

- 9.4 It is important to note that where a settlement is in the pattern does not necessarily dictate where growth is going to go in the future. This is because the policies in the LDP should do that, but it can help to see how successful those policies are. So, for instance if a policy sets out that a settlement is going to grow and provide additional services and facilities, it should in time, if the policy is positively working, move up the settlement pattern. Maldon/Heybridge and Burnham on Crouch are the District's two towns and therefore do not feature in the table below. The updated Settlement Pattern is listed below and the details behind it can be found on the Council's website at www.maldon.gov.uk – out the right link in ;

SETTLEMENT NAME
Large Villages
Southminster
Tollesbury
Maylands
Latchingdon
Wickham Bishops (including Beacon Hill)
Tillingham
Tolleshunt D'Arcy
Great Totham South - clusters with Great Totham North
Cold Norton
Purleigh
Medium Villages
Bradwell-On-Sea
Althorne
Woodham Walter
St.Lawrence
Langford
Tolleshunt Knights
North Fambridge
Heybridge Basin
Steeple
Goldhanger
Small Villages
Tolleshunt Major
Great Totham North - clusters with Great Totham South
Little Totham
Great Braxted
Ulting
Hamlets
Woodham Mortimer
Stow Maries
Dengie
Mundon
Southminster - Old Heath Road
Asheldham
Hazeliagh
Little Braxted
Bradwell Waterside
Cock Clarks

1) Do you agree with the updated Settlement Pattern and how the settlements in the District have been grouped together?

2) If you do not agree, how should they be grouped and on what basis?

3) Referring to the table on the Council's website which sets out all the services and facilities for each settlement – are there any comments about this or matters which need to be altered or changed.

9.5 Options for Growth in the Review of the LDP

9.6 The current approved LDP concentrated housing growth in sustainable extensions to Maldon, Heybridge and Burnham-on-Crouch in the form of Garden Suburbs and Strategic Allocations. The plan did not allocate growth in the District's smaller settlements but relied on existing commitments (sites with planning permission already) and windfall sites (not planned) coming forward within settlement boundaries.

9.7 This strategy, whilst being considered at the time as the one able to deliver positive growth for the District it has however caused a number of issues, which are prudent to reflect on:

- Small and medium building companies have found it difficult to build in Maldon District because of the lack of smaller allocated sites and windfall opportunities; this could be having an effect on job availability, growth and skills in this sector. It could also be slowing down the opportunity to bring forward housing more quickly on smaller sites.
- Though the plan had a windfall allowance in it, there was not a policy setting out how that was going to be delivered so it has not been as effective in tapping into this source of supply.

9.8 The Plan included settlement boundaries around most settlements. Whilst these appeared to be a way of protecting settlements, they have caused inflexibility in regard to housing coming forward. This is because settlement boundaries restrict development to within a defined settlement area. This has led to a lack of available land supply for windfall sites, which help support housing supply and this ultimately is one of the contributing factors to the District not having a 5 year supply of housing from 2021. The other negative impact of settlement boundaries is that all housing is constrained or squeezed into the settlements. This means that important green gaps, backland development and infill development have a presumption to be supported within the settlement boundary. This ultimately leads to a loss of the very unique character of some settlements, that it was an LDP objective to protect; especially the ones with larger properties and large gardens that can be subdivided. Over time, a continuation of this policy is likely to exacerbate this issue and the impact on the uniqueness of settlements will become more prevalent, as land is squeezed in them to fulfil housing demand.

- A lack of rural housing in the sustainable rural villages is failing to support transport provision and rural business improvements; this ultimately could lead to a loss of services and facilities and increased rural isolation and accessibility.

- Rural settlements have either had housing approved through the appeal system or have not grown sufficiently enough to ensure some affordable housing delivery is a tangible benefit. This could, if left unchecked, lead to an out-migration of younger people who cannot afford to live near their families, though it is hoped that the new “First Homes” may address some of this issue, the plan needs policies to accommodate this national change to policy.
- 9.9 At the time of the current approved LDP, national planning policy did not direct how much growth local planning authorities should place in settlements, but left the decision-making to each relevant authority. In 2019, national policy changed and acknowledged that small and medium sized sites can also make a positive contribution to wider housing delivery and offer other opportunities to local housing markets, SME builders and local supply chains. It is now envisaged by national policy that at least 10% of housing allocations will be delivered on sites which are no larger than 1.0 hectare.
- 9.10 The Council also has to consider the possibility that the Bradwell B Nuclear Power Station development will start to come forward during the plan period, in the event it is granted its DCO. This is a NSIP so the decision concerning it is not within the Council’s remit, but will be made by the Planning Inspectorate.
- 9.11 It would not be in the wider interests of the District if the Council did not give this project due consideration during the LDP Review. It needs to reflect on the possibility that it may have an impact on the District negative, neutral and positive. There may be other development needs arising from the Bradwell B project that the LDP needs to consider now, such as impacts on housing market, tourism and infrastructure. A silent LDP could be very damaging to the District leaving it vulnerable to development that the Council has very little control over. Therefore, each of the options outlined below is also accompanied by the following paragraph;
- 9.12 *“The LDP Review will have a major infrastructure project policy included which will consider the impacts of, and plan for, the Bradwell B Nuclear Power Station, should it proceed under the NSIP process. This policy will set out in broad terms the way the Council will deal with any growth needs arising from both the construction and the operation of the power station. It may look to allocate additional sites to manage this and these could be in the towns or large villages in the east of the District and/or along the rail line that terminates at Southminster. The policy will also set out how the Council will consider applications connected with any growth arising from the Power Station in terms of material planning considerations. This policy will only be activated if the Power Station receives consent and additional growth arises.”*
- 9.13 By placing the prospect of the Power Station into a major infrastructure project policy, it also enables the Council to be prepared if any other major infrastructure project comes forward in the District.

Question - Do you agree with the approach set out above for major infrastructure projects?

- 9.14 The Council is therefore asking for consideration to be given to the following housing growth options;

9.15 OPTION 1 – Retain the option in the LDP approved in 2017 – focus growth in the settlements of Maldon/Heybridge and Burnham on Crouch

This option would continue the principles set out in the present approved LDP 2017 with most of the growth being allocated in Maldon/Heybridge and Burnham on Crouch, these are the main towns of the District. This could ensure the economies of scale necessary to generate a wide range of community facilities in these areas, a supported public transport network, business and employment opportunities and a supported retail offer. The only alteration would be encompassing national planning policy changes with regard to 10% of any housing allocation should be on smaller sites.

This scenario is characterised by the following;

- Urban extensions on greenfield sites adjacent to the main towns;
- 10% of the District's housing allocation on smaller sites would also be directed to Maldon/Heybridge and Burnham on Crouch;
- Promotion of new employment opportunities in the main towns;
- Continuation of the policy of having settlement boundaries;
- Development restricted in the other settlements to sites within the settlement boundaries;
- Development in the countryside restricted to that which supports the local economy and tourism.

9.16 OPTION 2 – A strong focus on the towns and larger sustainable villages

This option would focus the majority of growth on the two towns in the District, Maldon/Heybridge and Burnham on Crouch and the larger sustainable villages. The larger sustainable villages in the context of this option will most likely be the top three/four/five (yet to be determined) large villages as set out in the settlement hierarchy with a good range of services and facilities and connectivity. This would ensure the economies of scale necessary to generate a wide range of community facilities, a supported public transport network, business and employment opportunities and a supported retail offer that could not only support their own populations but also spread benefits to their surrounding rural communities. It could also increase opportunities for small, medium building enterprises to develop housing in the District.

This scenario would be characterised by the following;

- Urban extensions on greenfield sites;
- 10% of the District's housing allocation being directed to the other sustainable large villages in the settlement pattern;
- A windfall policy for housing for the towns and large villages;
- A windfall policy for housing for the medium and small villages;
- Most affordable housing would be provided in the towns and with 'exceptions sites' being supported in the larger sustainable villages other large, medium and small villages, subject to identified need;
- Promotion of new employment opportunities in the towns and large villages;
- Increased new housing and business development in the more sustainable settlements (i.e. those with sufficient services and facilities to support themselves and surrounding smaller villages) sufficient to support their own role and meet the needs of smaller villages;

- Development in the countryside restricted to that which supports the local economy, including tourism.

9.17 *OPTION 3 – Growth generally focused on the towns Maldon/Heybridge and Burnham on Crouch and all the large villages of the Settlement Hierarchy*

This option would focus on the most sustainable settlements within the District, with the allocated growth going in the towns Maldon/Heybridge and Burnham on Crouch and the large villages. The amount of growth will be proportioned out with the housing allocated being proportional to the number of houses already in each settlement.

This scenario would ensure the economies of scale necessary to generate a wide range of community facilities, a supported public transport network, business and employment opportunities and a supported retail offer for anticipated population growth.

The scenario would be characterised by the following;

- Urban extensions of greenfield sites;
- 10% of the District's housing allocation being directed to the medium villages;
- There will be a windfall policy for the towns and large villages;
- There will be a windfall policy for the medium and small villages;
- Most affordable housing would be provided in the towns and large villages with 'exceptions sites' being supported in the medium and small villages;
- Promotion of new employment opportunities in the towns and large villages;
- Increased new housing and business development in the more sustainable villages (i.e. those with sufficient services and facilities to support themselves and surrounding smaller villages) sufficient to support their own role and meet the needs of the smaller villages;
- Development in the countryside restricted to that which supports the local economy, including tourism.

9.18 *OPTION 4 – Pepper pot growth throughout the Settlement Hierarchy (Spread the growth across all the sustainable settlements in the District)*

All growth will be pepper potted across the towns, large, medium and small villages this would include major and minor site allocations. This means that all settlements would get some growth and it would be based on a percentage proportion of the number of homes in each settlement, so larger settlements will receive more growth.

The scenario would be characterised by the following;

- Housing allocations in all towns, large, medium and small villages in the hierarchy, spreading the visual burden of growth across the settlements of the District.
- It may lead to an inability to provide essential infrastructure because of a lack of economies of scale and inevitably more smaller sites being brought forward.
- It would provide a quality of choice of sites across the District in different settlements which could support small, medium construction firms.
- There could be a decline in the amount of affordable housing coming forward because of smaller sites being allocated.
- May help support the sustainability of smaller settlements and encourage business and growth in those places.

- There will be a windfall policy for sites coming forward that are not allocated during the plan period.

9.19 *OPTION 5 – Create a new satellite settlement or large urban extension bolted onto one of the towns, larger villages and/or settlement adjacent to the District boundary*

The satellite settlement or large urban extension would accommodate all allocated growth excepting 10% and a 20% buffer. This would ensure the economies of scale necessary to generate a wide range of community facilities, a supported public transport network, business and employment opportunities. The 10% and 20% buffer of growth would be allocated to the remaining towns and large villages.

The option would be characterised by the following;

- Urban extensions on greenfield sites in the new satellite settlement;
- 10% and the 20% buffer of the District's housing allocation being directed to the other towns and large villages, this will allow housing to come forward whilst the strategic allocations are preparing their applications and starts on site;
- A windfall policy for the towns and large villages;
- A windfall policy for housing for the medium and small villages;
- Most affordable housing would be provided in the satellite settlement or urban extension with 'exceptions sites' being supported in the other large, medium and small villages;
- Promotion of new employment opportunities in the towns and large villages if appropriate in the satellite settlement or urban extension;
- Increased new housing and business development in the more sustainable villages (i.e. those with sufficient services and facilities to support themselves and surrounding smaller villages) sufficient to support their own role and meet the needs of the smaller villages;
- Development in the countryside restricted to that which supports the local economy, including tourism.

9.20 *Option 6 – Focus growth in the north of the District to link into the service and facilities available in Tiptree, Witham and Maldon/Heybridge.*

This option would focus major allocations in the settlements in the north of the District. These settlements have a relationship with the settlements of Tiptree and Witham which lie outside of the District, and Maldon/Heybridge in the District. They look to these settlements for the majority of their higher-order services and facilities. Maldon/Heybridge is not included in this scenario for strategic growth allocations because of the amount of growth it has previously received, the amount of existing commitments it already has but are still to come forward and the lag in infrastructure coming forward in the town. Maldon/Heybridge requires a period of time in order for planned infrastructure to be delivered and existing commitments to be built out without additional pressure from new strategic growth.

10% of allocated growth on smaller sites would be in the remaining large villages and Towns.

This option is characterised by the following;

- Urban extensions on greenfield sites in and adjacent to the settlements in the North of the District, and those that border the District in Braintree and Chelmsford.
- 10% of the District's housing allocation being directed to the remaining large villages and Towns.
- A windfall policy for the towns and remaining large villages
- A windfall policy for the medium and small villages
- Most affordable housing would be provided in the northern settlements of the District with 'exceptions sites' being supported in the medium and small villages;
- Promotion of new employment opportunities in the towns and if possible in the northern settlements of the District;
- Increased new housing and business development in the more sustainable villages (i.e. those with sufficient services and facilities to support themselves and surrounding smaller villages) sufficient to support their own role and meet the needs of the smaller villages;
- Development in the countryside restricted to that which supports the local economy, including tourism.

9.21 *OPTION 7 – Focus growth along the rail line to Althorne, North Fambridge and Southminster*

This option would focus major allocations to Althorne, North Fambridge and Southminster because they have railway stations with a connection to London. Sites making up the 10% of housing allocations to be delivered on sites no larger than 1.0 hectare will be directed to Maldon/Heybridge, Burnham-on-Crouch and the remaining large villages. Though Burnham-on-Crouch has a railway station it is not included in this scenario for strategic growth because of the amount of growth in both allocations and windfall development it has previously received and the lag in infrastructure coming forward in the town. Burnham-on-Crouch requires a period of time in order for planned infrastructure to be delivered without additional pressure from new strategic growth.

This option is characterised by the following;

- Urban extensions on greenfield sites in and adjacent to Althorne, North Fambridge and Southminster;
- 10% of the District's housing allocation being directed to the District's towns and large villages (including Burnham on Crouch);
- A windfall policy for the towns and remaining large villages
- A windfall policy for the medium and small villages
- Most affordable housing would be provided in Althorne, North Fambridge and Southminster with 'exceptions sites' being supported in the medium and small villages;
- Promotion of new employment opportunities in the towns;
- Increased new housing and business development in the more sustainable villages (i.e. those with sufficient services and facilities to support themselves and surrounding smaller villages) sufficient to support their own role and meet the needs of the smaller villages;

- Development in the countryside restricted to that which supports the local economy, including tourism.

Please Note

9.22 All options outlined are reliant on the fact that there will be sufficient land in the areas summarised for delivery of the strategic growth target.

1) Which growth option do you consider to be the most appropriate for the District of Maldon? Please set out your reason for this view.

2) Do you believe that there is another suitable growth option for the District, perhaps a combination of any of the above – please set out your views.

3) Do you think it is appropriate to include in the LDP review a policy dealing with major infrastructure projects such as the Bradwell B Nuclear Power Station, to be activated if this type of project comes forward?

10.0 EFFECTIVE USE OF LAND

10.1 The majority of housing in Maldon District is inevitably going to be delivered on greenfield sites because the District does not have a legacy of industrial landscapes laying derelict and would otherwise provide ideal brownfield sites for redevelopment. Housing can however be delivered in ways which utilises land more effectively and the Council would ask that you consider the following questions;

1) Would you consider the delivery of housing appropriate on areas of land where there are disused agricultural buildings, or derelict land in or adjacent to large, medium and small villages?

2) Housing can be delivered in larger quantities, but using less greenfield land, by building at higher densities. Would you consider this appropriate if sites with higher densities were designed to ensure they achieved a high quality of design?

3) Would you support minimum density standards to uplift the delivery of housing and ensure land in Maldon District was used as efficiently as possible, or do you think design, or other factors should dictate density on housing sites?

4) Would you consider higher density housing appropriate in large, medium and small villages, if the design was to a higher standard and the character of the settlement was still respected?

5) Is it appropriate to develop land for housing that has been previously used for commercial uses such as employment and retail which is otherwise vacant, underused and derelict ?

11.0 HOUSING IN THE MEDIUM AND SMALL VILLAGES

11.1 Inevitably housing will come forward and be developed in the large, medium and small villages, either through site allocations or as windfall development. The Council understands that the character of many of these settlements is very important to local people and whilst the rural settlements had settlement boundaries in the approved Local Plan, as discussed above, it is believed that these have not allowed for enough flexibility in the delivery of housing and this has contributed to the present lack of a 5-year supply of housing land and a squeeze on the character and uniqueness of the District's settlements.

1) Should the medium and small settlements retain some form of a settlement boundary, albeit more flexibly drawn?

2) Should the Council develop a windfall policy for all or specific settlements, potentially capping the number of units for each site coming forward and ensuring the protection for key views, green infrastructure gaps and the historic environment in each village.

12.0 FUTURE HOMES FOR GYPSY, TRAVELLER AND TRAVELLING SHOWPEOPLE

12.1 As with reviewing the needs for general housing, the Council has a duty to consider the needs of the District's Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople. There are currently two public sites in the District which meet the needs of Gypsies and Travellers who do not own land, but rather have housing needs that are met locally on a rental basis. These sites are owned by Essex County Council. There are also a further 17 sites that are privately owned and home to a number of Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople households

12.2 The current LDP established Policy H6 which is a criteria-based policy to make provision for new Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople pitches/plots to meet District needs, which in 2017 stood at an additional 9 pitches.

12.3 The Council will be updating its Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) in 2021/2022 to ensure any further provision of pitches and plots in the District is based on up to date and robust information collected locally and project the future need forward to the at least 2043 as the existing GTAA only looked forward to 2033.

12.4 This will help us to understand if there have been any changes in local households since the last GTAA was prepared in 2016, such as older children needing a pitch of their own, in-migration, or new households forming within the community. The GTAA update will also help us review whether any of the District's Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople households are currently living in over-crowded conditions or are concealed households due to social mobility or a lack of provision, to determine if there is a need in the LDP Review to identify existing sites that could safely be intensified or expanded, new sites allocated in the plan, or stronger policies that can support meeting the need.

12.5 Work remains underway by all Essex Local Planning Authorities through the Duty to Cooperate to establish whether there is a specific need for Transit Sites to be built in Essex to cater for Gypsies and Travellers who continue to travel to the county but have no-where authorised to pitch-up. This has been underway since 2018, however it has been impacted

by Covid-19 and a fall in travelling lifestyle amongst the Gypsy & Traveller community due to lockdowns and a lack of work. The Council will remain part of this project during the LDP Review.

1) In the event of an increase of need, should the Council work look to establish both private and public sites for Gypsies and Travellers in the future, recognising that not all needs can be catered by one tenure of provision?

2) In the event of an increase of need, should the Council seek to intensify or expand existing Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople sites as much as possible, where it is otherwise safe and suitable to do so?

3) In the event of an increase of need, should the Council consider how it could use its Settlement Hierarchy, Rural Exception Sites and/or Windfall Policy (if implemented) to support the increased provision of new sites in sustainable locations that can serve the community's needs better?

4) Is there anything else the Council should be considering for homes for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople?

13.0 SELF-BUILD/CUSTOM BUILD HOUSING PLOTS

13.1 The Council does not currently have a high number of registrations on its statutory Self-Build and Custom Housebuilding Register, however there were 430 people on the Buildstore Register looking to self-build in Maldon District and of those, 127 live in the District. There is therefore an indication that self/custom build, as a form of housing provision, is of interest to local people. The council has a legal duty to provide plots equivalent to the number of people who have joined the statutory register. To ensure compliance with this in the future, the council could therefore consider allocating specific sites for self-build/custom build, or encourage them to be brought forward on smaller sites in the District

1) Should the Council seek a proportion of self-build/custom build plots on larger housing sites.

2) In addition to the above, should the Plan also allocate specific sites in the LDP Review exclusively for self-build/custom build, either put forward by people who want to self-build or caveated by policy that they can only be brought forward by self-builders.

14.0 A BEAUTIFUL BUILT ENVIRONMENT

14.1 The Council would like the LDP Review to prioritise attractive places and spaces when making choices around future land allocations and policies. Attractive places and spaces are, by their nature, subjective, but they often reflect local character and what is special or distinctive about a place. The National Design Guide illustrates how well-designed places that are beautiful and successful can be achieved in practice and supports local design guidance that meets the priorities of local communities. The Building Better, Building Beautiful Commission is an independent body set up to advise the government on how to promote and increase the use of high-quality design for new build homes and neighbourhoods. Its report sets out the importance of considering beauty at three scales during the planning process. These are:

- Beautifully placed (sustainable settlement patterns, sitting in the landscape)
 - Beautiful places (streets, squares and parks, the "spirit of place")
 - Beautiful buildings (windows, materials, proportion, space)
- 14.2 The Commission defines a beautiful place as ‘a place in which people wish to walk, rather than a place that the car helps them to avoid... buildings that reflect the history, character and identity of their community and that belong in their surroundings: somewhere, not anywhere... a walkable settlement, in which the streets are an improvement on what preceded them, even when what preceded them was open countryside’.
- 14.3 The Council wish to ensure that these are the kinds of places that we want to plan for and the LDP should help to deliver them. Maldon District Council already has an adopted Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document that seeks to achieve better design through developments, but it could go further than that by working to endorse the wider Essex Design Guide.
- 1) Designing beautiful spaces and buildings, how important do you think it is that we should actively plan to create beautiful spaces and buildings?**
- 2) What do you think about the design policy in the LDP 2017 and the Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2018? Do they need amending? If so, how and why?**
- 3) Should the Council seek to endorse the Essex Design Guide with a Maldon District supplementary section? Would this be a more flexible approach to design?**
- Please provide comments below on design matters you consider to be particularly important. We would be especially interested in your views on whether we should include general design guidance on relevant site allocations.**

15.0 TACKLING CLIMATE CHANGE

- 15.1 Climate change is one of the biggest threats that we face both as a district, nationally and globally. Extreme weather events and rising sea levels are more common and the rate of species extinction is increasing. These impacts will affect Maldon District, especially as it does have an issue with flood risk and is rural, with agriculture as one of its main employment sectors. Taking bold and decisive action over the next 15 years (or sooner) will be critical if we are to avoid global temperature rising beyond 2 degrees Celsius, which is identified as a critical level, above pre-industrial levels.
- 15.2 To this end the Council can in its review of the LDP significantly strengthen its policies in connection with climate change. This however, could come at a cost in terms of how much developers may be able to provide in other funding contributions for infrastructure such as affordable housing, and community funding. One of the main requirements of a local plan is its policies must not make development unviable or unaffordable to build. The Council tests this by carrying out a viability appraisal on all its policies. In connection with climate change the Council is interested in the following;
- 1) Should the LDP Review make climate change one of its key priorities?**

2) What do you consider to be important in terms of development and climate change? Are on site renewables such as photovoltaics, ground source heat pumps, etc as important/more important as off-site renewable energy projects such as on-land wind farms, solar farms, district heating networks, etc?

3) Should we plan for net-zero carbon from plan adoption in 2023? - This would require all new development to be net-zero carbon upon adoption of the plan. Would the Council need to bring forward any additional guidance to support this?

4) Should we plan for net-zero carbon from a specific future date? - This would require all new development to achieve net zero carbon from a future date in the plan process, set out in policy. It could allow time for the development industry to adjust to the higher standards and may mean we can secure more affordable housing and community benefits from development, earlier on in the plan process.

16.0 ENHANCING AND GROWING THE ECONOMY

16.1 Enabling the creation of a prosperous economy is an important objective of plan making. The provision of high quality employment land works to attract business and enterprise to an area, which in turn creates and diversifies employment opportunities, increases the addition of value and ultimately strengthens the local economy.

16.2 A high quality retail offer is attractive to residents and visitors alike, but the nature of the high street has rapidly changed within a very short period of time, this has been accelerated with the Covid pandemic and the closure of some key national anchor retail outlets.

16.3 In a rural area the prosperity and success of the rural economy can help with job growth and retention when other sectors are struggling and Maldon district has a high number of self-employed residents as well as a high number of niche rural businesses. These types of employment also link into the continuing sustainability of smaller rural settlements providing some local employment, in some cases providing higher wages and the opportunity for younger people to stay and work in their communities.

16.4 The Bradwell B site is designated in the current National Policy Statement for Energy Infrastructure (EN-6) for large scale nuclear, a policy position that the Council supports if it can be demonstrated that nuclear sector development and associated major infrastructure projects would make a meaningful contribution to a low carbon economy and bring potentially significant economic benefits to the area.

1) Should the local plan policies strongly support the economy in terms of a transition to a low carbon economy, ensuring development and growth opportunities are supported through this process?

2) Should the local plan allocate employment land so that it extends existing employment premises / areas in the District by working with existing businesses to ascertain their future need?

3) Should the Council contain a policy preventing the redevelopment of employment premises to residential units? If so, should the scope of such a policy be limited in any way? Please explain the rationale for your answer.

4) How important is the rural economy? How do you believe the rural economy can be supported through policy?

5) Should the nature, size and type of policy support for Maldon and Burnham-on-Crouch`s High Streets` change? How would you like the high street to change?

17.0 THE VISITOR ECONOMY

17.1 The visitor economy is covered by policy E5 in the current Local Plan. This policy supports development which contributes positively to the growth of local tourism in a sustainable manner and realise opportunities that arise from the District's landscape, heritage and built environment. Development for new tourist attractions, facilities and accommodation should demonstrate an identified need for the provision proposed and have good connections with other tourist destinations. The policy supports existing tourism development.

1) Do you believe this policy requires modification? If so how would you like to see it changed?

2) Do you believe this policy encourages tourism or is it too restrictive?

18.0 PROTECTING AND ENHANCING THE ENVIRONMENT

18.1 Maldon District is blessed with an outstanding natural landscape. The two estuaries that it lies on form a distinctive characteristic and form an attractive lure for visitors. Many of the areas are of international, national and local importance and subsequently have been designated as Ramsar Sites, Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), Special Protection Areas (SPA), Special Areas of Conservation (SAC) and National Nature Reserves (NNR). Development can result in unacceptable negative impacts on areas of wildlife value. It is for this reason that new housing already pays a financial contribution in the District to mitigate impacts that would otherwise occur through increased user pressure.

1) Should the Council consider having protected landscape views in the District, even though this may place development pressure elsewhere?

19.0 ACCESS AND SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT

19.1 The Government define sustainable transport as "any efficient, safe and accessible means of transport with overall low impact on the environment, including walking and cycling, low and ultra-low emission vehicles, car sharing and public transport". Promoting sustainable transport in new development can have multiple benefits – these include reducing traffic congestion, reducing carbon dioxide emissions, improving air quality, and improving both physical and mental health.

19.2 Though, Maldon District is rural in character, it does not mean that some rural settlements do not have access to services and facilities in towns and larger settlements. The Council is supportive, in principle, of how it could integrate the 15/20-minute neighbourhood

concept⁴ into the planning for growth, recognising however, that this is not practicable in some of the District's more rural locations. Most of the District has access to a reasonably regular bus service with shopper and commuter benefits and the District has four train stations all with access to London and regional connections, via Wickford.

- 19.3 Aside from the A12 and A414 both outside and inside the District, the road network is generally provided on lower-order B and C class roads. Whilst not comparable to some of the larger urban locations like Chelmsford and Colchester, this could be seen as a positive feature because it adds to the character of the District and is part of the attraction for those residents and visitors who seek a quiet rural idyll. However, some settlements find they have little or no footpath provision running alongside their rural roads, which can deter people to walk to services for safety reasons.
- 19.4 The current LDP sought to provide the following highway and public transport infrastructure to support the growth in the LDP, linked to Strategic Allocations throughout the District, which continue to remain relevant:
- North Heybridge Relief Road (part of North Heybridge Garden Suburb);
 - South Maldon Relief Road (part of South Maldon Garden Suburb);
 - Upgrades to B1018 Langford Road/ Heybridge Approach and A414 roundabout;
 - Improvements to B1010 and B1021 junction in Burnham on Crouch;
 - A414 Oak Corner and Spital Road junction improvements;
 - Eves Corner Junction changes in Danbury; and
 - Passenger transport improvements in South Maldon, North Heybridge and Burnham on Crouch.
- 19.5 In developing the LDP Review, it will be important that consideration is given how the above schemes can continue to be catered for and any additional highway and transportation impacts that any new spatial strategy and policies may lead to and the appropriate mitigation to minimise these impacts.
- It will also be important as to what other initiatives should be exploited to help improve access and transport in the District, including complementary measures such as developing place-based Transport Strategies to manage various competing demands for roadspace, parking and public transport in specific areas more effectively and in a coordinated manner; securing a District-wide Local Cycling and Walking Implementation Plan (LCWIP); and investing in project development such as the Department for Transport's Restore Your Railways Ideas Fund that could support the introduction of new movement corridors to support model shift.
- 19.6 The Council intend to commission a Highways and Transport Modelling Study that will help evaluate the impacts and test the mitigation necessary to reduce the impact. This will include reviewing appropriate opportunities to promote sustainable transport modes and a shift in people's behaviour of how they look to travel in the future, including a greater take-up of active travel choices (such as walking and cycling), reviewing any significant impacts from new development on the capacity and congestion on the transport network, any issues concerning highway safety and mitigation costs.
- 1) In terms of access and sustainable transport in the District, what is most important to you?**
- 2) Should the Council focus future growth on those areas with higher levels of commuter access either by bus or train?**

⁴ [The 20-minute neighbourhood | Town and Country Planning Association \(tcpa.org.uk\)](https://www.tcpa.org.uk)

- 3) Should all new development be linked to its settlement by a footpath wide enough to accommodate a wheelchair or double buggy/pram?
- 4) Should development have to demonstrate that it can provide footpath/cycle links, which incorporate green infrastructure and support active travel choices?
- 5) Should the council continue to explore and support complementary projects delivered outside the planning system that can support travel choice and modal shift in the District?

20.0 SECURING INFRASTRUCTURE

- 20.1 The Government is clear in national policy that the LDP Review should set out a strategic policy which makes sufficient provision of infrastructure including transport, telecommunications [including digital and broadband], security, water supply, wastewater, flood risk and coastal change management and the provision of minerals and energy. It also stresses that community facilities such as health and education must also form part of the development of the future planning strategy for the District.
- 20.2 The LDP Review will put expectations on new developments to deliver high quality development with infrastructure to support the local community. These requirements, commonly known as S106 contributions or Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) will have financial implications for development. Our policies in the LDP Review should therefore be clear so that developers do not pay too much for a piece of land then determine that they cannot afford to meet our policy requirements. All policy requirements are important but no requirement can be so high that it makes development unviable, so if one is raised, another may need to reduce. To help us set our policy requirements at a level that is viable for development to go ahead, the Council will be commissioning an update to its Viability Assessment.
- 20.3 In the delivery of the first five years of the current LDP, not all infrastructure has come forward at the pace envisaged. It is acknowledged that there are perceptions that there have been delays in expanding The Plume secondary school and the construction of the South Maldon Relief Road in Maldon, for example. Whilst the upgrades have not yet taken place, this is not down to the infrastructure not being planned for or S106 contributions not coming forward from development that has been constructed, rather there has been a slower than anticipated delivery of housing units in the Garden Suburbs and on other strategic allocations, which has in turn, not brought in enough S106 contributions yet to fund their delivery; but with further time and demand created when the new housing is built, triggers to release more funding from the developments will be hit.
- 20.4 The LDP Review will therefore be an important opportunity to consider how development in the District can best meet the needs of new and existing residents and businesses supported by necessary infrastructure. This will include considering if certain spatial options (as set out earlier in Section 9), or development phasing offer a better chance of securing the necessary infrastructure upgrades, given advantages over critical mass and how existing capacities are being managed by infrastructure commissioners or providers and how these relate to national standards or benchmarking.

- 20.5 There is a need for high quality digital connectivity to continue to support the District's residents, businesses, transport infrastructure and key services, such as schools and GP practices. Through work undertaken by Superfast Essex, more of the District's rural locations have access to superfast broadband, but connection in more remoter places can be limited. The Government is currently considering requiring all new build residential developments to be fitted with full fibre digital connections, which the LDP Review will support as far as possible.
- 20.6 Whilst the Council is the local planning authority for the District, it is not responsible for the commissioning or delivery of many of the forms of infrastructure that communities depend on. It is imperative therefore that the Council continues to work with all relevant infrastructure stakeholders, including Essex County Council to prepare an update to the Maldon District Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to ensure all developments have the best chance of being supported by the required infrastructure that offsets its impact on the District. This will include a review of infrastructure costings and help inform how development can be sustainably phased and reflected in the LDP Review policies. The IDP should also be able to continue to be used to consider whether a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), or any future replacement would help bring in additional contributions from more developments that otherwise have an impact.
- 20.7 Finally, moving forward, it will also become more important for the council to chase every penny of external funding and lobby Government and other funding bodies when infrastructure delivery either falls short of expectations, or cannot be funded fully/ at all by development.
1. **Should the Council focus future growth on those areas which stand to offer the better chance of securing infrastructure upgrades due to critical massing of development in particular locations?**
 2. **Affordable housing is often the biggest influence on viability, so should the Council continue to prioritise this policy requirement over infrastructure contributions or design quality across the District?**