along Lawling or Coopers Avenues or through Scraley Road. The whole area will also be impacted by the proposed plan to build on the Heybridge Swifts site bring even more traffic to an already congested area.</p> <p>Concern that issues of flooding in the Coopers Avenue area appear to have been ignored.</p> <p>Planned developments are a necessity and many existing residents of Heybridge and Maldon fear that despite best intentions the character of the area will be changed completely. The existing infrastructure cannot cope so why put such a heavy concentration of development in this area? What is wrong with smaller developments along the Burnham to Woodham areas and villages where they have good road and rail links</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Traffic assessments have been undertaken by Essex CC and these have informed preparation of the LDP and Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Essex Highways is working with Maldon DC to finalise details of highways improvements in the wider Maldon area. A comprehensive Transport Assessment would form part of any planning application and would set out how the development can be accommodated and the requirement for any necessary mitigation to the highway network. A site wide drainage strategy will be required to ensure there is no adverse impact on adjoining areas.</p> <p>Heybridge Swifts is proposed</p>

Reference No	Name (source)	Summary of Consultation Responses	Comments on Consultation Responses/ Proposed Changes to Draft SMF
		and two senior schools.	<p>as a strategic allocation in the LDP and will be subject to a separate planning application.</p> <p>The LDP sets out principles for development of the North Heybridge Garden Suburb which are further amplified in the masterplan. The objective is to ensure that it is planned as a high quality neighbourhood that will complement and enhance the character of the District and protect and enhance the environmental qualities of eth surrounding area.</p> <p>The location of strategic growth is determined through the LDP which is currently subject to Examination-in-Public.</p>
NHGS6	English Heritage	Section 3.7 covers archaeology and heritage matters. English Heritage welcomes the requirement in paragraph 3.7.5 for a programme of comprehensive and detailed archaeological investigations across the whole of the area prior to any development. We also agree that paragraph 3.7.6 identifies all the designated heritage assets that may be affected by the development. It would be appropriate to note the requirement in Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to have special regard to the desirability of conserving listed buildings, which includes protection from harm	Add to para 3.7.6 reference to requirement in Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to have special regard to the desirability of conserving listed buildings, which includes protection from harm resulting from development within their setting.

Reference No	Name (source)	Summary of Consultation Responses	Comments on Consultation Responses/ Proposed Changes to Draft SMF
		<p>resulting from development within their setting. The requirement for protection of the setting of these heritage assets might then be included within the key objectives as set out in paragraph 4.1.3.</p> <p>In our opinion, it would then be appropriate to set out in Section 5 (Developing the Masterplan Framework) how the emerging masterplan has responded to the issue of the setting of the heritage assets identified in paragraph 3.7.6, and how the requirements of Section 66 of the 1990 Act have been discharged. In practice, the decision to include open space (and no built forms apart from the link road) on the western part of the site is likely to protect the setting of both the Grade II listed barn at Mitchell’s Farm and the Grade II listed Rectory and Stables. The provision of further open land on the north side of the link road immediately south and west of the group of listed buildings at Poplar Grove Farm will go some way to mitigate the harm that might result to the setting of these listed buildings, but clearly they will no longer have the agrarian setting that one would expect for agricultural buildings. It would be helpful to have a clearer understanding of the implications of topography, and how the edge treatment for the nearest blocks of dwellings might contribute to mitigating any remaining harm.</p>	<p>Add requirement for protection of setting of heritage assets to para 4.1.3</p> <p>Add reference to designation of areas as open space and contribution this will make to protection of heritage assets and their setting.</p>
NHGS7	Ms Helen Philpott Drapers Farm Sports Club	<p>Section 5 Playing Fields</p> <p>Playing fields provision for recreation land and playing fields comprises relatively small separate areas of land primarily intended for residents of new development. Concern that this will not be sufficient for the proper development of sporting activities by Clubs which have a record of producing results such as Maldon Rugby Club and Maldon Cricket Club.</p> <p>The membership of the Cricket and Rugby Clubs has increased to the</p>	<p>Comments noted. Meeting to be held with Drapers Farm Sports Club to discuss sporting provision within Garden Suburb.</p> <p>Detailed proposals have not been prepared at this stage. Further consideration will be</p>

Reference No	Name (source)	Summary of Consultation Responses	Comments on Consultation Responses/ Proposed Changes to Draft SMF
		<p>extent that the playing areas are no longer sufficient for the demand. Furthermore, as mentioned earlier, the Cricket Club also uses the Promenade Park with the disadvantages which arise from such split site usage. There are also considerable problems at the Drapers Farm Sports Club as a result of inadequate car parking facilities.</p> <p>In short more playing space is required and the opportunity should not be missed of taking advantage of the development proposals in the Maldon and Heybridge areas in the Local Development Plan (i.e. the two proposed Garden Suburb propositions) to create a further initiative similar to that from which the Drapers Farm Sports Club developed.</p> <p>Drapers Farm Sports Club has made previous representations requesting that any new development should contain an area of land similar to that at Drapers Farm which is a sports field and public open space and was part of a S106 agreement. Provision of one or two sports pitches is not sufficient and would become dog walking areas. District Council should work with developers to make provision for an area of 15-20 acres for sports provision.</p> <p>Need to address issues of playing field management and current shortfall of facilities. It is necessary to provide an area of land for the proper development of sporting activities and not simply odd patches of land scattered about as unconnected 'leisure facilities'. At present the Drapers Farm Sports Club/Ground is struggling to cater for the demand particularly from young people as is evidenced by the (literally) hundreds of youngsters joining the Colts sections of both Clubs and it is obvious that additional facilities are required.</p> <p>Drapers Farm Outline Development Plan submitted in June 2014 outlines the need for more facilities for rugby and cricket to cater for growing demand which will be increased with additional residential properties being built. The Council has undertaken to continue to work</p>	<p>given to the location and use of the pitches in consultation with Sport England and local sports clubs.</p>

Reference No	Name (source)	Summary of Consultation Responses	Comments on Consultation Responses/ Proposed Changes to Draft SMF
		<p>with the relevant clubs to assist with their development proposals.</p> <p>In short it is essential that an area of land of approximately 15-20 acres is allocated in one location for sporting provision; four or five different small sites will not be sufficient for the proper management of sporting activities. The provision of one/two sports pitches or a token soccer goal scattered here and there is by no means sufficient and as has been seen in other areas of the town would merely become dog walking areas.</p>	
NHGS8	Mrs Sue Dobson English Bridleways Association	<p>Previous response to consultation on LDP resulted in some proposed revised wordings to incorporate bridleway access, together with the request that any new relief roads will incorporate a 'green corridor' enabling their use by all vulnerable road users, including horseriders, away from the danger of heavy traffic.</p> <p>It is welcomed that the new developments will incorporate increased access with links between housing and green spaces; however, we are disappointed to note that it is proposed to include use by only walkers and cyclists. We therefore request that wherever possible that multi-user tracks are incorporated into all developments to enable the use by walkers, cyclists, horseriders and other vulnerable road users. At only 7% of the total rights of way, Maldon district has the worst provision of bridleways against other rights of way in the whole of Essex. It therefore follows that, in accordance with the Rights of Way Improvement Plan, bridleways should be included as far as possible in any new development to redress this balance. It would be very beneficial if all new rights of way are designated as bridleways which will not only concord with Central Government's aims but also those in the emerging Local Development Framework for the Maldon District.</p> <p>Bridleways should be considered within any new development as opposed to just footpaths or cycle ways, because bridleways are, in</p>	<p>Proposed Changes.</p> <p>Paragraph 5.11. 2 - add reference to potential for improved provision for horseriders.</p> <p>Consideration will be given where practical to the potential for multi-user tracks to enable the use by walkers, cyclists, horseriders and other vulnerable road users.</p> <p>Add to Sections 5.6 and 5.7 reference to Bridleways-incorporation and where possible enhancement of existing bridleway network</p> <p>Add to Paragraph 5.3.4 reference to potential use of green corridor to enable</p>

Reference No	Name (source)	Summary of Consultation Responses	Comments on Consultation Responses/ Proposed Changes to Draft SMF
		<p>reality, multi user tracks. They can be legally used by walkers, cyclists, riders and people with mobility problems i.e. the sections of society who are recognised as vulnerable road users. From an economic point of view, it makes sense to provide the public with one multi user track rather than constructing separate tracks. They will also benefit all other road users – people in cars and lorries do not want to have to encounter vulnerable road users. The community as a whole will also benefit from an economic, safety and health point of view.</p> <p>We therefore request that measures applied by the Highways Authority in accordance with the HASPST should be adopted in design of relief road, providing access over/under such roads being built in at the construction stage, also that a ‘green corridor’ within the landscape buffer zone either side of these roads is allowed for to enable access by horseriders and cyclists away from the danger of the traffic. It is noted on page 13 of the Masterplan that the area around the new relief road is to be used for green infrastructure and flood alleviation measures, also the area north of this road. We therefore request that equestrian access is considered within these parcels of land designated for flood alleviation and green infrastructure.</p> <p>We note that there is a proposal for the creation of a new country park to the west of Maypole Road and this is welcomed; however we request that equestrian access is included in this proposal and we would support a plan which enabled links to be made between the country parks and the Blackwater Rail Trail. Some equestrian access to the existing Heybridge Woods and Elms Farm would also be a welcome addition.</p> <p>The Masterplan advises that developer contributions will be sought for</p>	<p>access by horseriders, cyclists and pedestrians and link with wider network</p>

Reference No	Name (source)	Summary of Consultation Responses	Comments on Consultation Responses/ Proposed Changes to Draft SMF
		<p>various supporting infrastructure proposals and it is requested that the respective developers are required by planning condition to contribute to the enhancement of the rights of way network, principally bridleways, bearing in mind the imbalance of proportion of bridleways to other rights of way as mentioned earlier in this response.</p> <p>It is noted that during the Visioning Workshop and subsequent Stakeholders Workshop that both parties stated the inclusion of links with the countryside and neighbouring villages '<i>by foot, cycle and bridleway</i>'; also to '<i>enhance and expand the country park (Elms Farm)</i>'. The Stakeholders Workshop stated that '<i>there should be the creation of a network of green infrastructure and links</i>'. We are therefore disappointed to note that the subsequent Masterplan Development exercise ignored any bridleway links or enhancements and mentioned only walking and cycling. Points 5.13.4 and 5.13.5 mention the green infrastructure and the proposed country park but no mention is made as to any rights of way or bridleway enhancement. We note that the boundary of the park will be determined in the future; we trust that consideration is given to equestrian access prior to the submission of any planning application. Yet again, we note from the Access and Movement Framework Plan that no consideration has been given to enhancing the bridleway network – yet cyclists have several routes listed on this. In the light of our previous comments, we would request that this anomaly is rectified.</p> <p>Existing bridleway network – we note that the new development will be relatively near to two existing bridleways and we are concerned to note that no mention has been made to incorporate or enhance the current</p>	

Reference No	Name (source)	Summary of Consultation Responses	Comments on Consultation Responses/ Proposed Changes to Draft SMF
		<p>network. Furthermore, there are several footpaths in the area and upgrading these to bridleway status would create a useful circular route which can then be used by horseriders, cyclists and pedestrians. Footpaths 3, 17 and 30 would make ideal upgrades which could link into the existing bridleway, also linking in horse riding and cycling access onto the Blackwater Rail Trail. The Masterplan document mentions a number of permissive farm rides in existence; these should not be considered as public rights of way as they are permissive only, have no legal standing and can be withdrawn by the landowner at any time. Unless there are plans to adopt these as legal bridleways, their reference in this consultation should be ignored.</p> <p>Request that Essex Bridleways Association is added to Maldon District Council's list of consultees for this and all other large scale developments. We note that an officer from the Council has now confirmed that bridleways in general will be considered and has proposed a meeting with our Association to discuss this issue further and this is very welcome news. We would emphasise our willingness to be involved in any pre-application discussions or if we can help in any way prior to detailed plans being drawn up, and would welcome any input or involvement that may be possible in this and any other planned development.</p>	
NHGS9	Mr Len Thorogood	<p>Section 4</p> <p>The vision and objectives only appears to reflect the Council's requirements, and most certainly do not reflect the views of the local residents, and those of adjoining councils, and their residents, who have very serious concerns as to the proposals for the development,</p>	Section 4 sets out how the vision and objectives for the North Heybridge Garden Suburb have evolved and been refined through on-going

Reference No	Name (source)	Summary of Consultation Responses	Comments on Consultation Responses/ Proposed Changes to Draft SMF
		<p>and who's lives will be affected by the development, both locally and the whole of the area</p> <p>Section 5.14 Again this only appears to reflect the Council's requirements, and does not reflect, or allow for the impact of the proposed development outside of Heybridge. Drawings and plans can be utilised to highlight exactly what individuals that produce them, to reflect exactly what they wish, and does not give any indication as to what the final <i>product</i> might be</p> <p>Section 5 This proposed development will result in the loss of <i>soakaway</i> land to the North of Holloway Road, which already floods on a regular basis, so this situation will only be made worse. All the flood alleviation systems that have been provided in recent times, as part of other local developments, have all been less than successful, and in some cases, have actually resulted in structural damage to the properties that were built. It is interesting to note that the proposed flood alleviation system is only a data projection, and when making enquires, I understand that the proposals have never been utilised elsewhere, so everything is theoretical / experimental, so there is a major risk of failure, which can only result in even more flooding, which can only lead to major health concerns. The proposed bulk storage of rainwater during periods of heavy rainfall, is also flawed, as the water would soon stagnant, so, in addition to the obvious smell, there will be a consider health issues, and potential safety issues</p> <p>Section 6 The only consideration that I can see is the Council's aspiration to</p>	<p>consultation between the Council, key stakeholders and the local community. These underpin the masterplan framework and reflect policies set out in the LDP.</p> <p>Section 5- The issues raised will be fully addressed in the design, implementation and management of an appropriate flood alleviation scheme. Development proposals will be required to be accompanied by a site wide drainage strategy agreed with Essex CC and the Environment Agency.</p> <p>Section 6- The Council will require a high quality of design and sustainable development in accordance with the principles in Policy S4 and the masterplan. The masterplan will be a material consideration in the determination of planning applications.</p> <p>Section 7- the development of the North Heybridge Garden Suburb will be required to deliver a range of strategic</p>

Reference No	Name (source)	Summary of Consultation Responses	Comments on Consultation Responses/ Proposed Changes to Draft SMF
		<p>provide a huge number of new properties, with little or no consideration as to possible designs, and the impact that the creation of a huge housing estate will have on the local residents, and their properties. New developments in other areas have been self-contained / stand-alone developments, so that they do not impact on the local residents</p> <p>Section 7 There is no infrastructure considerations, other than those for the proposed new development, so it can be readily anticipated local residents will have major difficulties in travelling to and from the Maldon area, which is already an issue, due to long traffic queues, and the various junctions in the surrounding areas, that cannot be modified. The whole area already becomes gridlocked whenever there is an accident or an incident in the area</p> <p>Conclusion Before any type of development is undertaken the proposed flood alleviation measures must be undertaken, including the upgrading of the local sewers which are already operating at > 85% maximum capacity, and all the other utility services to meet the increase in demand. Consideration must be given to improving the infrastructure in the adjacent communities, as well as the local infrastructure improvements, which should include the screening and protection of the properties adjacent to the proposed development, and should be undertaken prior to any works being undertaken. As a point of interest, I understand that a considerable number of planning application for housing developments in the area, and on brown field sites, have been rejected by the Council, and if these had been allowed to proceed, it is</p>	<p>infrastructure which will serve the wider area. Traffic assessments have been undertaken by Essex CC and these have informed preparation of the LDP and Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Essex Highways is working with Maldon DC to finalise details of highways improvements in the Maldon area. A comprehensive Transport Assessment would form part of any planning application and would set out how the development can be accommodated and the requirement for any necessary mitigation to the highway network.</p> <p>Conclusion- Comments noted. The Council will seek the earliest possible delivery of necessary infrastructure. Implementation of development and infrastructure provision will be regulated through the use of planning conditions and planning obligations.</p> <p>The location of strategic growth</p>

Reference No	Name (source)	Summary of Consultation Responses	Comments on Consultation Responses/ Proposed Changes to Draft SMF
		<p>quite possible that options for self-contained / stand-alone developments would have presented themselves as the overall housing requirement would have been reduced by 75%. It should also be noted that the council continually changes their proposals / increases the number of proposed dwellings to suit their most recent finance projections</p>	<p>is determined through the LDP which is currently subject to Examination-in-Public. The masterplan provides a framework for development of the North Heybridge Garden Suburb in accordance with the policies in the submitted LDP. The document makes it clear that where necessary the document will be revised following the EiP and adoption of the LDP.</p>
NHGS10	Dr Robert Burns	<p>Questions whether the plans genuinely conform to Garden City principles. Clarification requested of how second principle to '<i>capture land value for the benefit of the community</i>' will be enacted. Refers to TCPA guidance which states that the key to success is to '<i>access the right land in the right place at the right price</i>' by capturing land value and that '<i>getting the most out of land value uplift is the key to meeting the building and ongoing costs of a new community</i>'. No details are provided of how this is to be achieved in North Heybridge. Reference made to '<i>four steps to site selection</i>'- preparation of <i>design brief, site search, submission of proposals for new communities which fulfil the design brief and identification, testing and consultation on options for growth leading to identification of preferred option. A full assessment of options has not been undertaken</i> and the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment should not be relied on as a substitute for a proactive search. Opportunities should be fully explored Consideration should be given to opportunities in south of District given the superior transport infrastructure with regard to both rail and road access to London and the SE area generally in the south compared with the northern part of the District. The evidence suggests</p>	<p>Comments noted. The location of strategic growth is determined through the LDP which is currently subject to Examination-in-Public. The masterplan provides a framework for development of the North Heybridge Garden Suburb in accordance with the policies in the submitted LDP. The Council will secure developer contributions to the delivery of necessary infrastructure including community facilities. Development of North Heybridge Garden Suburb will be phased to deliver housing over the plan period including</p>

Reference No	Name (source)	Summary of Consultation Responses	Comments on Consultation Responses/ Proposed Changes to Draft SMF
		<p>that possible large scale development in North Fambridge and Burnham, or indeed Althorne and the area between Althorne and North Fambridge has not taken place. Council has not therefore <i>explored all reasonable options to fulfil the OAN within the District. The North Heybridge plan could not be a source of shortterm delivery of housing delivery as is repeatedly claimed. There is no indication of how the North Heybridge scheme has addressed and resolved the issue of the price of the land. 'Planning and delivering a large-scale new community is a serious and distinctive task requiring a highly focused and motivated team. Such large-scale development projects will also require a wide range of specialist and technical expertise, and the local authority will not necessarily possess all the background knowledge ore experience needed ' (6.2.1.). Maldon District does not have the skill to do this. The Planning Department should be concentrating on developing a series of strict criteria for approval for small and medium sized new estates, spread throughout the District. This would reduce the need for new infrastructure. Need to review location of proposed development in North Heybridge. It must surely have been possible to find land which did not require the expensive flood alleviation scheme and a new relief road which will increase the overall costs of the development. It would be irresponsible to start building the 'garden suburb' until the present flooding problems have been resolved. It will take time to prove that the alleviation scheme if implemented actually succeeds. Concern about all access to be provided from relief road and impacts this will have on residents- particularly children going to school. The north east sections of housing will be isolated from the larger development. The 'country park' is redundant because it lies on the far side of a busy road. There is no mention of provisions for a Church or Churches in the garden suburb</i></p> <p>Framework for new Green Spaces (Section 5) is based on managing flood risk rather than the need to provide a balanced amount of green</p>	<p>the short term. Preparation of the strategic masterplan framework will assist the Council in the determination of applications and securing necessary infrastructure.</p> <p>The provision of the Country Park is a requirement of the development and will form part of an extended green infrastructure network and an important asset for the local area.</p> <p>The Council is committed to the delivery of necessary infrastructure alongside development to ensure that the impacts of development can be accommodated. The indicative framework for the phased delivery of infrastructure (extracted from the Infrastructure Delivery Plan) reflects the advice of Essex County Council and other infrastructure providers and has taken into account issues related to infrastructure capacity and viability. All</p>

Reference No	Name (source)	Summary of Consultation Responses	Comments on Consultation Responses/ Proposed Changes to Draft SMF
		<p>space . Much of it is concentrated where is is not greatly needed, i.e., near the wood or north of the relief road</p> <p>Movement and Access (Section 5)- concerned that development (together to some extend with the South Maldon route) will generate a great deal of new commuter traffic on the road north to Witham through Wickham Bishops. External transport infrastructure of this kind is crucially important because no employment is proposed within the garden suburb and people will commute.</p> <p>The wood prevents free internal flow within the suburb and this rules out any notion that the 'suburb' could ever be a single integrated community</p> <p>Design Principles Section 6- insufficient detail is provided. The Council should organize a competition among architects to design housing which reflects particular forms of architecture especially characteristic of the District,</p> <p>Infrastructure Delivery- statements are too vague and ambiguous. No plan should be placed before the public when little more than aspirations are being affirmed rather than plans which have already reached the stage of firm contracts between the parties involved. For instance, one needs to know exactly when the flood alleviation scheme will be delivered, who will deliver it and at what cost. It needs to be in place from the outset by a contractor legally obliged to finish it all before any housing is completed. 6.2. Who is to be responsible for delivering the relief road on time and how is it to be financed. How will road improvements in the Blue Mills area be delivered to accommodate increased traffic. On p. 70 it is stated that the masterplan provides an '<i>indicative structure</i>' but that seems to mean there is nothing definite about the delivery dates: it will be '<i>phased</i>' and '<i>flexibility</i>' is required to</p>	<p>development will be required to mitigate against adverse environmental impacts and climate change.</p> <p>The Strategic Masterplan Framework is intended to set out design principles not detailed design proposals. The Council places the utmost importance on securing a high quality of design and will require design codes to be established.</p> <p>The Council places the utmost importance on ensuring that the community is fully engaged in the development and future management and governance of the Garden Suburb. Para 5.3.2 states that the Council will work with developers of the Garden Suburb and stakeholders to secure agreement and delivery of long term management and governance arrangements. This will include development of a Community Development Strategy which reflects Garden Suburb principles. This may</p>

Reference No	Name (source)	Summary of Consultation Responses	Comments on Consultation Responses/ Proposed Changes to Draft SMF
		<p>ensure delivery takes account of <i>'unforeseen circumstances'</i>. This indicates that nothing has been firmly settled. It will be <i>'delivered in stages alongside the construction of new homes'</i>. The stages should be clearly specified now, and so should the nature, number, and location of new homes. Contends that the sentence <i>'the indicative phasing of development has been structured to provide flexibility over where and when development takes place'</i> really means that no <i>'structure'</i> exists. Inadequate information provided about delivery. <i>'Timely'</i> delivery should be guaranteed now. There is a need to demonstrate this complex partnership between the Council and developers will continue with a <i>'monitoring framework which sets out key targets ... to ensure delivery'</i>. <i>Cannot ensure delivery unless legal framework in place.</i></p> <p>Further details requested of the <i>management structure established in December 2013 to ensure effective joint working</i> of the <i>'partnership between MDC, developers/landowners, relevant stakeholders and the local community. And role of the 'local community'</i>. Reference is made to meetings having been held with Heybridge and Langford/ Ulting Parish Councils to keep them up to date' Why have no meetings taken place with Great Totham Parish Council?</p> <p>Governance and Community Representation - The CGSTGC states categorically that <i>'the governance structure of the new community, whether a local authority strategic body or a separate delivery vehicle must be considered from the outset and must include community representation'</i> (4.3). There is nothing in the document which fulfils this requirement and no details of a suitable <i>governance structure that put local people at the heart of their community and facilitates the ownership of community assets and high standards of long term management.'</i></p>	<p>include the establishment of a Community Trust type organization to engage residents in the future management of the Garden Suburb.</p>

Reference No	Name (source)	Summary of Consultation Responses	Comments on Consultation Responses/ Proposed Changes to Draft SMF
NHGS11	Sport England	<p>Education – Section 5.9 In view of the new primary school being located in the centre of the community adjoining other community facilities, the master plan should make reference to the primary school being designed to facilitate access for the wider community to its facilities outside of school hours. Primary school facilities such as school halls and playing fields are often used by the wider community and can complement the main community facilities provided in a major development such as this. Through careful design, new schools can be planned to maximise the potential for safe and secure community access to be facilitated (e.g. through separate community entrances to buildings and external areas). It is therefore requested that this section refers to the role that the school can play in meeting wider community needs and promotes the school being planned to facilitate community access to its facilities that may offer potential for community use. Consideration should also be given to whether any community facilities should be co-located on the school site.</p> <p>Open Space and Recreation - Section 5.13 Sport England supports the principle of on-site playing field provision being provided to meet the needs of the development. However, potential concern is raised about the proposal to have two separate playing fields within the development within close proximity. Our experience from similar scale developments elsewhere shows that the provision of a single large site for outdoor sport is more effective and efficient in terms of meeting community needs and providing for sustainable management than providing two or more sites. Operators and users of playing fields, particularly local authorities, leisure trusts and sports clubs prefer larger sites from a management and sports development perspective. From a sports club perspective, if for example, a single local football club was to use the proposed sports pitches it would prefer to have all of its teams playing on the same site</p>	<p>Reference to be included to potential for community use of primary school facilities</p> <p>Comments noted. Detailed proposals have not been prepared at this stage. Further consideration will be given to the location and use of the pitches in consultation with Sport England and local sports clubs.</p>

Reference No	Name (source)	Summary of Consultation Responses	Comments on Consultation Responses/ Proposed Changes to Draft SMF
		<p>rather than dispersed over two separate areas which can provide difficulties for coaches and parents. In addition, there would be a need to duplicate the ancillary facilities to support the use of the playing fields i.e. there would be a need for two pavilions and car parks instead of one which will have cost and land use implications as well as being less efficient for the management body to maintain over a long term period. It is therefore advocated that the master plan is reviewed in this respect to assess whether it is possible to provide one large playing field area within the development rather than two separate sites. If this is not feasible, it is advocated that the two sites are planned and designed to complement each other rather than providing the same outdoor sports facilities. For example, it would be unlikely to be appropriate for both sites to provide cricket pitches and the same sized football pitches. One site could therefore be focused around being designed for cricket while consideration could be given to planning one site for adult football while the other is designed for youth/mini football. While it may be inappropriate for the master plan document to go into detail on the planning of each playing field, the master plan should set out that as a principle the design and layout of the two playing field should be responsive to meeting local playing pitch needs and that the two sites should be planned so that they provide complementary facilities rather than duplicating provision.</p> <p>Open Space and Recreation - Section 5.13 (Continued) Specific comments that are made on the design and layout of the proposed playing fields are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The two sites should be planned so that they are large enough to accommodate the largest size sports pitches so that there is flexibility to meet needs as they change over time. In practice it is advised that the sites be planned so that there is sufficient space to accommodate a senior cricket square (with outfield) and two senior football pitches within the outfield therefore. 	<p>Design considerations to be amplified in Section 5.13 to reflect sport England comments</p>

Reference No	Name (source)	Summary of Consultation Responses	Comments on Consultation Responses/ Proposed Changes to Draft SMF
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="674 301 1612 432">□ A (sports turf consultant's) feasibility study of the ground conditions of the areas proposed for sports pitches should be a pre-requisite of development of the site to ensure that fit for purpose playing pitches will be provided in practice <li data-bbox="674 440 1612 772">□ Pavilions providing essential changing, equipment storage and refreshment (teas, light snacks etc for players/supporters) facilities should be a pre-requisite of the design of the sites as these will be an essential ancillary facilities to support the use of the pitches. Early consideration should be given to the nature of the use of the pitches as this will influence the range of facilities to be provided in the pavilion e.g. senior teams will require more changing rooms and social areas than junior teams. Provision will also need to be made on each site for a maintenance storage building for maintenance machinery, chemicals etc. <li data-bbox="674 780 1612 1046">□ Adequate car parking will be necessary for supporting the use of the sports pitches. In practice, the majority of users of the pitches especially 'away' teams and officials will not reside within the development and therefore need to travel to the site usually by car. Adequate on-site parking is therefore essential to avoid a scenario where parking overflows into adjoining residential areas during peak periods of use of the pitches at weekends which usually generates residential amenity conflicts. <li data-bbox="674 1054 1612 1257">□ Consideration will need to be given to vehicular access to the site to minimise the need for users from outside the garden suburb to generate traffic within it during peak periods. Access to the site should therefore ideally be off the primary roads within the development and will need to co-ordinated with the proposals for the siting of the car parking and pavilion on each site. <li data-bbox="674 1265 1612 1362">□ Consideration should be given to options for sports pitch management at an early stage to consider how the site can be sustainably managed in practice. 	

Reference No	Name (source)	Summary of Consultation Responses	Comments on Consultation Responses/ Proposed Changes to Draft SMF
		<p>The above considerations should be incorporated into section 5.13 of the document to ensure that appropriate consideration is given to these matters in the planning applications that will follow. Sport England would be willing to provide further advice on these matters to the District Council and/or developers upon request.</p> <p>Vision, Objectives and Consultation – Section 4.1 In addition to the key objectives listed in paragraph 4.1.3, the garden suburb should be explicitly encouraged to be designed to encourage physical activity due to the health, transport etc benefits this offers. This would be consistent with the other objectives in this section. It is requested that the master plan makes reference to Sport England’s established Active Design guidance which provides Government endorsed guidance on how major new developments such as this can be planned to promote opportunities for sport and physical activity in the design and layout of development through three key principles of improving accessibility, enhancing amenity and increasing awareness. See www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-sport/planning-tools-and-guidance/active-design/ for further detail.</p> <p>Infrastructure Requirements – Section 7.1 This section should confirm whether off-site developer contributions will be expected to be secured towards meeting the indoor sports facility needs generated by the proposed development as it is unclear. Off-site provision towards new or enhanced facilities in the Maldon/Heybridge area would be considered more appropriate than on-site provision.</p> <p>Infrastructure Delivery – Section 5.2 The proposals in the indicative phasing programme for providing the proposed playing fields are welcomed as they would ensure that the facilities are operational at an early stage of the development which would avoid pressures being placed on existing facilities which may</p>	<p>Add new bullet point to paragraph 4.6.3- Community ‘Physical activity and healthy lifestyles will be encouraged through provision for sport, promotion of walking and cycling and provision of allotments’</p> <p>Comments noted. No specific requirements have been identified in association with development of the North Heybridge Garden Suburb. If appropriate, off-site developer contributions recreation facilities in the Maldon and Heybridge area may be funded through CIL once adopted by the Council.</p>

Reference No	Name (source)	Summary of Consultation Responses	Comments on Consultation Responses/ Proposed Changes to Draft SMF
		<p>already be at capacity. The Council is advised that new natural turf playing pitches typically take around 18 months on average from commencement of construction to be ready to use. This should be accounted for as the phasing programme develops.</p>	
NHGS12	Woodham Walters Parish Council	Woodham Walter Parish Council has no comments.	Comments noted
NHGS13	Irene Allen	<p>Extremely concerned at creeping urbanisation– this ‘Garden Suburb’ just extends Heybridge into Langford. This is a rural area and should be preserved as such and any new development kept to the east of Maypole Road which is the natural distinction between Heybridge and Langford.</p> <p>concerned that in section 7 no real thought has been given to traffic problems. The proposed ‘outer relief road’ between Langford Road and Broad Street Green Road will merely channel more traffic through an already overburdened village ‘B’ road. The Langford Road end of this proposed relief road will bring it straight out between an existing roundabout at Heybridge Approach and a sharp bridge at the village end. I know there was an idea to remove the bridge at one time, but this is our only traffic calming measure and is a feature of the village. It would surely have been better to use the existing disused railway track to link up to the A12 or make a road directly from the northern end of Broad Street Green/Maypole Road to the A12. As it stands this road proposal will only make traffic problems worse for our village and will have a knock-on effect at Hatfield Peverel which is already having to cope with extra traffic numbers from proposed development there. Pretty as the scheme undoubtedly is, ‘Garden Suburb’ is just that – a suburb which is eating into our already rapidly shrinking countryside,</p>	<p>Comments noted. The masterplan proposes that the area between maypole Road and Langford Road will be used for green infrastructure, flood alleviation and landscaping. No development is proposed to the west of Maypole Road.</p> <p>Traffic assessments have been undertaken by Essex CC and these have informed the preparation of the LDP and Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Essex CC is working with Maldon DC to finalise details of highways improvements in the Maldon area. A comprehensive Transport Assessment would form part of any planning application and would set out how the development can be accommodated and the requirement for any necessary</p>

Reference No	Name (source)	Summary of Consultation Responses	Comments on Consultation Responses/ Proposed Changes to Draft SMF
		and I am wholly opposed to any more green belt land being developed in this way.	<p>mitigation to the highway network.</p> <p>The location of strategic growth is determined through the LDP which is currently subject to Examination-in-Public. The land is not designated as statutory Green Belt. A key principle is the retention of existing hedgerows and natural landscape features and the creation of an extensive network of green spaces which will create an attractive landscaped setting and provide access to the wider countryside.</p>
NHGS14	Eclipse Planning on behalf of Endurance Estates and Peter Travis	Welcome the growth proposals for Heybridge but express concerns over the comprehensive delivery of all the elements proposed within the Strategic Masterplan Framework as not all of the land within the North Heybridge Garden Suburb boundary is within the control of the Council or the lead developers. Clients own a 3.2 hectare site known as Rectory Fields, located to the west of Maypole Road and consider site has the potential to deliver considerable benefits to the District and the community as part of a modest development and assist in securing the comprehensive development of the Garden Suburb. A Development Appraisal for the site has been prepared which demonstrates the site is suitable for a modest level of housing development which can be designed and delivered without prejudicing the design principles outlined in the Draft Strategic Masterplan Framework. A development of the size proposed, circa 30 dwellings, does not necessitate significant	Comments noted. No change proposed. The Strategic Masterplan Framework must be in accordance with the LDP which states that the area between the new relief road, Maypole Road and Langford Road will be used for green infrastructure, flood alleviation and/or landscaping measures. The Strategic Masterplan Framework cannot include new allocations which have not been allocated in the LDP.

Reference No	Name (source)	Summary of Consultation Responses	Comments on Consultation Responses/ Proposed Changes to Draft SMF
		<p>infrastructure improvements and would complement and enhance the proposals for the North Heybridge Garden Suburb. The development offers significant community benefits- it contribute to the Council's housing supply in the short term by delivering a modest number of homes to help meet local housing need, they would be delivered in a substantial landscaped setting, providing an appropriate transition from town to country. It is proposed that the development envelop would be approximately 40% of the site. The remaining 60% would comprise a landscape setting with opportunities to expand the country park identified in the Strategic Masterplan Framework to the south and west. Significant opportunities exist to provide public access through the site, particularly at the southern end of Maypole Road and to enhance connectivity from the proposed residential development east of Maypole Road, to the country park and to the existing network of green infrastructure beyond. All surface water run off would be managed on site by means of a sustainable urban drainage system that offers additional opportunities to promote and enhance wildlife and biodiversity. The inclusion of this site in the Masterplan Framework for a modest scale of development within a substantial landscaped setting, would ensure that the North Heybridge Garden Suburb is comprehensively planned, and moreover, fully deliverable. Clients are willing to work with the Council and the lead developers in respect of their land interests and the comprehensive delivery of the Garden Suburb.</p>	<p>Details of the boundary of the Country Park have not been defined and the Council and developers will work with landowners and relevant stakeholders to take forward proposals in accordance with the LDP.</p>
NHGS15	Mr David Sismey	<p>Concern expressed about the purpose and status of the masterplan. Assumed that is masterplan was adopted by the Council, the development ultimately approved for the garden suburb would be consistent with the contents if the masterplan. This implies that the masterplan has to be prescriptive - ie in ensuring that the development that takes place follows the masterplan proposals. Concern that masterplan is not intended to be prescriptive. Questions Council's intention to make the spaces shown as open spaces in the plan open</p>	<p>Comments noted. The Strategic Masterplan Framework provides further guidance on the policies and principles set out in the LDP. It does not provide detailed proposals for development of the Garden Suburb. The</p>

Reference No	Name (source)	Summary of Consultation Responses	Comments on Consultation Responses/ Proposed Changes to Draft SMF
		<p>spaces, how has this been costed in the infrastructure budget and how private sector farmland with no public right of way can count as open space? Specifically - if the current draft is adopted will the areas identified as proposed open space actually become open space? If the masterplan is not prescriptive, it would raise false hope that the development actually ends up following the masterplan proposals.</p>	<p>provision and management of a network of green spaces is a key requirement. Details of the boundary of the Country Park have not been defined and the Council will work with landowners and relevant stakeholders to take forward proposals in accordance with the LDP.</p>
NHGS16	Great Totham Parish Council	<p>The Council was surprised that the proposed school is only of one-form entry and assumes that this is just the initial position.</p> <p>Concern that the plan does not appear to anticipate further traffic and consequent infrastructure improvements on the Langford to Witham (via Great Totham and Wickham Bishops) road or the B1022 Heybridge to Colchester (via Great Totham) road. These are direct routes to the Trunk Road and National Rail Networks as well as industrial and Commercial centres at Colchester, Witham and Chelmsford and smaller centres in between. These roads include several places with high concentrations of traffic at present such as the Captains Wood Road junction in Maypole Road; junctions near the Mitre and at Snow's Corner in Wickham Bishops Street; Blue Mill Bridge; the bends on the B1022 near the Green and Rookery Lane in Colchester Road, Great Totham; and the cross roads on the B1022 at Tiptree Heath and the junction near the Factory Shop in Colchester Road Tiptree.</p>	<p>Essex CC have advised that a 1 FE entry school is required to meet the needs arising from the development. There would be potential for enlargement of the school at a later date to meet future needs if required. Essex CC advise that there is sufficient capacity in Heybridge Primary School to accommodate requirements in early stages of development.</p> <p>Traffic assessments have been undertaken by Essex CC and these have informed preparation of the LDP and Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Essex CC is working with Maldon DC to finalise details of highways improvements in the Maldon area. A comprehensive</p>

Reference No	Name (source)	Summary of Consultation Responses	Comments on Consultation Responses/ Proposed Changes to Draft SMF
			Transport Assessment would form part of any planning application and would set out how the development can be accommodated and the requirement for any necessary mitigation to the highway network.
NHGS17	Anglian Water	<p>The Developers has liaised with Anglian Water on sites S2(d), S2 (e), and S2 (f) via our pre planning service and we have provided a potential foul drainage solution for all three sites.</p> <p>We are satisfied that Section 7 - Infrastructure & Delivery Plan adequately covers the requirements to ensure drainage infrastructure is planned and implemented in order to provide sustainable development.</p>	Comments noted
NHGS18	Heybridge Parish Council	<p>We have previously commented on the basic character of the proposed development; Council believes that the general concept is announced without evidence to suggest that the options proffered are those which emerge from an evidence-based analysis of the various options for development within the District. Lacking the force of investigative and evidence-determined background, and coupled with the extensive infrastructure cost and the extensive expansion of the built environment to provide theoretical funding to install the same, HPC continues to maintain the stance that the fundamental proposals are flawed beyond incremental redress. A fundamental concern is that of the unproven nature and costs of proposed infrastructure to address flooding transportation and built environment cohesion with the existing village whilst providing no additional funds for community gain through CIL and other means.</p>	<p>The location of strategic growth is determined through the LDP which is currently subject to Examination-in-Public. The masterplan provides a framework for development of the North Heybridge Garden Suburb in accordance with the policies in the submitted LDP. The document makes it clear that where necessary the document will be revised following the EiP and adoption of the LDP.</p>

Reference No	Name (source)	Summary of Consultation Responses	Comments on Consultation Responses/ Proposed Changes to Draft SMF
		<p>Given this background, we comment without prejudice on the content of the masterplan outline section 4 as follows:</p> <p>1. Consultation activities.</p> <p>We note the various workshops and consultative group meetings which have been held in support of the plan as delivered for consideration. We are grateful for the comprehensive nature of these and for the nature of the participation of local stakeholders. We express concern generally in the following areas of the vision and objectives of the consultative document as borne out during those functions:</p> <p>1.1 Social infrastructure</p> <p>The development of a ‘heart’ of the current village is virtually impossible by the addition of the development to the West; the existing Westerly boundary is such as to present in essence an impenetrable row of housing making use of minor roads. We do not believe that the development itself can be structured in such a way as to provide integration with current common community facilities of retail commercial and other services. Hence we feel the community facilities which are incorporated within the new development almost certainly will be uncoupled and isolated geographically and socially from current resources. We believe it extremely likely that this will simply give rise to what are essentially two separate villages with a single boundary, with physical and social connectivity in essence impossible.</p> <p>1.2 Built environment</p> <p>Heybridge already possesses isolated built environment in the most recent developments (Elms Farm area) located within the area between Holloway Road and Heybridge Approach due to the ‘add-on’ options the</p>	<p>Costs of proposed infrastructure have been taken into account in preparation of the LDP and Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p>Integration of the Garden Suburb with Heybridge is a key planning principle. Para 5.8 to be amplified to emphasis importance of integration of the local centre with existing community and good access to community facilities</p> <p>Para 4.6.3 to be amplified to highlight integration with existing settlement</p> <p>Further amplification of the overall movement strategy will be provided in section 5.</p>

Reference No	Name (source)	Summary of Consultation Responses	Comments on Consultation Responses/ Proposed Changes to Draft SMF
		<p>earlier built environment mandates. We fear the same parameters must exist in the much larger built environment proposed and will further confound the reality of generating a comprehensive consolidated village environment.</p> <p>1.3 Transport</p> <p>The ‘self-contained’ nature of the proposed development simply forces access to its interior to be effected by a single ring road as an artery with extensive cul-de-sac supporting roadways many of which are likely to be of a shared nature. We find this undesirable and in no way contributing to the quality of life the area can offer.</p> <p>Additionally the generation of such a large residential area without any likelihood of significant local employment simply presents a commuting requirement unable adequately to be supported generally by the district and its wider connectivity within the area.</p> <p>1.4 Green spaces</p> <p>The encapsulation of an ancient woodland within the proposed development not only provides a risk of its abuse but also prevents a more even housing density across the target area. We feel the character of the wood given its proposed encirclement by high-density housing to be impossibly compromised.</p> <p>Further green space allocations rely upon the use of significant quantities of land intended to be dedicated to containment and management of surface water and the alleviation of local flooding. We do not consider this inevitability to be consistent with the development of leisure areas with characteristics able to permit the delivery and establishment of green spaces within the objectives outlined.</p>	<p>The masterplan framework includes the creation of a network of pedestrian and cycle routes to link key parts of the garden suburb together and with the wider area.</p> <p>The LDP allocates land in the District for employment development. Employment opportunities are available in Maldon and Heybridge.</p> <p>Provision is made for the future enhancement and management of Heybridge Wood as part of an extended green infrastructure network.</p>

Reference No	Name (source)	Summary of Consultation Responses	Comments on Consultation Responses/ Proposed Changes to Draft SMF
		<p>The main weakness of the NHGS is its reliance on two transport corridors. One, which is over capacity, is the A414 where no improvement is possible; the other is the B1019 Hatfield Peverel junction, where any improvement is likely to be (and already announced as) unaffordable.</p> <p>The mitigation to support the NHGS traffic generated has both of these corridors marked for improvement. One, requires minor works at Eves Corner and the other includes a new A12 junction. We consider these items a fundamental key to the success of the scheme and express concern that the A12 junction is neither a requirement incorporated within nor mentioned as a part of the NHGS development.</p> <p>The improvements at Eves Corner have been minimal and follow a number of minor alterations over the years. The NHGS scheme not only ignores the fact that this is the busiest single carriageway road in Essex but that it is already over capacity. This fact is well known and led to an informal Inquiry some years ago to find a solution. The only solution that could be agreed on was to by-pass Danbury, and this was found to be environmentally unacceptable. A corridor improvement was carried out recently but this did not provide additional capacity. Moreover, further developments such as the NHGS are likely to impose further and unacceptable environmental impacts on the community of Danbury.</p> <p>With respect to the A12/B1019 Hatfield Peverel junction, it is acknowledged in the supporting draft LDP that no improvements to this junction are possible since the only solution would be a new grade separated junction onto the A12. (The mechanism to achieve this is at para 2.68 LDP). A clear requirement is to raise Government awareness and seek funding for a new junction, which is most unlikely</p>	<p>Include reference to average density range appropriate for Garden Suburb to provide 1235 new homes.</p> <p>The masterplan incorporates a network of green spaces and the requirement for a country park to the west of Maypole Road.</p> <p>Traffic assessments have been undertaken by Essex CC and these have informed the preparation of the LDP and Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Essex CC is working with Maldon DC to finalise details of highways improvements in the Heybridge area. A comprehensive Transport Assessment would form part of any planning application and would set out how the development can be accommodated and the requirement for any necessary mitigation to the highway network. The issue of improvements to the Hatfield Peverel junction is not a requirement solely of traffic</p>

Reference No	Name (source)	Summary of Consultation Responses	Comments on Consultation Responses/ Proposed Changes to Draft SMF
		<p>in even in the medium to long term. In the mean time reliance must be placed upon reducing traffic impact by appropriate projects which encourage the use of sustainable transport options and none of which adequately can support the requirements of the NHGS.</p> <p>The weaknesses in these approaches are twofold: Firstly the uncertainty in obtaining Government funding for the needed multi-million grade separated junction onto the A12 and secondly, the difficulty in designing such a junction with two existing junctions at Hatfield Peverel and at Witham.</p> <p>A further difficulty is the lack of public transport being able to play any role in reducing traffic. The development is in a rural location relying on commuting for employment. The principal requirements of commuting involve travel to the main attractors of London, Colchester, Chelmsford and the Southend area. Public transport does not at this time and is likely not in future to be able to offer a level of service to the NHGS area which would be attractive.</p> <p>Moreover, flooding remains an issue and any consent for the Garden Village could not be implemented without an agreed and proven mitigation scheme; such a scheme neither exists nor has been scientifically outlined costed and planned.</p> <p>The question must be for the Inspector: is the impact on these corridors so serious that the scheme fails the tests of the National Planning Policy Framework.</p>	<p>generated from the Maldon and Heybridge Area, and needs to be seen in the context of strategic initiatives being developed to reduce pressure on the A12 corridor. On a long term basis a new junction to the A12 from the B1019 at Hatfield Peverel would provide an effective solution. It is recognised that this will require long term engagement between a number of organisations to develop this further. In the short term, to manage traffic, ECC is working with Maldon District Council and the principal developers in Maldon and Heybridge to finalise details of interim measures involving traffic management and bus-based public transport initiatives in order to manage traffic movements on this part of the network.</p> <p>The LDP establishes the requirement for developers to contribute to passenger transport improvements.</p>

Reference No	Name (source)	Summary of Consultation Responses	Comments on Consultation Responses/ Proposed Changes to Draft SMF
			<p>In accordance with Policy S4, development will not be permitted unless and acceptable flood alleviation scheme can be delivered. Maldon DC, Essex CC, the Environment Agency, Essex waterways and developers are working together to secure the design, implementation and management of an appropriate scheme.</p>
NHGS19	Langford & Ulting PC	<p>Section 5: Green and Blue Infrastructure</p> <p>a) Langford & Ulting Parish Council supports provision of the Country Park focused to the west of Maypole Road. This will provide a green space between the two parishes and stop the coalescence of Heybridge into Langford.</p> <p>b) Access to the Blackwater Rail Trail will need to be improved, particularly from the B1018 which is narrow and does not have a footway.</p> <p>Section 7: The framework for Infrastructure Delivery</p> <p>a) The Parish Council note that a proportion of the traffic generated by housing developments in the North Heybridge Garden and South Maldon Garden Suburbs will travel along the B1018 and B1019 through Langford and Ulting to access the A12. As a new direct road connecting Maldon and Heybridge to the A12 is not deliverable at this</p>	<p>Support for Country Park to west of Maypole Road noted.</p> <p>Para 5.13.5 includes reference to access to the Blackwater Trail.</p> <p>Traffic assessments have been undertaken by Essex CC and these have informed preparation of the LDP and Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Essex CC is working with Maldon DC to finalise details of highways improvements in the Heybridge area. A comprehensive Transport</p>

Reference No	Name (source)	Summary of Consultation Responses	Comments on Consultation Responses/ Proposed Changes to Draft SMF
		<p>time, the Parish Council is concerned that traffic volumes generated by the new suburbs will have a detrimental effect on residents living in Langford and Ulting and reduce their quality of life.</p> <p>b) The additional traffic will add to noise levels already in excess of those recommended by WHO for critical health effects (See Capita’s Noise Impact Assessment, 8th August 2014 – FUL/MAL/14/00788). The NPPF states in paragraph 109 that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environments by preventing both new and existing development from being adversely affected by unacceptable levels of noise pollution.</p> <p>c) The Parish Council is concerned that greater numbers of vehicles will be meeting and passing in the already constricted sections of the B1018/B1019. Two heavy goods vehicles travelling in opposite directions are unable to pass without mounting the footway on the section of road between the railway bridge and the speed indicator device adjacent to Magnolia View.</p> <p>d) The Parish Council is also concerned that when the River Blackwater floods and the B1019 becomes impassable at Langford, there are not sufficient alternative means of accessing and egressing Heybridge and Maldon. Alternative routes are narrow one track lanes with occasional passing places; the ensuing chaos caused by heavy goods vehicles buses and other vehicles using these roads is unparalleled.</p>	<p>Assessment would form part of any planning application and would set out how the development can be accommodated and the requirement for any necessary mitigation to the highway network. The issue of improvements to the Hatfield Peverel junction is not a requirement solely of traffic generated from the Maldon and Heybridge Area, and needs to be seen in the context of strategic initiatives being developed to reduce pressure on the A12 corridor. On a long term basis a new junction to the A12 from the B1019 at Hatfield Peverel would provide an effective solution. It is recognised that this will require long term engagement between a number of organisations to develop this further. In the short term, to manage traffic, ECC is working with Maldon District Council and the principal developers in Maldon and Heybridge to finalise details of interim measures involving traffic</p>

Reference No	Name (source)	Summary of Consultation Responses	Comments on Consultation Responses/ Proposed Changes to Draft SMF
			management and bus-based public transport initiatives in order to manage traffic movements on this part of the network.

Reference No	Name (source)	Summary of Consultation Responses	Comments on Consultation Responses/ Proposed Changes to Draft SMF
NHGS20	Essex County Council	<p>ECC has undertaken a considerable amount of assessment to inform the emerging Local Development Plan and the North Heybridge Garden Suburb Masterplan, primarily in terms of the impact on the local and wider highway network and primary, secondary education, and early years and childcare. Specific assessment has included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact of Potential Core Strategy Sites on Existing Junctions Report, 2010 • Preferred Options Consultation, July 2012 – Education Assessment • Assessment of Impact of Proposed Development Sites in Heybridge, South Maldon and Burnham on Crouch, May 2013 • Assessment of Alternative Growth Options, July 2013 • Assessment of the impact of Draft Local Plan, 2014-2029 • Assessment of the capacity of The Plume Academy (2013) <p>In accordance with the ‘Duty to Cooperate’, as established in the Localism Act 2011, the County Council has and will continue to contribute to the preparation and implementation of the LDP and the Masterplan, particularly to ensure the planned growth can be satisfactorily accommodated on the highway network and in existing and new education facilities.</p> <p>Highway Issues</p> <p><u>North Heybridge Link Road</u></p> <p>The North Heybridge Link Road will need to function as a Primary Route 1 (PR1) within the Essex road hierarchy. The Essex Traffic Management Strategy (ETMS) states such routes should seek to maintain the free flow of traffic to enable them to perform their function. An appropriate speed strategy to accord with the Essex Speed Management Strategy (ESMS) will need to be considered in order to</p>	

Reference No	Name (source)	Summary of Consultation Responses	Comments on Consultation Responses/ Proposed Changes to Draft SMF
		<p>prioritise the Relief Road against the congested junctions within Heybridge. ECC considers that an appropriate speed limit be signed as 50 mph to be consistent with recent changes around Maldon, and the rural nature of the road being set within a 'green corridor' with a looser grained urban edge. This should inform the future design of the Link Road; its key junctions, gateways and the rest of the masterplan.</p> <p>Furthermore, ECC Development Management Policies seek to ensure that the number of accesses are kept to a minimum on such routes and that new access points should be designed and constructed in accordance with the current standards and be subject to road safety audit. Paragraphs 5.7.2/5.7.3, and Figure 18, refer to existing and potential new walking and cycling routes to the countryside to the north of the Garden Suburb. ECC would wish to be consulted upon any further investigation with regards any potential need to cross the Link Road, in order to consider any potential impact on its Primary Route 1 function.</p> <p><u>Figure 18 – Access and Movement Framework Plan</u></p> <p>It is generally accepted that sites S2(e) – North of Holloway Road and S2(f) – West of Broad Street Green Road will be brought forward in the early phases of development (2015/16 – 2018/19) with a separate vehicular access from the relevant road. Paragraph 5.5.2 states that vehicular access will not be provided between these land parcels and the wider development, and is supported. However, there will need to be appropriate pedestrian and cycle routes provided. In order to provide clarity an additional pedestrian/cycle connection should be indicated between Site S2(e) and the wider development.</p> <p>3. Masterplan Framework (Figure 16, Page 53)</p>	<p>Add reference to para 5.5.2 to provision of appropriate pedestrian and cycle routes between land parcels</p> <p>Comments noted. These are</p>

Reference No	Name (source)	Summary of Consultation Responses	Comments on Consultation Responses/ Proposed Changes to Draft SMF
		<p>Figure 16 provides an illustration regarding the proposed relationship between the co located primary school/early years facility, new stand alone facility and the local centre. Some observations are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • there is a preference for a traffic free entrance to the co located primary school site to encourage the dropping off of school children in a safe environment. Figure 18 – Access and Movement Plan indicates that the primary school and local centre is separated by part of the primary road network, which will carry traffic from the outer relief road eastwards and westwards through the development. Consequently, there is likely to be some parking/drop off on the main access road, and could lead to traffic implications for through traffic and safety issues. Additional impacts may arise in relation to noise and air quality. ECC would prefer the primary route is directed to the north of the local centre to enable a pedestrian priority link between the primary school and local centre. • Pedestrian access to the school should be linked to safe walking and cycling routes and separated from vehicular access to the school itself and the local centre. • any parent/pupil entry to the school site could be from more than one point but the main focus should be to connect up with the main walking and cycling routes through the development. • at present it is unclear where any staff car parking and delivery arrangements will be made to the co located facility. This should be located so as to avoid safety issues arising with pupil movements. • a minimum of two accesses will be required, one for access to the school buildings, and a secondary access to allow emergency vehicle access • Visitor parking in surrounding residential streets should be planned to provide safe drop off points and disperse school run 	<p>issues of detailed design. Add to section 5.9 reference to potential for shared community use of school buildings should be considered. Add new para- Further discussion will be undertaken with Essex County Council to agree the design and layout of the local centre and primary school/early years facility at the detailed planning application stage.</p>

Reference No	Name (source)	Summary of Consultation Responses	Comments on Consultation Responses/ Proposed Changes to Draft SMF
		<p>traffic</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The school should have a robust school travel plan covering both pupils and staff (the staff would fall under a workplace travel plan).consideration will need to be given to ensuring the provision of cycle storage facilities, as part of any new build. • Reference should be made to considering the potential for shared community use of school buildings at an early design stage • ECC would prefer any new bus service to drop off at close proximity to the primary school/local centre, as indicated in Figure 18 – Access and Movement Framework Plan. <p>ECC welcomes reference (paragraph 5.9.2) to providing well connected footpaths and cycle routes to the local centre and primary school. The early phases of development is likely to be to the west of the suburb near Maypole Road. The pupils generated by the early phases of development are likely to be accommodated at Heybridge Primary school beyond the Garden Suburb boundary. ECC is concerned at the apparent lack of safe and direct routes to Heybridge Primary in advance of the completion of development to the east of the suburb.</p> <p>A significant amount of highway modelling has been undertaken to support the Local Development Plan. This has identified the two junctions in Heybridge (indicated below) presently operate over capacity, and as a result of background traffic at 2026, and any proposed development. These junctions are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>B1018 The Causeway / The Square / B1022 The Street Roundabout – over capacity at base year</i> • <i>B1022 Colchester Road / B1026 Goldhanger Road Roundabout – overcapacity with 2026 background traffic</i> <p>The outer relief road is essential to relieving some congestion at these</p>	<p>Include reference to need to give consideration to identifying alternative safe and direct route to Heybridge Primary early in the development in consultation with Essex CC.</p>

Reference No	Name (source)	Summary of Consultation Responses	Comments on Consultation Responses/ Proposed Changes to Draft SMF
		<p>junctions, but it is unlikely that this will be completed prior to the completion of early phases of development. The most direct route from early phases of development is likely to involve pupil movements along Holloway Road, and passed the junctions above, which gives rise to some safety concerns. ECC would welcome consideration of identifying any alternative safe and direct route to Heybridge Primary early in the development.</p> <p>4. Sustainable Urban Drainage</p> <p>Under the Flood and Water Management Act 2010 ECC is the Lead Local Flood Authority responsible for managing the risk of flooding from surface water flood risk; groundwater and ordinary watercourses (local flood risk). ECC will become the established SuDS Approving Body (SAB) during 2015, and as the Lead Local Flood Authority any development proposal with a surface water drainage implication will requiring approval from ECC.</p> <p>ECC has published the SuDS Design and Adoption Guide, December 2012, which outlines the requirements for sustainable surface water drainage in Essex. It provides a steer to what is expected, and complements national requirements whilst prioritising local needs. ECC would welcome further discussion regarding detailed measures, as part of any planning application.</p> <p>http://www.essex.gov.uk/Environment%20Planning/Environmental-Issues/local-environment/flooding/Documents/suds_design_adoption_guide.pdf</p>	<p>Timescale for implementation of SAB has been delayed subject to consultation by Defra. Reference to need for drainage strategy to be consistent with SuDS national and local standards. Reference to be included to SuDS Design and Adoption Guide, Essex CC, December 2012. The SuDS measures will be identified at the detailed design stage to support the planning application.</p>

Reference No	Name (source)	Summary of Consultation Responses	Comments on Consultation Responses/ Proposed Changes to Draft SMF
		<p>5. Essex Minerals Local Plan- Mineral Safeguarding Areas</p> <p>The Essex Minerals Local Plan (MLP) was formally adopted by the County Council in July 2014.</p> <p>Policy S8 - Safeguarding mineral resources and mineral reserves seeks to safeguard mineral resources of national and local importance from surface development that would sterilise a significant economic resource or prejudice the effective working of a permitted mineral reserve.</p> <p>Any non-mineral proposal located within a Mineral Safeguarding Area (MSA) that is 5ha or more (for sand and gravel) in size will need to be supported by a minerals resource assessment to establish the existence, or otherwise, of a mineral resource capable of having economic importance. This will ascertain whether there is an opportunity for the prior extraction of that mineral to avoid the sterilisation of the resource as required by the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraphs 143 and 144).</p> <p>The majority of the North Heybridge Garden Suburb area is located within an MSA (see attached map), and subject to Policy S8 above.</p> <p>7 Other Comments</p> <p>Some amendments (underlined) are suggested for section 3.7 - Archaeology and Heritage:</p> <p>Paragraph 3.7.1 - Archaeological assessment work shows that the area contains no designated sites, <u>however extensive undesignated archaeological remains are known to be present.</u></p>	<p>Reference to be included in Section 2.1 Planning Policy to Policy S8 of Essex Minerals Local Plan and requirement for minerals resource assessment for any land within a Mineral Safeguarding Area (MSA).</p> <p>Text to be amended</p>

Reference No	Name (source)	Summary of Consultation Responses	Comments on Consultation Responses/ Proposed Changes to Draft SMF
		<p>Paragraph 3.7.2 - Aerial photographs and previous archaeological studies reveal the presence of <u>extensive</u> archaeological remains dating from the Neolithic to the medieval period.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.7.3 - Archaeological investigations <u>in the immediate vicinity of the area</u> have also revealed <u>extensive</u> multi-period archaeological remains. The assessment work demonstrates that there is potential <u>for further, as yet unidentified, archaeological remains to be present within the site, dating from the Neolithic to the medieval periods.</u></p> <p>Paragraph 7.4 - The majority of the area has been subject to little modern disturbance, and as such, archaeological deposits are likely to be in a good state of preservation.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.7.5 - A <u>structured</u> programme of comprehensive and <u>detailed archaeological evaluation</u> will be required across the whole of the area prior to any development. Dependent upon the results, a detailed mitigation strategy will be required comprising further intrusive works and excavation followed by <u>publication</u>, or preservation in situ where feasible and where the importance of such deposits warrants such a strategy.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.7.6 - <u>In terms of above ground heritage assets, there are Conservation Areas at Langford and along the Chelmer and Blackwater Navigation. In the more immediate vicinity of the proposed development, however, are groups of listed Buildings to the south west of the site (Old Rectory and Mitchells Farm) and to the north-east of the site, at Poplar Grove Farm.</u></p> <p>Paragraph 4.2.3 – reference to ECC becoming the adopting authority for SuDs in October should be amended, as no definitive timetable has</p>	<p>Text to be amended</p> <p>Text to be amended</p> <p>Text to be amended</p> <p>Text to be amended</p> <p>Text to be amended</p>

Reference No	Name (source)	Summary of Consultation Responses	Comments on Consultation Responses/ Proposed Changes to Draft SMF
		<p>been confirmed by Defra. It is most likely that this will now be implemented during 2015.</p> <p>Paragraph 5.9.3 – ECC preference is for both new early years and childcare facilities not to be located at the local centre. Childcare Sufficiency data (Spring 2014) for Heybridge East and West indicates that there is presently no capacity at the local pre school, with limited capacity available at existing childminders. ECC welcomes reference to the opportunity for the stand alone facility to potentially be located closer to the initial phase of development, subject to detailed consideration of the phasing of development.</p> <p>Paragraph 6.3.1 – reference should be made to the provision of Early Years and Childcare facilities, both stand alone and co located with the new primary school</p> <p>Design principles should also include reference to the environmental sustainability of new buildings (as referred to in Policy D2 of the LDP) and the implications of a changing climate and extreme weather conditions (as referred to in Policy D4 of the LDP).</p> <p>Paragraph 7.4.2 – ECC has previously provided advice with regards the potential delivery timescales of key strategic infrastructure, based on a proposed rate and distribution of housing delivery. Reference is made to the rate of housing delivery being indicative. ECC reserves the right to review the impact of planned housing growth on the key functional areas of education and highways and transportation, following any changes in housing delivery and once detailed housing mix is known.</p>	<p>Comments noted</p> <p>Text to be amended</p> <p>Reference to be included in para 6.2.1 to environmental sustainability of new buildings and Policies D2 and D4</p> <p>Add to para 7.4.2 Essex CC and Maldon DC in conjunction with promoters/developers and other stakeholders will review the impact of planned housing growth on the key functional areas of education and highways and transportation, following any changes in housing delivery and once</p>

Reference No	Name (source)	Summary of Consultation Responses	Comments on Consultation Responses/ Proposed Changes to Draft SMF
			detailed housing mix is known
NHGS21	Mr Colin Parker	<p>Concern that Countryside not willing to commit to any details in plans and questions viability of project.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing- no details of types of properties to be built • Road- unclear when road will be built. Phased construction unacceptable • Flood alleviation- need for independent data to be produced by Environment Agency to demonstrate that flood alleviation scheme will work. Existing drainage system unable to accept additional water. • NHS- Countryside unable to confirm whether there would be additional medical facilities. Concern that development will further stretch existing services <p>Section 5- does not accept argument that system will significantly reduce the future risk of flooding in Heybridge to be a good enough reason for development to be granted. Surface water flooding is not the only issue- also need to consider tidal flooding. Concern about potential contamination caused by imported clay for flood storage banks and traffic impacts</p> <p>Section 6- new housing development should complement existing area not become a new heart of the community. Major concerns about traffic impacts during development and in longer term, particularly in Danbury, Wickham Bishops, Tiptree and Hatfield Peverel. New road will create</p>	<p>The Strategic Masterplan Framework is intended to provide further supplementary guidance on the site allocations and policies contained in the LDP. It is not intended to be prescriptive but sets out development principles and infrastructure requirements. Detailed proposals will be the subject of future planning applications. The Strategic Masterplan Framework will be a material consideration in the determination of any planning applications.</p> <p>In accordance with Policy S4, development will be required to deliver an acceptable flood alleviation scheme. Maldon DC, Essex CC, the Environment Agency, Essex waterways and developers are working together to secure the design, implementation and management of an appropriate scheme.</p>

Reference No	Name (source)	Summary of Consultation Responses	Comments on Consultation Responses/ Proposed Changes to Draft SMF
		<p>more traffic issues by encouraging people to cut through Heybridge.</p> <p>Section 7- The Infrastructure Delivery Plan shows flood alleviation scheme being developed in stages. If development proceeds, flood alleviation scheme must be main priority and totally completed before houses are developed in order to protect existing properties. Relief road should also be fully completed so it can be used by construction traffic and keep lorries out of village. Phased delivery linked to completion of houses unacceptable.</p> <p>Community facilities, schools and doctors' surgeries should be in place for first phase of development to reduce impact on over stretched services.</p>	<p>A key principle of development of North Heybridge Garden Suburb is its successful integration with the wider community of Heybridge.</p> <p>Traffic assessments have been undertaken by Essex CC and these have informed the preparation of the LDP and Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Essex CC is working with Maldon DC to finalise details of highways improvements in the Heybridge area. A comprehensive Transport Assessment would form part of any planning application and would set out how the development can be accommodated and the requirement for any necessary mitigation to the highway network.</p> <p>The masterplan includes an indicative timetable based on advice from Essex CC and Environment Agency. Funding considerations will require appropriate phasing of infrastructure delivery but the</p>

Reference No	Name (source)	Summary of Consultation Responses	Comments on Consultation Responses/ Proposed Changes to Draft SMF
			Council is committed to working with partners to secure the earliest possible delivery of the flood alleviation scheme and relief road. The Council is working with NHS England and GP practices to secure new health provision.
NHGS22	Countryside Properties	<p>Confirms continuing support for the North Heybridge Garden Suburb proposals and welcomes the initiative that the Council has displayed in encouraging the preparation of the SMF. Production of document has provided an excellent opportunity for consulting with stakeholders and the wider public on spatial and delivery matters in advance of the planning application stage, and has assisted in providing a vehicle for co-operation and collaboration between the developer and landowner interests.</p> <p>The SMF needs to be considered in the context of the Local District Plan and therefore needs to be consistent with this. In facilitating outcomes, it seeks to guide rather than prescribe outcomes. It should be regarded as a flexible device that will enable planning applications to be prepared and determined. Such development needs to be brought forward viably and planning documents, supplementary in nature, should not place unnecessarily a policy burden on development. During the production of the document, we were mindful of the concerns raised by the LDP Inspector, Mr Vickery. As you know, in the drafting of the North Heybridge SMF, we have always been keen to ensure that the SMF quotes from or cross-refers LDP policies directly rather than including text that might be mistakenly considered to comprise new policy, and that any plans and images conveying a suggested geographical distribution of land-uses or layout are clearly marked as illustrative. Subject obviously to the specific representations that we</p>	Comments noted. The Strategic Masterplan Framework provides further guidance on the policies and principles set out in the LDP. Following endorsement by the Council, it will be a material consideration in the determination of planning applications.

Reference No	Name (source)	Summary of Consultation Responses	Comments on Consultation Responses/ Proposed Changes to Draft SMF
		<p>have made to it, we believe Policy S4 sets an appropriate framework within which this SMF has been prepared, and we believe the SMF overall strikes the right tone, in terms of outlining broad development principles whilst maintaining flexibility in how these can be achieved. The SMF provides helpful analysis and suggestions as to how the land might be developed in accordance with Policy S4, without being prescriptive as to outcomes.</p> <p>The SMF forms part of a suite of documents which will inform the delivery of the Garden Suburb. It presents a basis for assisting design and delivery. In terms of infrastructure delivery, we recognise the importance to all parties of ensuring that development is accompanied by the timely provision of infrastructure, whilst ensuring also that development remains viable overall. In that context, Section 7 of the SMF helpfully summarises material already published elsewhere as part of the LDP and Infrastructure Delivery Plan in respect of the infrastructure requirements of the overall scheme. At the same time, we agree with the caveats expressed at paragraph 7.3.1 as regards the indicative infrastructure phasing. Appropriately, through the process of preparing our planning application, we will be looking at the issue of the timing and mechanisms of infrastructure provision in more detail.</p> <p>Notwithstanding our overall support in principle for the North Heybridge Garden Suburb and the SMF, the following suggested text edits are put forward with the view to assisting in the clarity of the document:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Para 1.1.2 – As we understand the Council’s intended Modifications to the LDP, the wording of Policy S3 is to be altered to remove the wording “planning consents for the development within the Garden Suburbs will only be granted by the Council if proposals are in</p>	<p>Timing and mechanisms of infrastructure provision will be determined through continued partnership working between Essex CC, Maldon DC and developers.</p> <p>Text to be updated to reflect proposed modifications to the LDP.</p>

Reference No	Name (source)	Summary of Consultation Responses	Comments on Consultation Responses/ Proposed Changes to Draft SMF
		<p>accordance with the respective masterplans ...” and the text here should be updated to reflect that position. The SMF is informative or indicative; it is not a prescriptive document, but one concerned with principles and outcomes. As currently worded, this text is inconsistent with the recent Modifications, and is any event we feel inappropriate in its terminology because it is in effect a statement of policy outside the LDP. The status and interpretation of the SMF requires clarity and its use in practice needs to be understood in the context of the LDP.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Para 1.2.1 – We suggest deleting the sentence which starts “Where appropriate...”. Either the Council will, in due course, adopt the SMF as SPD or it won’t. It is inappropriate for the SMF to have a sentence within it which effectively makes its status unclear, by saying that it may or may not be SPD.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Para 1.3.1 – It should be made clear that the list of requirements set out in the bullet points at the end of this paragraph are the requirements already set out by Policy S3; this to avoid any confusion that the list represents an additional policy outside the LDP.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Para 1.5.1 – In order to be clear as to the function of the SMF, we suggest the word “enable” should be replaced by “facilitate” to make clear that the SMF is a document aimed at assisting the application process, rather than controlling it i.e. the first bullet point should read “Expand on the key development principles set out in Policies S3 and S4 to facilitate a co-ordinated approach ...”.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Para 7.2.1 – We suggest deleting the wording “...and development will not be permitted unless an acceptable flood alleviation scheme can be delivered”. In practice, the strategic flood alleviation works are a part of the overall development scheme, and will only come forward if the development as a whole comes forward. As drafted, para 7.2.1 is</p>	<p>Text reflects LDP- no change proposed.</p> <p>Clarification to be added to para 1.3.1</p> <p>Text to be amended</p> <p>Policy S4 makes it clear that the strategic flood alleviation scheme is a requirement of development of the North Heybridge Garden Suburb. It is</p>

Reference No	Name (source)	Summary of Consultation Responses	Comments on Consultation Responses/ Proposed Changes to Draft SMF
		<p>inconsistent with Policy S4, because Policy S4 is phrased positively in terms of stating that development will be <i>granted</i> (subject to the list of requirements), rather than being phrased negatively. This sentence therefore appears to add an additional element of policy or rephrase policy in a manner that is not consistent with Policy S4.</p> <p>□ Para 7.7.1 – We suggest deleting “Planning applications should be in accordance with the SMF” to reflect the fact that the SMF represents guidance, rather than policy, and suggest instead stating that “Planning applications should have regard ...”.</p> <p>Para 7.7.2 - 1st Bullet – Suggest deleting the word “detailed” before “Masterplan”. The level of detail in any Masterplan is likely to reflect the scale of the application, with more detail possible on smaller sites.</p>	<p>not considered that the wording adds an additional element of policy but serves to emphasise the importance attached to the delivery of a suitable scheme. However, text will be revised to ensure consistency with LDP.</p> <p>The SMF provides further guidance on the policies and principles set out in the LDP. Planning applications should therefore be in accordance with the SMF. Add ‘principles set out in’ before SMF in para 7.7.1</p> <p>Para 7.7.2 – the Council would expect masterplans to include an appropriate level of detail at the planning application stage. The use of the word detailed is considered to be appropriate in this context. However, it is proposed that word ‘site’ should be added before masterplan to distinguish from strategic masterplan framework</p>
NHGS23	Mr Robert Ryall	Residents have asked that there is no access to development from Holloway Road	It is generally accepted that site S2(e) – North of Holloway Road will be brought forward in

Reference No	Name (source)	Summary of Consultation Responses	Comments on Consultation Responses/ Proposed Changes to Draft SMF
		<p>Residents in Holloway Road want the flood alleviation scheme in place before new homes and infrastructure. Flooding is an increasing problem.</p> <p>Residents want to know full details of measures for dealing with wider impact of traffic commuting from the development on Hatfield Peverel, Danbury, Wickham Bishops and Tiptree</p> <p>The plan shows primary schools not being completed until 2019/2020- where will school aged children go to school?</p> <p>What happens if the developer reneges on his promises</p>	<p>the early phases of development (2015/16 – 2018/19) with a separate vehicular access from Holloway Road. This has been agreed with the Highway Authority. The access will only serve this site and vehicular access will not be provided between this site and the wider development. Access between land parcels will be limited to appropriate pedestrian and cycle routes. In order to provide clarity an additional pedestrian/cycle connection should be indicated between Site S2(e) and the wider development.</p> <p>In accordance with Policy S4, development will be required to deliver an acceptable flood alleviation scheme. Maldon DC, Essex CC, the Environment Agency, Essex waterways and developers are working together to secure the design, implementation and management of an appropriate scheme.</p>

Reference No	Name (source)	Summary of Consultation Responses	Comments on Consultation Responses/ Proposed Changes to Draft SMF
			<p>Traffic assessments have been undertaken by Essex CC and these have informed preparation of the LDP and Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Essex CC is working with Maldon DC to finalise details of highways improvements in the Heybridge area. A comprehensive Transport Assessment would form part of any planning application and would set out how the development can be accommodated and the requirement for any necessary mitigation to the highway network.</p> <p>The indicative infrastructure delivery and Phasing Plan reflects advice received from Essex CC regarding the timescale for new education provision.</p> <p>Infrastructure delivery will be secured through a legal agreement.</p>
NHGS24	Mrs Susan Ryall	<p>Loss of fertile farmland which acts as a natural soakaway</p> <p>Concern about access from Holloway Road and increased traffic.</p>	<p>Maldon DC, Essex CC, the Environment Agency, Essex waterways and developers are</p>

Reference No	Name (source)	Summary of Consultation Responses	Comments on Consultation Responses/ Proposed Changes to Draft SMF
		<p>Residents want flood alleviation scheme in place before commencement of development and a reduction in number of houses</p> <p>Concern about increase in traffic due to commuting through Hatfield Peverel, Wickham Bishops and Tiptree</p> <p>Questions what provision is being made for GP surgeries to accommodate new housing</p> <p>Questions whether developers will compensate residents in Holloway road if flood defences don't work as flooding will get worse not better with development of open fields.</p>	<p>working together to secure the design, implementation and management of an appropriate flood alleviation scheme. The development will incorporate a sustainable urban drainage system (SuDS) to deal with surface water drainage.</p> <p>Access to Site 2(e) is required from Holloway Road as the development will be brought forward in the short term. This has been accepted by Essex County Council. There will be no vehicular access from other parts of Garden Suburb onto Holloway Road.</p> <p>Traffic assessments have been undertaken by Essex CC and these have informed the preparation of the LDP and Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Essex CC is working with Maldon DC to finalise details of highways improvements in the Heybridge area.</p>
NHGS25	Mr Donald Benson Heybridge Residents Association	Residents of Heybridge have not been involved- an advisory team should have been selected from residents to inform preparation of LDP. Limited opportunity to input through public consultations- paper consultations not designed to encourage response.	Consultation has been undertaken at each stage in preparation of LDP and Strategic Masterplan

Reference No	Name (source)	Summary of Consultation Responses	Comments on Consultation Responses/ Proposed Changes to Draft SMF
		<p>Section 4 does not encourage residents that draft proposals represent a sound and sensible approach to building a ‘new town’ on the outskirts of the village. No indication of how a development of the size proposed could satisfy objectives of existing and new residents.</p> <p>The framework lacks information from residents who understand local issues.</p> <p>The term Garden Suburb is mis-used.</p> <p>The masterplan looks good on paper but there are a number of flaws such as buffer around Ancient Woodland and lack of details about how increase in traffic will be accommodated on overstretched local road system. Plan does not give confidence to residents about integration of scheme into existing area.</p> <p>Proposals for flood alleviation are at an unacceptable stage of development. Concerns about health and safety associated with water holding ponds.</p> <p>Concern about lack of certainty of design aspirations- details of how new town will be integrated with an existing village are missing.</p> <p>Unacceptable that infrastructure will be delivered in stages alongside development. Flood alleviation scheme to protect proposed development and existing Heybridge must be installed prior to any new houses being built. Local road network cannot cope with existing peak flows and measures to accommodate additional traffic must be</p>	<p>Framework.</p> <p>The Garden Suburb is not a new town but is being planned as an integrated part of Heybridge. The principles for development of the Garden Suburb and associated infrastructure are set out in the LDP.</p> <p>Traffic assessments have been undertaken by Essex CC and these have informed preparation of the LDP and Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Essex CC is working with Maldon DC to finalise details of highways improvements in the Heybridge area. A comprehensive Transport Assessment would form part of any planning application and would set out how the development can be accommodated and the requirement for any necessary mitigation to the highway network.</p> <p>Maldon DC, Essex CC, the Environment Agency, Essex</p>

Reference No	Name (source)	Summary of Consultation Responses	Comments on Consultation Responses/ Proposed Changes to Draft SMF
		<p>implemented.</p> <p>Flood alleviation scheme and infrastructure must be focus of plan- not housing. The present scheme should be abandoned and a scheme to build the required number of houses across the District actioned.</p>	<p>waterways and developers are working together to secure the design, implementation and management of an appropriate flood alleviation scheme. The delivery of an appropriate scheme will be a requirement of any development.</p> <p>The Strategic Masterplan Framework is not intended to establish detailed design proposals but to set out development and design principles. Integration with Heybridge is a key principle and this will be amplified in the document.</p> <p>The Council is committed to the delivery of necessary infrastructure alongside development to ensure that the impacts of development can be accommodated.. The indicative framework for the phased delivery of infrastructure (extracted from the Infrastructure Delivery Plan) reflects the advice of Essex County Council and other infrastructure providers and</p>

Reference No	Name (source)	Summary of Consultation Responses	Comments on Consultation Responses/ Proposed Changes to Draft SMF
			<p>has taken into account issues related to infrastructure capacity and viability.</p> <p>The location of strategic growth is determined through the LDP which is currently subject to Examination-in-Public. The masterplan provides a framework for development of the North Heybridge Garden Suburb in accordance with the policies in the submitted LDP.</p>
NHGS26	Mrs Mary Benson	<p>Village has long standing problems, mainly relating to flooding and traffic. Vision of building large number of new homes on edge of village without installation of flood alleviation scheme and upgraded road scheme will result in havoc. Flood alleviation plan appears to be proposed to safeguard residents of new development rather than existing residents. Need to address problems of existing area first before building new houses.</p> <p>Concern about impact of traffic on emergency services. Development would be better located elsewhere.</p>	<p>The Council is committed to the delivery of necessary infrastructure alongside development to ensure that the impacts of development can be accommodated.</p> <p>Maldon DC, Essex CC, the Environment Agency, Essex waterways and developers are working together to secure the design, implementation and management of an appropriate flood alleviation scheme which will address existing surface water flooding in Heybridge. The delivery of an appropriate scheme will be a requirement of any development.</p>

Reference No	Name (source)	Summary of Consultation Responses	Comments on Consultation Responses/ Proposed Changes to Draft SMF
NHGS27	Mr Geoffrey Cox	<p>Flood alleviation scheme should be in place before development takes place</p> <p>No access to the proposed development from Holloway Road or Heywood way.</p> <p>Open spaces should form a buffer between the existing houses and new development</p> <p>Proposed link road should have a footpath on both sides of road. Questions what measures will be put in place to deal with wider impacts of traffic</p> <p>Design principles look good on paper</p> <p>Concern about impact on existing facilities if school is not built until 2019/2020 and health facilities are not proposed until 2018/2019. Existing surgeries are full and unclear whether NHS will fund more doctors</p>	<p>The Council is committed to the delivery of necessary infrastructure alongside development to ensure that the impacts of development can be accommodated.. The indicative framework for the phased delivery of infrastructure (extracted from the Infrastructure Delivery Plan) reflects the advice of Essex County Council and other infrastructure providers and has taken into account issues related to infrastructure capacity and viability. The Council is working with NHS England and local GPs to secure improved provision of health facilities in area which will be funded through developer contributions.</p> <p>Access to Site 2(e) is required from Holloway Road as the development will be brought forward in the short term. This has been accepted by Essex County Council. There will be no vehicular access from other parts of Garden Suburb onto</p>

Reference No	Name (source)	Summary of Consultation Responses	Comments on Consultation Responses/ Proposed Changes to Draft SMF
			<p>Holloway Road.</p> <p>Proposed link road will be built to standards required by the Highway Authority and will make provision for pedestrian access and crossings.</p> <p>Essex CC is working with Maldon DC to finalise details of highways improvements in the Heybridge area. A comprehensive Transport Assessment would form part of any planning application and would set out how the development can be accommodated and the requirement for any necessary mitigation to the highway network.</p>
NHGS28	Mr Christopher Salmon	<p>Section 4- why build in area at risk from flooding? Building costs higher and other more suitable land available</p> <p>New houses should be spread across the District- this would avoid major impact in any one area eg: Althorne or Southminster with railway station</p> <p>NHGS will have major impact on traffic in Heybridge and wider impact on commuting traffic in Maldon, Hatfield Peverel, Danbury and</p>	<p>The location of strategic growth is determined through the LDP which is currently subject to Examination-in-Public.</p> <p>Essex CC is working with Maldon DC to finalise details of highways improvements in the Heybridge area. A comprehensive Transport Assessment would form part of</p>

Reference No	Name (source)	Summary of Consultation Responses	Comments on Consultation Responses/ Proposed Changes to Draft SMF
		<p>Wickham Bishops. No solution advanced to solve traffic problem.</p> <p>Concern about safety risk of balancing ponds for young children.</p> <p>NHGS and LDP are unsound.</p>	<p>any planning application and would set out how the development can be accommodated and the requirement for any necessary mitigation to the highway network.</p>
NHGS29	Mr Richard Cooper Committee member HRA	<p>Proposals for flood mitigation are unsatisfactory and development will increase risk of flooding. Council should be committed to protecting existing homes already at risk from flooding.</p>	<p>Maldon DC, Essex CC, the Environment Agency, Essex waterways and developers are working together to secure the design, implementation and management of an appropriate flood alleviation scheme which will address the existing flooding in north Heybridge. The delivery of an appropriate scheme will be a requirement of any development.</p>
NHGS30	Mr David Gozzett	<p>Section 7- infrastructure improvements including flood alleviation, medical centre, primary school and relief road should be secured by Section 106 agreement to ensure they are provided early in the phased development. MDC should apply for money released by Central Government for infrastructure improvements. Flood relief scheme is needed now as evidenced by increase in flooding in area from surface water runoff</p> <p>Section 5- relief road is needed as soon as possible to improve traffic flow in area</p> <p>Section 5- provision of additional sports and recreation areas should be</p>	<p>The Council is committed to the delivery of necessary infrastructure alongside development to ensure that the impacts of development can be accommodated. The indicative framework for the phased delivery of infrastructure (extracted from the Infrastructure Delivery Plan) reflects the advice of Essex County Council and other infrastructure providers and</p>

Reference No	Name (source)	Summary of Consultation Responses	Comments on Consultation Responses/ Proposed Changes to Draft SMF
		<p>reviewed in consultation with existing sports clubs to maximise effective use of new pitches and grounds</p> <p>Section 6- roads on development should be wide enough for good traffic flow and housing designs should include off-street parking to alleviate need for residents to park on verges and footpaths. Overall design should incorporate cycleways which are clearly marked to avoid use of footpaths by cyclists. Mix of properties to include bungalows to enable existing residents to downsize thereby releasing additional family houses.</p>	<p>has taken into account issues related to infrastructure capacity and viability. Funding will be secured through Section 106 agreements. Where appropriate consideration will be given to other possible sources of financing to assist in the earliest possible delivery of necessary infrastructure. Reference to this to be added to Section 7.3. Further clarification regarding design of roads and cycleways and housing mix to be added to Section 6.</p>
NHGS31	Mr Colin Philpott Maldon Cricket Club	<p>Section 5- Green spaces. Pleasing to note that provision has been made for playing fields, but they are too small and will create management problems ie: they will become dog walking areas and will not be of use to young people wishing to take part in sporting activities. It would be more beneficial to have one large playing field on lines of Drapers Farm sports field which could be managed by cricket or rugby clubs who require additional playing fields to accommodate large number of young people wishing to participate sports.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Detailed proposals have not been prepared at this stage. Further consideration will be given to the size, location and use of the playing fields in consultation with Sport England and local sports clubs.</p>
NHGS32	Mr Brian Strudwick Maldon Cricket Club/Drapers Farm Sports Club	<p>5.13.6 Playing Fields- facilities and resources at Drapers farm are at breaking point due to demands arising from increased membership of Maldon Cricket Club and Maldon Rugby Club- training/ practice needs; increasing number of matches for youth age groups and adults including girls and women. Rugby training on cricket outfield is</p>	<p>Comments noted. Detailed proposals have not been prepared at this stage. Further consideration will be given to the size, location and use of the playing fields in</p>

Reference No	Name (source)	Summary of Consultation Responses	Comments on Consultation Responses/ Proposed Changes to Draft SMF
		<p>incompatible with needs of playing cricket safely and at high standard. Results in costly annual recovery work and surface wear and compaction. Problem of inadequate parking on match and training days. Increased housing and population will attract new members to clubs and exacerbate existing problems. Masterplan must take account of these issues with sufficient land (say 15 acres) allocated to meet sporting needs with establishment of similar body to drapers Farm Sports Club to ensure future management.</p>	<p>consultation with Sport England and local sports clubs. Arrangements for future management and maintenance will be secured through planning obligations.</p> <p>Meeting to be held with Drapers Farm Sports Club to discuss sporting provision within Garden Suburb.</p>
NHGS33	Ms Maria Cooper	<p>Does not agree with proposed development on grounds of traffic impact and impact on social infrastructure- schools and GPs. Concerned about climate change and flooding which will become more of a danger in future. Roads already at gridlock during peak times.</p>	<p>The Council is committed to the delivery of necessary infrastructure alongside development to ensure that the impacts of development can be accommodated. The indicative framework for the phased delivery of infrastructure (extracted from the Infrastructure Delivery Plan) reflects the advice of Essex County Council and other infrastructure providers and has taken into account issues related to capacity and viability. All development will be required to mitigate against adverse environmental impacts and climate change.</p>
NHGS34	Mr Donald Macey	<p>Objectives are incompatible with sustainability and vision is unrealistic and not deliverable. Framework is driven by politics. Green space is</p>	<p>The objective is to create a high quality sustainable</p>

Reference No	Name (source)	Summary of Consultation Responses	Comments on Consultation Responses/ Proposed Changes to Draft SMF
		<p>only provided for the new development. Others will have to access by car which is unsustainable. Key design principles are not sustainable. Framework for infrastructure delivery bears no relation to planning. Proposed LDP is not the most sustainable answer to the housing requirement and is dependent on costly drainage and highway provision.</p>	<p>development in accordance with the NPPF and the principles set out in the LDP. Maldon and Heybridge are the largest urban area in the District and the focus for employment, retail and community facilities and is considered to be the most sustainable location for larger scale development.</p>
NHGS 35	Mr Alan Culley	<p>Section 4: overall concept ‘as good as it gets’ for the number of houses proposed and in the main uses the only suitable areas of land which meet our needs. Objective of meeting housing needs in a modern garden suburb concept met in overall plan but actual delivery remains uncertain as it will be a result of developer’s plans and styles. Affordable housing remains principle need and small units are imperative for first time buyers and older people. Planning Department must insist on a suitable mix of units.</p> <p>Section 5- need to ensure that family housing has adequate garden space</p> <p>Section 7- need for flood alleviation is paramount</p> <p>Section 5- Movement/ access seems fit for purpose but no indication provided of road improvements to address congestion on existing network</p> <p>Section 5- green space appears good for public use but maintenance is</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The Masterplan sets out the requirements for infrastructure delivery and development and design principles. This will provide the framework for determination of planning applications.</p> <p>The LDP states that development will be expected to provide a suitable mix and range of housing in terms of size, type and tenure to reflect local housing need particularly the needs of an aging population and the need for a higher proportion of smaller units. Policy H1 states that development of North</p>

Reference No	Name (source)	Summary of Consultation Responses	Comments on Consultation Responses/ Proposed Changes to Draft SMF
		<p>crucial and there is a need to secure necessary finance for this.</p> <p>Accepting the need for new housing, generally in favour and approve concept but need to enforce right mix and styles of housing at reasonable costs and ensure flood prevention. Need to ensure development is well controlled and maintained.</p>	<p>Heybridge Garden Suburb will be expected to deliver 25% of all units as affordable housing.</p> <p>Maldon DC, Essex CC, the Environment Agency, Essex waterways and developers are working together to secure the design, implementation and management of an appropriate flood alleviation scheme which will address the existing flooding in north Heybridge. The delivery of an appropriate scheme will be a requirement of any development.</p> <p>Essex CC is working with Maldon DC to finalise details of highways improvements in the Heybridge area. A comprehensive Transport Assessment would form part of any planning application and would set out how the development can be accommodated and the requirement for any necessary mitigation to the highway network.</p> <p>Maintenance and management</p>

Reference No	Name (source)	Summary of Consultation Responses	Comments on Consultation Responses/ Proposed Changes to Draft SMF
			<p>of green space will be secured through legal agreement.</p> <p>The Masterplan provides the framework for implementation, delivery and monitoring of development.</p> <p>The Council will place the utmost importance on securing high quality design and sustainable development. In addition to the use of design Codes, the Council may establish Design Review Panels.</p>

North Heybridge Garden Suburb- Strategic Masterplan Framework

Schedule of Proposed Modifications

This schedule outlines the proposed modifications to the Draft Strategic Masterplan Framework following public consultation which took place between 14 August and 30 September 2014.

For each proposed change, the schedule includes the following information:

Ref No: change identification number

Paragraph Number: The specific paragraph number to which the proposed change applies

Proposed change: Where text is to be deleted it will have a strike through

Where additional text is proposed it will be underlined

Reason for Change: The reason why any changes are proposed

Ref No.	Paragraph/ Page Number	Proposed Change (Deletions/ Additional Text)	Reason for Change
01	1.1.1	In summary, the submission LDP states that the North Heybridge Garden Suburb (NHGS), as shown on Figure 1.1, is expected to <u>will</u> accommodate the following key elements:	For clarification and consistency with wording of Policy S4
02	1.1.2	Amend first sentence: Policy S3 of the LDP states that masterplans for each of the Garden Suburbs at Maldon and Heybridge will be prepared in conjunction with relevant stakeholders <u>partnership between the Council, relevant stakeholders, infrastructure providers and developers/ landowners for illustrative purposes and as a guide for developers</u> . The policy clarification provided at paragraph 2.45 states that planning consents for development will only be granted within the Garden Suburbs if the proposals are in accordance with the respective masterplans which are endorsed by the Council <u>the principles set out in the masterplans will be in accordance with Policies S3 and S4 and other policies in the LDP.</u>	Updated to reflect additional proposed minor modification to the submission LDP (August 2014)
03	1.3.1	Add to end of paragraph: <u>These principles are set out in Policies S3 and S4 of the submitted LDP.</u>	For clarification
04	1.5.1	Amend first bullet point: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expand on the key development principles set out in Policies S3 and S4 to enable <u>facilitate</u> a co-ordinated approach to delivering the proposed level of growth in a garden suburb context; 	For clarification

Ref No.	Paragraph/ Page Number	Proposed Change (Deletions/ Additional Text)	Reason for Change
05	2.1.3	<p>Add as 2.2 Essex Minerals Local Plan Add new paragraph as 2.2.1.</p> <p><u>The Essex Minerals Local Plan (MLP) was formally adopted by the County Council in July 2014. Policy S8 - Safeguarding Mineral Resources and Mineral Reserves seeks to safeguard mineral resources of national and local importance from surface development that would sterilise a significant economic resource or prejudice the effective working of a permitted mineral reserve. This policy states that any non-mineral proposal located within a Mineral Safeguarding Area (MSA) that is 5ha or more (for sand and gravel) in size will need to be supported by a minerals resource assessment to establish the existence, or otherwise, of a mineral resource capable of having economic importance. This will ascertain whether there is an opportunity for the prior extraction of that mineral to avoid the sterilisation of the resource as required by the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraphs 143 and 144). The majority of the North Heybridge Garden Suburb area is located within an MSA and there will be a requirement to undertake a minerals resource assessment in accordance with Policy S8.</u></p> <p>Re-number following Section and paragraphs in Section 2</p>	Updated to reflect Essex Minerals Local Plan which was adopted in July 2014
06	2.2.1	<p>Amend numbering Amend first sentence: Maldon District Council submitted the Maldon District Local Development Plan (LDP) to the Secretary of State for examination in April 2014. <u>The policies set out in this document are as currently set out in the submission LDP (including the additional proposed minor modifications to the submission LDP as submitted in August 2014).</u></p>	For Clarification
07	2.2.2	<p>Delete first sentence: The policies set out in this document are as currently set out in the LDP which has been submitted for examination.</p>	To remove duplication
08	2.2.5	<p>Amend last paragraph: A masterplan for the each of the Garden Suburbs at Maldon and Heybridge will be prepared and developed, in partnership between the Council, relevant stakeholders, infrastructure providers and developer / landowners <u>for illustrative purposes and as a guide for developers.</u></p>	Updated to reflect additional proposed minor modification to the submission LDP (August 2014)

Ref No.	Paragraph/ Page Number	Proposed Change (Deletions/ Additional Text)	Reason for Change
09	2.2.6	Add new bullet point to end of list following 2 nd paragraph: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identified infrastructure requirements will be delivered in line with the requirements set out in <u>Policy I1 and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan</u> 	Updated to reflect additional proposed minor modification to the submission LDP (August 2014)
10	2.2.6	Amend 3 rd paragraph, 2 nd sentence: Development proposals within both the South Maldon Garden Suburb and the North Heybridge Garden Suburb must be in accordance with a masterplan endorsed by the Council for the respective areas. The Masterplans for the South Maldon Garden Suburb and the North Heybridge Garden Suburb must be in accordance with these broad development principles and other policies in the LDP.	Updated to reflect additional proposed minor modification to the submission LDP (August 2014)
11	2.1.14	Amend 3 rd paragraph: Developers will be required to contribute towards local and strategic infrastructure and services necessary to support the proposed development. Where the development may impact upon the local area, a Section 106 contribution may <u>will</u> be agreed between the Council and the developer to mitigate those impacts.	For clarification and to be consistent with Policy I1
12	3.3.6	Amend: In terms of above ground heritage assets, there are Conservation Areas at Langford and along the Chelmer and Blackwater Navigation. In the more immediate vicinity of the proposed development, however, are groups of Listed Buildings to the south west of the site (Old Rectory and and Mitchells Farm), and to the north-east of the site, at Poplar Grove Farm. <u>Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires special regard to be paid to the desirability of conserving listed buildings which includes protection from harm resulting from development within their setting</u>	Response to English Heritage and Essex CC comments
13	3.7.1	Add to end of paragraph 3.7.1 <u>However, extensive undesignated archaeological remains are known to present.</u>	Response to Essex CC comments
14	3.7.2	Aerial photographs and previous archaeological studies reveal the presence of <u>extensive</u> archaeological remains dating from the Neolithic through to the medieval period.	Response to Essex CC comments
15	3.7.3	Archaeological investigations to the south and north of the area have also revealed <u>extensive</u> levels of multi-period archaeological remains. The assessment work demonstrates that there is potential for <u>further as yet unidentified archaeological remains to be present within the site dating</u>	Response to Essex CC comments

Ref No.	Paragraph/ Page Number	Proposed Change (Deletions/ Additional Text)	Reason for Change
		from the Neolithic to Medieval periods. , in particular those of Iron Age and Roman date. Remains from the Neolithic and Bronze Age periods have also been recovered from the area, but the potential for remains from these periods is lower than for later periods.	
16	3.7.5	A <u>structured</u> programme of comprehensive and <u>detailed archaeological investigations evaluation</u> will be required across the whole of the area prior to any development. Dependent upon the results, a detailed mitigation strategy will be required comprising further intrusive works and excavation followed by <u>recording publication</u> , or preservation in situ where feasible and where the importance of such deposits warrants such a strategy.	Response to Essex CC comments
17	3.8.5	Add to end of paragraph: <u>The farm rides are not public rights of way and are permissive only.</u>	Response to Essex Bridleways Association comments and for clarification
18	3.8.6	Add to end of paragraph: <u>The site is also relatively close to two existing bridleways.</u>	Response to Essex Bridleways Association comments and for clarification
19	4.1.3	Add additional bullet point • <u>Protection of setting of heritage assets</u>	Response to English Heritage comments
20	4.2.3	Amend 2 nd bullet point • Essex County Council (on flood risk and drainage) , since the County Council will become the adopting authority for sustainable urban drainage systems from October of this year;	No definitive timetable has been confirmed by Defra. It is most likely that this will now be implemented during 2015.
21	4.3.3	Built Environment and Housing Amend 1 st bullet point • Provide homes for a range of age groups and other housing needs <u>including housing suitable for older people</u>	For clarification

Ref No.	Paragraph/ Page Number	Proposed Change (Deletions/ Additional Text)	Reason for Change
22	4.6.3	<p>Community</p> <p>Add first bullet point:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>The development will be well integrated with the wider Heybridge area;</u> <p>Amend 2nd bullet point:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The local centre will form a heart to provide a focus for the new Garden Suburb <u>and be accessible to the wider community</u>, comprising a mix of uses and co-located with the primary school which will be co-located with early years and childcare facilities; <p>Add additional bullet point:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Physical activity and healthy lifestyles will be encouraged through provision for sport, promotion of walking and cycling and provision of allotments.</u> 	Response to comments which stressed the importance attached to integration of the Garden Suburb with the wider community and not to be a separate development
23	5.5.2	<p>Add new sentence to end of paragraph</p> <p><u>The flood alleviation measures will be designed to minimise impact on the landscape and to reflect best practice in environmental design.</u></p>	To reflect objectives set out in paragraph 4.6.3.
24	5.1.7	<p>Add new sentence to end of paragraph:</p> <p><u>There will be a requirement to consult with all necessary statutory bodies regarding any potential impact of water discharge on the Blackwater Estuary which is designated as Ramsar, Special Protection Area (SPA), Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI).</u></p>	Response to Natural England comments.
25	5.2.4	<p>Add new paragraph as 5.2.5</p> <p><u>ECC has published the SuDs Design and Adoption Guide, December 2012, which outlines the requirements for sustainable surface water drainage in Essex. It provides a steer to what is expected, and complements national requirements whilst prioritising local needs.</u></p>	Response to Essex CC comments
26	p.40	<p>Change Section Heading p. 40 from Movement and Access to <u>Access and Movement</u></p>	Response to comments
27	5.3.1	<p>Add new paragraph</p> <p><u>The LDP sets out the principles for movement and access in the Garden Suburbs. Policy S3 states that development proposals for the Garden Suburbs must incorporate a network of safe and usable paths and streets for pedestrian, cyclists and vehicles. Policy S4 states that permission will be given for development provided that development proposals can be</u></p>	For clarification

Ref No.	Paragraph/ Page Number	Proposed Change (Deletions/ Additional Text)	Reason for Change
		<p><u>accommodated within the capacity of the Maldon and Heybridge road network and junctions and wider network following appropriate mitigation measures and junction improvements.</u></p> <p>Renumber paragraphs 5.3.1- 5.3.3 as 5.3.2- 5.3.5.</p>	
28	5.3.1	<p>Renumber as 5.3.2 Amend as follows.</p> <p>The LDP Policies require the construction of a new link-outer relief road to the north of Heybridge between Broad Street Green Road and Langford Road. <u>The new relief road should form a northern boundary of the development. Only strategic flood alleviation measures and landscaping measures may be allowed to the north of the new relief road.</u> , north of the new Garden Suburb and south of the pylon line. It can also will provide a <u>the principal</u> means of vehicular access to the new Garden Suburb.</p>	For clarification and consistency with Policy S4 in submitted LDP.
29	5.3.3	<p>Renumber as 5.3.4 Amend as follows:</p> <p>The Link Road will be designed to the standards of the Highway Authority in relation to the confirmed speed of the road <u>and will need to function as a Primary Route 1 (PR1) within the Essex road hierarchy. The Essex Traffic Management Strategy (ETMS) states such routes should seek to maintain the free flow of traffic to enable them to perform their function. An appropriate speed strategy to accord with the Essex Speed Management Strategy (ESMS) will need to be considered in order to prioritise the Relief Road against the congested junctions within Heybridge. Essex County Council considers that an appropriate speed limit be signed as 50 mph to be consistent with recent changes around Maldon, and the rural nature of the road being set within a 'green corridor' with a looser grained urban edge. This should inform the future design of the Link Road and Figure 10 shows an indicative alignment which has been developed within those parameters</u> curves have been introduced to present an 'organic' and less engineered alignment, consistent with the planned setting. The Link Road will in due course need to be subject to a road safety audit, which will help inform the detailed layout of key junctions, including Maypole Road/Link Road junction.</p>	To reflect comments from Essex CC

Ref No.	Paragraph/ Page Number	Proposed Change (Deletions/ Additional Text)	Reason for Change
30	5.3.4	<p>Renumber as 5.3.5 Amend 3rd bullet point:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The road is set within a 'green corridor', that allows scope for a variety of different landscape treatments, including tree and hedgerow borders, alongside the ditches, swales and ponds/surface water attenuation facilities; <u>provision for wildlife foraging routes and safe access for pedestrians, cyclists, horseriders and other vulnerable road users.</u> <p><u>Add new bullet points:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>The number of access points on the new link road should be kept to a minimum and new access points should be designed and constructed in accordance with the current standards and be subject to a road safety audit;</u> <u>Consideration should be given in the design of the link road to the location of potential access points to existing and new walking and cycling routes and bridleways to the north of the Garden Suburb. Essex County Council will be consulted with regards to the need for and location of potential crossing points on the new link road.</u> 	Response to comments and for clarification
31	5.5.1	<p>Add new sentence to end of paragraph. <u>This principle has been agreed with Essex County Council and will allow for sites S2(e) and S2(f) to be brought forward in the early phases of development with separate access from the relevant road.</u></p>	For clarification
32	5.5.2	<p>Amend paragraph 5.5.2 as follows:</p> <p><u>In order to avoid 'rat running', it is not proposed that there should be any vehicular links between Sites S2(e) and S2(f) and the wider development. However, there will be a requirement for appropriate pedestrian and cycle routes to be provided between these land parcels and the wider development.</u></p>	For clarification and in response to Essex CC comments
33	Figure 12 (page 43)	Add additional pedestrian/cycle link between Sites S2(e) and S2(d)	In responses to Essex CC comments
34	5.6.1	Delete as paragraph 5.6.1 duplicated	Correction
35	5.6.4	<p>Add new paragraph <u>Wherever possible, consideration should be given to the creation of multi-user tracks to enable use by walkers, cyclists, horseriders and other vulnerable road users.</u></p>	Response to Essex Bridleways Association

Ref No.	Paragraph/ Page Number	Proposed Change (Deletions/ Additional Text)	Reason for Change
36	5.7	Amend title to 'Walking, Cycling and Bridleway links between the new Garden Suburb, Heybridge and the Countryside'	Response to comments and to reflect objectives
37	5.7.4	Add new paragraph <u>Consideration should also be given to the potential for connections to the bridleways network.</u>	Response to Essex Bridleways Association
38	5.8.2	Amend 1 st sentence: There was clear feedback from the Stakeholder Workshop that non-residential (i.e. community and commercial uses) should be co-located, to ensure that the development has a vibrant heart to it which is well integrated with the rest of Heybridge and accessible to new and existing residents.	For clarification
39	5.8.3	Amend paragraph 5.8.3 as follows; The new local centre will be well served <u>connected</u> by pedestrian and cycle links <u>to all parts of the Garden Suburb and the wider area</u> , so that facilities are accessible to access to it by both new and existing residents can be on foot or by bike, as well as <u>or where appropriate</u> by car and public transport.	For clarification and in response to comments that integration of the Garden Suburb with wider Heybridge area should be highlighted.
40	5.9.1	Add to end of paragraph 5.9.1 <u>The pupils generated by the early phases of development are likely to be accommodated at Heybridge Primary School beyond the Garden Suburb boundary. Consideration should be given to identifying safe and direct routes to Heybridge Primary School early in the development.</u>	Response to Essex CC comments
41	5.9.2	Add to end of paragraph: <u>Essex County Council will be fully consulted on the detailed design and access arrangements for the local centre and primary school/ early years facility. Pedestrian access to the school should be linked to safe walking and cycling routes and separated from vehicular access to the school itself and the local centre.</u>	Response to Essex CC comments

Ref No.	Paragraph/ Page Number	Proposed Change (Deletions/ Additional Text)	Reason for Change
42	5.9.3	Amend paragraph 5.9.2 as follows; The education requirement includes two early years facilities – it is proposed that at least one of the early years/childcare facilities would be accommodated at the local centre, one as part of the primary school site. The co-location is designed to encourage activity at the local centre. <u>Essex County Council has expressed a preference for a traffic free entrance to the co-located primary school site to encourage the dropping off of school children in a safe environment and for a pedestrian priority link to be provided between the primary school and local centre.</u>	Response to Essex CC comments
43	5.9.5	Add new paragraph as 5.9.5 <u>Consideration should be given to the potential for shared community use of the new school buildings at an early design stage.</u>	Response to Essex CC comments
44	5.11	Add new sub-heading- Housing Renumber sub-headings 5.11-5.17 as 5.12-5.18. renumber paragraphs according to renumbered sub-heading	For clarification
45	5.11.1	Add new paragraph as 5.11.1 <u>It is proposed that the North Heybridge Garden Suburb will accommodate 1,235 homes in a range of dwelling types and tenures to meet the District's housing needs, including families, first time buyers and the elderly and affordable homes to cater for all members of the community. In accordance with Policy S4, a significant proportion of the proposed dwellings will be of a form, tenure and dwelling mix that is appropriate for meeting the housing needs of an older population. An average density range of 30-35 dwellings per hectare is envisaged across the masterplan area to reflect the sustainable development principles of garden suburbs.</u>	For clarification and in response to comments
46	5.11.1	Renumber as 5.12.1 and amend final sentence Based on the network of existing hedgerows (Green) and ditches (Blue) described in Section 3, and the potential for the new link road to run in a “green corridor”, the Strategic Masterplan Framework establishes a series of linked green and blue routes through the development area, which will contribute greatly to the character of the area, creating habitat and attractive routes for people and wildlife <u>and connect with the wider green and blue infrastructure network.</u>	For clarification and in response to comments

Ref No.	Paragraph/ Page Number	Proposed Change (Deletions/ Additional Text)	Reason for Change
47	5.11.2	Renumber paragraph 5.11.2 as 5.12.2 and add new paragraph 5.12.3 Consideration will be given to the potential use of green and blue corridors as pedestrian and cycle routes and <u>for improved provision for horseriders where practicable.</u>	Response to Essex Bridleways Association comments
48	5.12.2	Renumber paragraph 5.12.2 as 5.13.2 and add to end: <u>Measures will be required to ensure that Heybridge Wood is not adversely affected by any on-site surface water management schemes through the retention of ditches and incorporation of SuDS in new development.</u>	Response to Natural England comments
49	5.13.1	Amend: Open space is required alongside the new residential uses, in order to provide places for outdoor recreation and play <u>and to enhance the health and well-being of residents.</u> The main types of <u>formal and informal</u> open space that the new Garden Suburb will provide will include the following:	Response to Sport England comments
50	5.13.3	Amend: Add to end of paragraph: <u>Reference should be made to Sport England's Active Design Guidance in the preparation of planning applications.</u>	Response to Sport England comments
51	5.13.4	Renumber paragraph 5.13.4 as 5.14.4 and add to end of paragraph: <u>The Country Park will provide amenity and leisure opportunities for new and existing residents and opportunities for integration with the wider green and blue infrastructure networks.</u>	Response to comments.
52	5.13.6	Renumber paragraph 5.13.6 as 5.14.6 and amend: <u>The boundary of the Country Park has not been defined and the Council and developers will work with landowners and other relevant stakeholders to take forward proposals in accordance with the LDP. will be determined at the planning application stage.</u>	For clarification

Ref No.	Paragraph/ Page Number	Proposed Change (Deletions/ Additional Text)	Reason for Change
53	5.13.5	<p>Renumber paragraph 5.13.5 as 5.14.5 and amend as follows:</p> <p>It is not intended that the Country Park should be designed to attract visitors from far afield, and it is not intended to provide visitor facilities or car parking accordingly. Rather, the function of the Country Park would be to provide access for local residents, and to form a <u>pedestrian and cycle link between the proposed development to the east, and the Blackwater Rail Trail to the west. Consideration should also be given to improved equestrian access.</u> The proposed Country Park to the west of Maypole Road will act as a link between the Garden Suburb and rest of Heybridge and the existing Country Park at Elms Farm.</p>	Response to Essex Bridleways Association comments
54	5.13.6	<p>Renumber paragraph 5.13.6 as 5.14.6 and add:</p> <p><u>The location and layout of new playing fields and the requirement for associated facilities such as changing facilities and parking will be determined in consultation with Sport England and local sports organisations.</u></p>	Response to Sport England and local sports organisations comments
55	5.13.7	<p>Renumber paragraph 5.13.7 as 5.14.7. Amend first sentence as follows:</p> <p>The <u>indicative</u> locations shown on the diagram on the following page takes account of the following factors:</p> <p>Delete 2nd bullet point</p>	For clarification and in response to comments. The location and layout of sports facilities will be a matter for further consideration.
56	Figure 18 (page 55)	Add cycle and pedestrian links between Site S2(e) and wider development	Response to Essex CC comments
57	5.17	<p>Renumber sub-heading 5.17 as 5.18 and paragraph 5.16.1 as 5.18.1. Add to text</p> <p><u>Reference will be made to the Maldon District Green Infrastructure Study (September 2011) and any subsequent document</u></p>	Response to natural England comments
58	Figure 19 (page 56)	<p>Amend key</p> <p>Add symbol to show location of Country Park</p> <p>Add 'indicative' before sports pitches and associated facilities</p>	For clarification and in response to comments

Ref No.	Paragraph/ Page Number	Proposed Change (Deletions/ Additional Text)	Reason for Change
59	6.2	Delete word 'Existing' from sub heading	For clarification and to cover other appropriate design guidance which may be introduced
60	6.2.1	Amend: It will also be important that reference is made to the emerging Maldon District Council Design Guide and any other relevant local and national guidance. which may be produced by Maldon District Council during the development of the North Heybridge Garden <u>In accordance with Policy Development will be required to incorporate the design principles set out in Policy D1 and S3 and to mitigate against adverse environmental impacts and climate change and achieve specified nationally recognised standards for sustainable development in accordance with Policy D2.</u>	For clarification and in response to comments
61	6.3.1	Amend 9 th bullet point: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creation of a 'heart' to the community <u>which is well connected and accessible to new and existing residents</u> 	Response to Essex CC comments
62	6.3.1	Add new bullet point after 'a new primary school': <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Early years and childcare facilities, co-located with the new primary school and standalone; 	
63	7.1.5	2 nd bullet point <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green infrastructure - parks, children's play areas, sports pitches, <u>accessible green space</u>, allotments and local wildlife sites 	Response to Natural England comments
64	7.2.2	Add new paragraph <u>Furthermore major residential development proposals are required to provide comprehensive and robust flood risk assessments to the Council's satisfaction at the planning application stage. In accordance with national planning policies development proposals (including the construction process) will need to demonstrate that they will not increase flood risk on site and to the surrounding areas.</u>	For clarification

Ref No.	Paragraph/ Page Number	Proposed Change (Deletions/ Additional Text)	Reason for Change
65	Table 7.1	Table 7.1 to be updated as necessary to reflect Infrastructure Phasing Plan	Updated to reflect most recent information submitted as part of the LDP Examination
66	7.3.1	Amend: Infrastructure provision will be phased to ensure that the requirements arising from the development of the North Heybridge Garden Suburb will be secured in a timely fashion alongside development. <u>The Council will seek the earliest possible delivery of the necessary infrastructure.</u>	For clarification and in response to comments regarding the timescale for infrastructure provision
67	7.3.2	Add to end of paragraph: <u>Where appropriate, consideration will be given to other possible sources of financing to assist in the early delivery of infrastructure.</u>	Response to comments regarding the early delivery of infrastructure
68	7.3.7	Amend: The broad approach to the pooling of infrastructure costs is summarised in Policy I1 of the LDP, with the relevant details relating to the North Heybridge Garden Suburb summarised in the table (Table 7.2) overleaf. This table will be reviewed following the LDP Examination-in-Public and adoption. MDC has commenced work on CIL rates which will <u>MDC submitted its Draft CIL charging schedule for examination in September 2014. This would introduce charges on development to fund infrastructure projects and CIL payments from other developments could also contribute to the delivery of some strategic infrastructure in North Heybridge Garden Suburb. Other infrastructure requirements such as new or enhanced recreation provision in the Maldon and Heybridge area may also be funded under CIL.</u>	Updated text and response to comments from Sport England
69	7.4.2	Add to end of paragraph <u>Essex County Council and Maldon District Council in conjunction with promoters/developers and other stakeholders will review the impact of planned housing growth on the key functional areas of education and highways and transportation, following any changes in housing delivery and once detailed housing mix is known.</u>	Response to Essex County Council comments.

Ref No.	Paragraph/ Page Number	Proposed Change (Deletions/ Additional Text)	Reason for Change
70	7.6.1	Amend text: Maldon District Council will seek to work with promoters and developers of the Garden Suburb to develop a Community Development Strategy which reflects garden suburb principles.	For clarification and in response to comments
71	7.7.1	Amend 2 nd sentence: Planning applications should be in accordance with <u>the principles set out in the Strategic Masterplan Framework.</u>	For clarification
72	7.7.2	Amend 2 nd bullet point: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A detailed <u>site</u> masterplan for the area to which the application relates that is in accordance with the <u>principles set out in the Strategic Masterplan Framework;</u> 	For clarification
73	7.7.3	Add new paragraph: <u>Development proposals will be required to include appropriate mitigation measures to address environmental impacts and to mitigate and adapt to potential impacts of climate change.</u>	For clarification and in response to comments
74	7.7.4	Add to end of paragraph: <u>Reference should be made to best practice and guidance on sustainable design and construction in preparation of planning applications.</u>	For clarification
75	7.7.4	Add new paragraph as 7.7.5 <u>Any necessary mitigation measures identified through the assessments undertaken at the planning application stage will be secured through appropriate conditions or legal agreement.</u>	For clarification
76	7.8.2	3 rd bullet point <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Secure agreement and delivery of long term management and governance arrangements (including management of green spaces, <u>community facilities and sports pitches</u> 	Response to Sport England comments