



MALDON DISTRICT  
COUNCIL

## MEMBERS' UPDATE

DIRECTOR OF STRATEGY AND  
RESOURCES  
Paul Dodson

03 September 2024

Dear Councillor

### DISTRICT PLANNING COMMITTEE - WEDNESDAY 4 SEPTEMBER 2024

Please find enclosed the Members' Update for the above meeting, detailing any further information received in relation to the following items of business since the agenda was printed.

5. **24/00244/FULM Land South Of Brent Way And Off Of Endeavour Way, Burnham-On-Crouch, Essex**(Pages 3 - 6)


Yours faithfully

Director of Strategy and Resources



This page is intentionally left blank

CIRCULATED PRIOR  
TO THE MEETING



**REPORT of  
ASSISTANT DIRECTOR OF PLANNING IMPLEMENTATION**

to  
**DISTRICT PLANNING COMMITTEE  
4 SEPTEMBER 2024**

## MEMBERS' UPDATE

### AGENDA ITEM 5

<b>Application Number</b>	<b>24/00244/FULM</b>
<b>Location</b>	Land South Of Brent Way And Off Of Endeavour Way, Burnham-On-Crouch, Essex
<b>Proposal</b>	Construction of 63 dwellings (Use Class C3), and associated works, including informal and formal open space; vehicular, pedestrian and cyclist infrastructure; car and cycle parking; sustainable urban drainage; and infrastructure.
<b>Applicant</b>	Barratt David Wilson Homes (Eastern Counties)
<b>Agent</b>	Lanpro Services Ltd
<b>Target Decision Date</b>	27.09.24 (EoT)
<b>Case Officer</b>	Lisa Page
<b>Parish</b>	<b>BURNHAM-ON-CROUCH NORTH</b>
<b>Reason for Referral to the Committee / Council</b>	Strategic site within the strategic submitted Local Development Plan

### UPDATE REPORT SUMMARY

This update relates to 4 issues:

- Amended Plan number
- Additional Consultee comment
- Clarification on the market and affordable housing mix, and discussion of compliance with Local Housing Needs Assessment (LHNA)
- Implications of the housing mix to the 'planning balance'.

8. Proposed conditions, including heads of terms of any section 106 agreement

Within the 'approved plans' condition, alter Z113-2A-FP-001 to 'REV A'.

7.2 Statutory Consultees and Other Organisations

Natural England (NE) responded on 02.09.24 in relation to the LPA's submitted 'Appropriate Assessment'. NE concur with the specific measures identified in the strategic solution and conclude that if all mitigation measures are appropriately secured, there would be no adverse impact on the sites from

recreational pressure. Raise no objections subject to securing the appropriate mitigation.

## 5.1 Housing Need and Affordable Housing

The development would deliver 63no. units (38 market dwellings and 25 affordable). The LHNA identified a tenure mix of 75% rented and 25% shared ownership for the affordable housing. The proposed tenure mix is as set out at Paragraph 3.1.5 (not that at 5.2.8 which has incorrectly swapped the numbers stated for rented and shared ownership). The development meets with this tenure mix (19no. rented units and 6no. shared ownership units) and whilst the Committee Report discusses compliance with the LHNA it does not break down the provision between market and affordable housing. For clarity, this is included in the table below.

	<b>1bed</b>	<b>2bed</b>	<b>3bed</b>	<b>4+ bed</b>
<b>Market</b> - LHNA figure Number provided and %	Up to 10%	25-35% 6 (15.8%)	40-50% 20 (52.6%)	15-25% 12 (31.6%)
<b>Rented</b> – LHNA figure Number provided and %	30-40% 8 (42.1%)	30-40% 7 (36.8%)	20-30% 4 (21.1%)	Up to 10%
<b>Shared Ownership</b> - LHNA figure Number provided and %	15-25%	35-45% 3 (50%)	25-35% 3 (50%)	5-12%

It is clear from the above, that for market housing, there is an over-provision of 3 and 4 bed units (in actual numbers this equates to an over-provision of 1no. 3 bed unit, and 3no. 4 bed units). Whilst there is some conflict with the LHNA, Officers consider that this is modest such that no harm would be attributed to it.

In terms of affordable housing provision, for rented units, there is a very small over-provision of 1 bed units (which in actual numbers equates to an over provision of just 1 unit). The provision has been discussed with the Councils Strategic Housing Services who support the provision of the 4no. 1 bed rented bungalows being provided with wet rooms/showers for older people, and acknowledge the developer's willingness to increase the size of the 3 bed rented units to 3 bed 6 person houses, which will meet the need of larger families requiring rented properties.

With regards to the over-provision of shared ownership properties, the applicant would be unable to offer any 4 bed units as these would be very expensive/possibly unaffordable and therefore would most probably not be accepted by the Housing Associations who would have the issue of then selling these units. If the applicant was considering possibly one or two, 1 bed flats as shared ownership, these would be within a block of flats and again a Housing Association would likely have concerns with regards to management and service charges when both mixes of tenures are in one block.

Overall, in regard to affordable housing provision, the tenure mix of 75% rented and 25% shared ownership is policy compliant. Officers also support

the housing mix set out. Moderate weight remains assigned to the provision of affordable housing in the overall planning balance.

#### 5.11 Planning Balance and Sustainability

Within the Committee Report at 5.13 it sets out the summary of public benefits, and at 5.1.3.1 states that in terms of market housing, moderate weight is assigned to its delivery. Although the LPA can demonstrate 5YHLS, and whilst there is some conflict with the LHNA, there remains a wider ambition of the Government to deliver housing. This is most recently captured in the new government announcements and policy revisions currently in draft form (which has housing target delivery for all local planning authorities). However, it is considered that the weight to be assigned to the delivery of market housing falls between limited and moderate. The positive weight to be assigned to affordable housing remains as moderate.

#### 5.14 Conclusion

The above update clarifies and supports the planning considerations of the application, which remain acceptable. Having considered the benefits that would arise from the proposal and weighing this against the harm arising from the conflict with the employment land designation within the LDP, it is officers view that the overall benefits of the development, which are significant, would outweigh any harm. These benefits would amount to material considerations of substantial weight that would indicate that planning permission could be granted not in accordance with the Development Plan.

The recommendation remains as that set out within the Committee Report at Section 8. **Approve** subject to the completion of a Section 106 Agreement to cover the Heads of Terms outlined within the Report and subject to the conditions as set out.

This page is intentionally left blank