Question 8

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 8. Do you agree with the Council using the standard methodology in the calculation of its housing target for the period 2023 – 2043?	COUNCILS RESPONSE
Jenny	Clemo	Langford & Ulting Parish Council	The housing figure used should take into account the actual area of land available for development in the District once areas subject to flooding, rural countryside, woodland, protected coastal areas, Conservation Areas etc are removed.	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced. At the present time there is sufficient suitable land in the District to deliver the whole housing requirement. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months.
Gavin	Rowsell		Maldon District residents do not want the industrial scale housing targets under any guise, so why does the Council not explore other options under the clause 'exceptional circumstances justify an alternative approach'? (yes, we actually know why, but residents are not seeing the benefit of the Council's increased funding). Chelmsford and Braintree (as part of our Housing Market Area) should be approached (as before) to help alleviate any Maldon District needs	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced or cannot be accommodated within the District, therefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months
Gareth	Davies	N / A	The LDP needs to fulfil the requirements set out by the Government (failure to do this risks further unmanaged housing development). Using the standard methodology ensures that agreeing the LDP will take less time and increases the ability of MDC to use the LDP to manage future development in the District	Support noted
Jackie	Gibbs		I do agree that a target should be set, however, would question why with a reducing countrywide populace the target needs to increase year on year. Where are all the requirements coming from? There are enough brown sites & empty retail establishments ripe for conversion to enable a reduction in new builds.	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced, therefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months. The District does not have a history of industrial development so therefore does not have many brownfield sites, this means that development will have to go on greenfield sites. Empty retail uses would not be enough to fill the housing requirement.
Mike	Hayes		I am unconvinced that the existing commitments on housing are all likely to materialise within the plan period. This should be analysed further.	The District has a low slippage rate with regard to planning permissions not being implemented it is about half the national rate, there is no evidence that the existing commitments will not come forward.
David	Sismey		Interest rate rises likely to dampen house prices / price appreciation and therefore the price / median income assessment is probably wrong. In addition birth rate has fallen significantly. Both of these mean the housing estimates are probably too high.	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced, therefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months. Not building enough homes to meet demand could see house prices rise in the District making owning a house even less affordable
Stuart	Willsher	Persimmon Homes Essex	The NPPF confirms at para. 61 that housing targets should use the standard method, "unless exceptional circumstances justify an alternative approach." Persimmon Homes has reviewed the "Maldon District Local Housing Needs Assessment" and agrees with its findings that there is not a strong case for the Council to move away from the standard method figure (in either an upward or downward direction). Accordingly, the housing target should be minimum of 200 homes per annum	Support noted
Anthony	Fittock		In terms of strategy selected these are inportant factors in terms of sustainability from a climate perspective Agents in Rural South East Lower again describe a buoyant housing market, despite the area being predominantly the Dengie National Nature Reserve. Agents suggest a high proportion of buyers are retirees who live away from the commuter towns and older families looking for a quieter pace of life,for example in Tillingham. There is a trend for buyers in Maldon District to come from the eastern side of London, such as Dagenham and Romford, as well as Thurrock. Overall, there is an increasing number of purchasers coming from outside of the district, agents attributed this to buyers wanting to have more space especially as commuter patterns may change in light of Covid-19 pandemic	Comment noted but where in migrants come from does not affect the standard methodology other than in migration is built into the 2014 population projections which the method uses.
Daniel	McAllister	Robert Mulholland And Company Limited	The standard method produces a minimum number of houses that should be planned and the Council should seek to deliver more than this.	Support noted, the Council is looking at what buffer is should put on the housing requirement.
Sarah	Sapsford		Whilst I don't agree with the methodology government demAnds there is not much that can be done.	Comment noted, it is a requirement of the local plans that they now use the standard methodology for the calculation of the housing requirement.
Stephanie	Ireland		Have a real insight into how developments will affect communities by having regular face to face forums with residents in the area.	The Council is working toward a more productive relationship with the Parish Councils who are the elected representatives of local residents.
e	e	e	If this is meant to link to https://www.maldon.gov.uk/download/downloads/id/18676/maldon_district_local_housing_needs_assessment_may_2021.pdf then yes, I do agree.	Support noted
Kevin	Lagan		Targets change. Setting them now is wrong as we do not know what the need will be in the future.	The Council does know what the future population forecasts are, these are produced by the Office of National Statistics. The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced, therefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months.

Question 8

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 8. Do you agree with the Council using the standard methodology in the calculation of its housing target for the period 2023 – 2043?	COUNCILS RESPONSE
Bethany	Jones	Colchester Borough Council	Yes, use of the Standard Methodology is now a requirement as per the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The 'Maldon District Local Housing Needs Assessment' has now identified that Maldon is within a Housing Market Area with Chelmsford and Braintree. The current Housing Needs Assessment for Colchester which supported the adopted Section 1 Local Plan and is supporting the Emerging Section 2, which is in the final examination stages, identifies the Housing Market Area as Braintree, Chelmsford, Colchester and Tendring. Any impact to future plan making will need to be explored further through the Duty to Cooperate by all affected authorities. Response is subject to call in until 15 March.	Comment noted. Duty to Co-operate meetings are arranged on a regular basis with the respondant.
magnus	Magnusson	Parker Planning Services	Yes, the Council should use the 'standard methodology' for calculating its housing need in the plan period and as prescribed by national planning policy and guidance. This would result in a figure of 4,492 new dwellings in the period 2023-2024	Support noted
Nick	Whiteley		I think an increase in affordable is absolutely required. Regardless of the aging populace in the district, couples are having less children due to financial strains, renting is quickly becoming the least viable method with rents increasing year on year easily keeping up with potential mortgage payments. Increasing affordable housing should alleviate some (residents) funds for general spending in the public, shopping etc, increasing the economy within the district	The Council will be assessing the level of affordable housing provision as part of the LDP Review
Linda	Flowers	Self Employed	The base figure but not plus unnecessary buffers. Also my concern with these numbers is that they are supplying national not local need. The vast majority of these properties are being built for in-migration from areas with higher house prices. The majority of residents, including those unable to afford these houses, do not benefit by seeing the substantial erosion of green land and subsequent downgrading of road access and by-passes. The local housing needs are not being designed for. Insufficient older and younger persons homes are being constructed. Need for affordable housing for is not being adequately measured or designed for. There is no allowance for the need for single younger person households but a presumption that they will have to wait until they form a multi income household. These figures need to consider possible reductions due to commercial competitive risks I.e. the South Woodham Ferrers strategic site which proposes low carbon housing and has a station and main road links.	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced, and it is expected that Councils will put in place a buffer on the housing requirement. Therefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months. The whole LDP will have to undergo a viability assessment and the cost of infrastructure will be examined in terms of its level of contribution from developers versus keep development viable.
Peter	Holmes		I think that the housing target should be based on LOCAL needs. I can't believe this equates to another 6200 units by 2042. If we do build this number, it will just attract people wanting to re-locate from London. This would put massive pressure on the District's infrastructure.	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced, therefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months. It is not possible to control who moves into the District but wider population growth predications do show an increased need for
Colin	Pryke		Is any other acceptable methodology available.	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced, therefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months
John	Hitcham		When determining planning applications, MDC seem to think that One Size Fits All. Each sub area of the the district has distinct needs. Eg: There may be a great need for1/2 bed dwelling in the ditrict as a whole. But in Burnham with large new states with high 1./2 bed content and the approved Old People's Village just out of town, there is/will be very shortly a surplus of 1.2 bed dwellings. Plans to be sustainable must be based on local local housing need, a shortabage in Eg: Heybridge is pretty irrelevant to Burnham	When assessing housing need the whole district is assessed and there is not that much difference in and around the settlements. The Council cannot control who moves into the District or where they are going to live so a spread of housing choices including bedroom and size is essential across the district.
Richard	Kelly	Croudace Homes	Whilst we agree in principle, the requirement of delivering 308 dwellings per annum ('dpa') should be clearly recognised as a minimum requirement as set out at paragraph 11b of the National Planning Policy Framework ('NPPF') which states, "strategic policies should, as a minimum, provide for objectively assessed needs for housing". To note – the Council has included a 20% buffer on top of the dpa figure which results in 370 dpa over the plan period (7,392 / 20 years). Again, this should be the minimum delivered. In ensuring the 308 dpa or indeed 370 dpa is a minimum, this will provide the base to allow affordability to improve across the District which currently sits at 11.6% (property price to earnings ratio). The District therefore needs to do everything it can to ensure this continues and a key driver for this is to ensure a sufficient supply and mix of sites" (National Planning Policy Framework, paragraph 68 ('NPPF')) are allocated which are deliverable	The Council understands that any housing requirement is always set out as a minium and is not a ceiling. Support noted
Andy	Quelch		see my previous comments on the way I feel it should be addressed.	Noted
James	Rushton		There has to be a housing target. The key is what sort of housing and where it is built. It is so important to the character of the district that the small and medium villages retain their character (as described in relation to the North West Area in the Spatial Picture) and that there continues to be separation between the built areas and those smaller settlements	There are no plans or discussions to merge settlements and the Council understands the importance that residents hold with retaining a settlements individual status.
Catherine	Champion		There should be an adjustment to take into account all the over development of the last few years.	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced, therefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months

Question 8

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 8. Do you agree with the Council using the standard methodology in the calculation of its housing target for the period 2023 – 2043?	COUNCILS RESPONSE
Terence	Hughes	Burnham-on-Crouch constituent	The calculation should be how much increase in the population can the infrastructure take and how can we improve the infrastructure to accommodate this increase. Unfortunately the opposite seems to happen with the infrastructure chasing the increase in population.	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced, therefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months.
John	Tompkins		How can a LHNA be accurate when the base information is incorrect? An inaccurate LHNA leads potentially to poor decisions that can destroy communities. There are however a significant number of inaccuracies appertaining to the survey purported to have been carried out on the village in 2021 and recorded in the consultation documentation. IIt creates a false impression as to the requirements and as to how communities are able to absorbe new development. The inaccurate information also creates a false impression of sustainability in some smaller and medium sized villages.	The Local Housing Needs Assessment was updated in 2021, it is not clear how this relates to a survey in a village so no further comment can be made.
Jeremy	Potter	Chelmsford City Council	The City Council welcomes MDC's review of housing needs and its conclusion that Maldon lies within a Housing Market Area with Chelmsford and Braintree, taking into consideration migration and travel to work. It is noted that an early review of the LDP is required in part due to under delivery against its housing targets for the last three years, and being unable to demonstrate a five year supply of available housing land. The carry-over of the shortfall, and the application of a 20% contingency buffer, results in a target of 4,492 new homes over the plan period. The City Council welcomes MDC meeting their housing need in full.	Support noted
Daniel	Goodman	Rochford District council	The Council notes that MDC has a housing need of around 308 homes per year, as calculated using the standard method set out in Government guidance. The Council also notes that MDC proposes to include a buffer of 20% to allow for greater choice and to serve as a contingency. The Council would support MDC's commitment to meeting this housing need within its own authority area and supports the inclusion of a buffer as an effective way to provide competition and choice in housing supply, as well as to provide a contingency and continuing authority for the development plan in the event of sites not coming forward as expected. The Council would support MDC's continuing monitoring of both housing need and supply as plan-making progresses, to ensure that the version of the plan finally adopted provides a strong basis for meeting local housing need over the plan period. The Council also acknowledges that in the context of its own Local Plan (Spatial Options) consultation in August 2021, it wrote to MDC to understand whether Maldon District would be able to accommodate any of Rochford's housing needs that the Council expects cannot be met outside of the Green Belt. The Council acknowledges and accepts MDC's response that the stage of plan-making means it is too early to be able to make this assessment, but that in any case, Maldon and Rochford sitting in different housing markets mean alternative routes to addressing this need should be exhausted first.	Support noted
Chris	Harvey		The proposed increase of housing within the District over the 20 year period is very high and it would be useful for residents to know the proposed increase of the population can be absorbed with the required levels of infrastructure. Under the current LDP to date there has been a marked failure for the infrastructure to keep pace with the increase in population.	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced, therefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go or what infrastructure is required and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months.
Jane	Senior		Consideration should be borne in mind that to be linked within the Housing Market of Braintree and Chelmsford, they have greater space and accesssibility (Maldon has water on one side and only one way movement out of the area). Also despite the shortfall of houses within the current LDP , are all current properties occupied, purchased or even affordable. I think the housing target for the next period should be reviewed and hopefully reduced in number so as not to alter the 'feel' of living in Maldon and rather turn the area in 'overspill' with no character which personally is the impression given in Braintree, Witham and Chelmsford. You cannot lose the centre or hub of the area or make it hard to find in the planned sprawl.	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced, nor that it cannot be accommodated within the District herefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months.
Amanda	Clack		Whilst in principle this seems logical, it is against the overarching Government policy for Levelling Up. Whilst the technical assessment provides information on the range of sites that are available to meet the housing need, we understand it is the LDP that will determine which of those sites are the most suitable to meet those needs. Site ALT2 specifically needs to be reconsidered and rejected, with sites to the north of the District, with their better infrastructure connections offering better alternatives and having less impact on an area of outstanding natural beauty. I cannot understand why Maldon District Council in Essex needs to call for more housing on a narrow overcrowded peninsular of land with poor infrastructure when there is a government policy of Levelling Up and moving more industry, with housing and jobs, to the north of the country? The housing target for Maldon District seems to be contrary to that policy.	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced, therefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months. The Council cannot respond on site specifics at this stage of LDP Review. Work on site allocations will be undertaken in the coming months with a Preferred Options consultation being carried out at the end of this period.

Question 8

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 8. Do you agree with the Council using the standard methodology in the calculation of its housing target for the period 2023 – 2043?	COUNCILS RESPONSE
Daphne	Scott		I believe the criteria used to assess the size of villages to be too simplistic and in error. The village of Althorne has been upgraded to 'sustainable' just because it has a railway station and because the person doing the assessment was working on outdated information. It appears that they thought that the village has a shop and Post Office. Sadly this is not the case. The village has one pub, a church, a village hall and a church hall (both of which a very old) and a recreation park. The railway line from Althorne goes to Wickford with a few commuters trains going to London and the route of the line close into the River Crouch and will be vulnerable to flooding and even be submerged totally if the rise in ocean and river levels increases at the rate predicted. And most people living in the village work in the larger towns such as Chelmsford, Maldon and Colchester. There is no bus service to most of the village and anyone moving into this locality will be forced to use their own cars (thereby increasing CO2 emissions as very few people can finance the purchase of new electric cars) to access shops, all medical services and entertainment venues.	The answer does not relate to the question so no further comment can be made other than at the present time the Council cannot comment on whether individual settlements can or cannot accommodate future growth.The LDP Review process has to plan for future growth and it will have to be accommodated within the District. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and this was one of the reasons for the Issues and Options Consultation. In the coming months work will be undertaken to make the necessary decision using the evidence prepared as part of the LDP Review work.
Kenny	Alexander	Thomas Gainsborough School	Understandable that an algorithm is utilised to plan, but specific locations need personalisation and not generic calculations.	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced, therefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months
David	Kennedy		I would disagree that 5% of the population is sufficient to be representative considering that the list was produced at random. I would disagree that with such a small sample (5%) any degree of weighting would be capable of removing all potential for bias. The consultants study take no account of the impact that Covid-19 has had on migration over the last two years in that more people are looking to move from locations to more rural ones., a trend that is likely to continue.	It is not clear what the consultee response means - so no further comment can be made.
Mark	Behrendt	Home Builders Federation	As is recognised in the Local Housing Needs Assessment report the standard method arrives at the minimum number of homes to be planned for, however there may be circumstances where a higher housing requirement is necessary. Whilst the Council's evidence considers the three scenarios set out in paragraph 2a-010 of PPG it is important to note that this paragraph also states that Councils should not be limited to the circumstances listed. As such it is important for the Council to consider if other circumstances, such as whether the level of housing delivery will be sufficient to support any economic growth aspirations in the Borough, may warrant a higher housing requirement to be established	The Council understands that any housing requirement is always set out as a minium and is not a ceiling. We also understand that circumstances such as a need for affordable housing or economic growth may mean that the Council has to consider a higher housing requirement. Support noted
Matthew	Cooper		Assumptions are made around the need to build housing for a population that outwardly commutes. These needs are likely to remain reduced due to the COVID-19 pandemic and increased working from home. This will reduce demand for housing in the District, relative to other areas of the UK, as already being evidenced by ONS House Price Indices by region.	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced, therefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months
Terry	Inkpen	None	Detailed analysis still in progress.	Comment noted, it is a requirement of the local plans that they now use the standard methodology for the calculation of the housing requirement.
christine	collins		ridiculously complicated - is that deliberate to prevent the average person from being able to comment ?	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced, therefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months
Stuart	Williams	Ace group	The area can't cope with more houses it is already at bursting point	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced, therefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months
Reegan	Howles		4,492 homes from 2023 to 2043 is a very large number of homes that need to be built. Whilst I am in no position to argue with governmental projections, it is clear that the rate of this development is unsustainable, and we cannot continue to build homes in the South East at this speed. Wider, governmental strategies need to be introduced to stimulate growth in other areas of the UK, where land is more readily available. If this number is to be achieved, any developments in the district should prioritise brownfield sites in areas with a good existing infrastructure. Large developments should not occur in small villages, and any developments should be split evenly across the district, preventing any one region from being overwhelmed.	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced, therefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months. The District does not have a history of industrial development so there is very little brownfield land to bring forward and the development of housing inevitably will have to go on greenfield land.
jasbir	Singh		I agree that setting a housing target is right. However, some of the sites given consideration are in my opinion not suitable for the reasons I have outlined already. Especially ALT2	Support noted. At the present time the Council cannot comment on whether individual settlements can or cannot accommodate future growth.The LDP Review process has to plan for future growth and it will have to be accommodated within the District. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and this was one of the reasons for the Issues and Options Consultation. In the coming months work will be undertaken to make the necessary decision using the evidence prepared as part of the LDP Review work.

Question 8

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 8. Do you agree with the Council using the standard methodology in the calculation of its housing target for the period 2023 – 2043?	COUNCILS RESPONSE
Janice	Jackson		this target needs to be reduced. you are proposing major developments in the althorne, burnham and southminster areas and they cannot cope. Surely you should be focussing this towards Witham and Chelmsford where more infrastructure is in place	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced, therefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months.
Roy A	Clare	Charities	It's fine as far as it goes, but it feels unimaginative in terms of "affordable housing" as a priority. I would favour more emphasis on 'first homes', with a demand for new tech, innovative house-building options, so that lower-cost "starter" units can be constructed more quickly, to meet local needs and respond to the government's latest policy expectations. Such "starter homes" should be eco-demonstrators too, with particular attention to fuel economy.	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. This is a minimum and in order to bring forward additional affordable housing if evidence supports this possibility then the housing requirement can be uplifted further.
Felicity	Gale		Reduce the housing allocation within small villages and place where current infrastructure is in place.	No decisions have been made at this time as to where the future growth of the District is going to be placed, this is a decision that the Council will have to make in the coming months.
Lindsey	Wright		Maldon has far too many houses now! There are not enough roads to cope. There are not enough doctors to cope. There are not enough schools to cope. There are not enough GPs to cope.	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months.
David	Hill	Dandara Ltd	Yes, it should, however, the Local Housing Needs Assessment states that the standard method arrives at the minimum number of homes to be planned for and there may be circumstances where a higher housing requirement is necessary, especially where neighbouring authorities potentially have Green Belt restrictions to overcome going forward and given its proximity and connectivity with London	Maldon District does not have any greenbelt land, though its neighbouring authorities do there is no thoughts at the present time that they wish Maldon to accommodate their future growth.
Steven	Potter		It is ridiculous to apply national standard methodology to Maldon District, which covers a large area, much of which is sparsely populated. The vast developments resulting from the current plan are swamping small villages like North Fambridge. It is important to bear in mind that the district borders the North Sea on the east and the river Crouch on the south, so all traffic has to travel north and west, and there are only four main routes out of it.	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced, therefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months.
Vysian	Banyard	TKPC	We understood there was no choice in any case.	Comment noted, it is a requirement of the local plans that they now use the standard methodology for the calculation of the housing requirement.
Diane	Carter		Yes. But, please ensure that housing provision is made for key workers and those on lower incomes. Also, we need more 1 and 2 bedroom properties in this area.	Comment noted, housing for specialist needs is part of the Councils considerations when making policies for the district.
Luke	Garrett	Obsidian Strategic Asset Management Ltd	Obsidian Strategic agrees with the principle of the District Council applying the standard methodology in calculating its housing target on the basis of consistency with national policy. However, the NPPF is clear at Paragraph 61 that the standard methodology should be used to determine the minimum [our emphasis] number of homes needed. The PPG explicitly states that "there will be circumstances where it is appropriate to consider whether actual housing need is higher than the standard methodology indicates". Whilst the District Council's evidence base, principally its Local Housing Needs Assessment (May 2021), considers the 3no scenarios required by the PPG, it is prudent to note that the PPG also states that Local Planning Authorities should not be limited to the circumstances listed. As such, Obsidian Strategic considers it imperative that the District Council gives full regard to whether other circumstances indicate that a higher housing requirement should be adopted. Given the acknowledgement by the District Council of the current affordability crisis within Maldon, Obsidian Strategic considers that this should weigh in favour of establishing a housing target which exceeds the minimum calculated using the standard	Support noted. At the present time there is no evidence that the Council needs to move above the housing requirement as set out in the Standard Methodology, though the Council is considering a buffer to the housing requirement to ensure choice for the market.
Robin	Fanshawe		I can only deal with my particular concerns which solely relate to the proposals for the overwhelming new development in Purleigh	At the present time the Council cannot comment on whether individual settlements can or cannot accommodate future growth.The LDP Review process has to plan for future growth and it will have to be accommodated within the District. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and this was one of the reasons for the Issues and Options Consultation. In the coming months work will be undertaken to make the necessary decision using the evidence prepared as part of the LDP Review work.
John	Brown		Who am I to question the guidance of people who have looked in detail at this. I don't like how much the population is likely to grow and I hope I will be long gone before the world is completely ruined by over population. I should say, even more ruined. If it was my choice I would want to minimise the population growth in the area by deliberately minimising the housing stock but that requirement is dictated by central government so out of our hands.	At the present time the Council cannot comment on whether individual settlements can or cannot accommodate future growth.The LDP Review process has to plan for future growth and it will have to be accommodated within the District. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and this was one of the reasons for the Issues and Options Consultation. In the coming months work will be undertaken to make the necessary decision using the evidence prepared as part of the LDP Review work.
Chris	Waumsley	Inovo Consulting	The standard methodology should be a starting point for calculating the housing target but to ensure delivery, choice and to remedy the current shortfall in housing supply an additional 10% should be added to the target over the standard methodology figure.	Support noted
Phil	Jacklin		The methodology would appear to include a 20% buffer which, I understand, is dictated by others	The buffer is a matter for the Council to decide it is the basic minimum housing requirement that is set by the national Standard Methodology.
Robert	Jones	The University of Reading	The specification of a 20% buffer is questionable and likely to open the door to excessive planning proposals.	The buffer is a matter for the Council to decide it is the basic minimum housing requirement that is set by the national Standard Methodology.

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 8. Do you agree with the Council using the standard methodology in the calculation of its housing target for the period 2023 – 2043?	COUNCILS RESPONSE
Robert	Stephens	N/A	Publishing a 5 year housing supply on a yearly basis is not satisfactory. Results should be made available on a more frequent basis which would provide an earlier indication that targets may be missed and what if any earlier corrective actions could be put in place to maintain a 5 year housing supply.	Best practise states that the 5 year supply should be published yearly. Everytime you publish all the planning application in the pipeline or at appeal have to be reassessed and discussed and the it creates uncertainty and increased costs for both the council and the applicants. The Council has in its Authority Monitoring Report this year reserved the right to publish twice yearly.
Pete	Butcher		The document is too long - not enough time to read it properly.	The Council has undertaken a learning exercise from the experience of this consultation and will, if necessary be making changes to future consultations. However, digital consultation is the way the Government is moving in regard to engaging with the planning system. The Council will always offer ways for those without digital acccess to engage with any consultation as we did with the Issues and Options Consultation where residents could telephone in with their comments.
JO	COOMBES		Although the council needs to set a housing target it needs to review whether the current target is correct, whether there are better ways of achieving it than land scale private new development on green land, and seriously review the weak and shoddy environmental commitments of planned developments	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced, therefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months.
Jonney	Aldridge		have we taken into account the land that will be under water by 2043	Areas in high flood risk are not considered suitable for housing allocations, there is sufficient land outside of high flood risk to accommodate the District`s future growth.
Mark	Hurley	Selfridges	There is no doubt mopre houses are needed in Essex due to polulation increases and it's right to address this and as I have nothing else to go on then the allocation in terms of numbers required I will have to acceppt as true. However, the way these additional houses are being proposed is WRONG! Whoever is planning this way seems to be just doing the least possible and cheapest they can to get the numbers. Social impact doesn't seem to get a show and there are so many more effective ways which woudl give all parties a better quality of living.	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced, therefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months.
Neil	Burke	Bradwell Power Generation Company Limited	Bradwell B do not have any specific comments to make on this question.	N/A
Lynne	Goodbourn		Geographic location and transport accessibility in the dengie peninsula requires specific attention	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced, therefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months.
Christopher	Kent		Lot and lots of information then a figure. ????????	Not clear what this consultee means and therefore no further comment can be made.
Sophie	Pryor		Yes. However, paragraph 2a-010 of PPF states that Councils should not be limited to these levels of growth. Given the potential for a new nuclear power station within the District this is likely to create significant housing pressure in the short, medium and long term which will need to be planned for and addressed.	Support and comment noted
c/o Agent	c/o Agent	Clarion Housing	Clarion agree that the housing target should be based on the Standard Method calculation, in line with paragraph 61 of the NPPF. In light of the fact that MDC cannot currently demonstrate a 5YHLS, a 20% buffer is appropriate to ensure that there is a continuous supply of housing over the plan period and beyond, and the housing needs of the District are met.	Support noted
Stephanie	Jones	home	The specification of a 20% buffer is questionable and likely to open the door to excessive planning proposals.	The question does not relate to the consultees response so no further comment can be made
Phillipa	Griffiths		It states there is no additional housing needs, yet more and more houses are being built WITH NO INFRASTRUCTURE!!!	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced. The Council will assess future infrastructure needs as part of the LDP Review, therefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months.
Matthew	Taylor		The consultation document sets out an assessment of need. The Council needs to overlay issues related to land supply and infrastructure capacity and environmental impact in considering whether this can be sustainably accommodated.	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced in terms of infrastructure, land supply or environmental impact, therefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months.
Anne	Bailey		Create extra housing but in suitable areas where there is less impact on the invroment and poeples mental health. i.e. having to travel miles to be able to get to work or connect with transport.	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced, therefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months.
Lucien	Taylor		I agree with the setting of housing targets but surely we need to factor in housing that could become available through natural death from an aged population.	Births and deaths are a factor when calculating the formation of new households in an area alongside inward and outward migration both national and international.

Question 8

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 8. Do you agree with the Council using the standard methodology in the calculation of its housing target for the period 2023 – 2043?	COUNCILS RESPONSE
David	Baker		1. The assessment of affordable housing needs is clearly flawed as developments consistently fail to deliver sufficient properties for the younger generation. First time buyers with an average age related local income are ill served. 2. The 20% contingency is not justified anywhere in the plan and needs to be reviewed as it inflates requirements considerably.	The present affordable housing targets were worked out as the maximum without causing development to become unviable. In the main developments are delivering that target and the LDP Review will be looking at these to see if they need to be adjusted. This question does not relate to the housing buffer so no further comment can be made
Glenna	Wilkins		Most people have no idea what the set target for extra housing in Maldon is and is, at the present time.	Comment noted, it is a requirement of the local plans that they now use the standard methodology for the calculation of the housing requirement.
Danny	Soul		Standard methodology should not be applied to the Maldon District due to its unique structure, for example a large proportion of the area is given over to protected coastline - thus it cannot be treated in the same way as land-locked districts.	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced, therefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months
Fiona	Barkham	Private Individual	However the Council should also include whether infrastructure capacity can be sustainably accommodated and have minimal to no environmental impact Site GB1 does not achieve these goals	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced, therefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months
Isabel	Adcock		Must look beyond the short term and plan for the future not just for time of political term	Comment noted, it is a requirement of the local plans that they now use the standard methodology for the calculation of the housing requirement.
alan	johnson	sky broadcasting	you are just saying it's right to carry on the same way you are which has already led to poor services and accessibility	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced, therefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months
Victoria	Cutmore	Endurance Estates	The NPPF is clear that there must be exceptional circumstances for a local planning authority not to use the standard method in its calculation of housing requirements. Indeed paragraph 10.1 and 10.3 acknowledge this. As part of this, it is necessary to consider whether actual household growth between 2014 and 2018 reflects the growth anticipated in the 2014-based household projections (2014HP) on which the standard method is based. The 2018-based household projections show a higher growth compared to the 2014-based household projections for Maldon, which is likely to indicate that demographic behaviour has changed. This should be taken into consideration in determining the housing requirement as part of the Plan's review.	The Council will be updating the LHNA prior to finally setting the housing target and will be assessing whether the housing requirement should be higher than the Standard Methodology.
Jane	Potter	Purleigh Parish Council	The Parish Council does not agree with using the standard methodology in the calculation of the housing target for 2023–2043. A standard nationally applied methodology should not be applied to the Maldon district, which covers a large area, much of which is sparsely populated, has very distinct topography and geology, and incorporates numerous Ramsar sites, sites of special scientific interest, special protection areas, special areas of conservation and national nature reserves. The large developments resulting from the current plan are already swamping small villages like North Fambridge to the detriment of the previously existing community. It is important to bear in mind that the district borders the North Sea on the east and the river Crouch on the south, so all traffic has to travel north and west and that there are only four main routes out of it. This, combined with its unique characteristics and landscape, make it deserving of a	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced, therefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months.
Brian	Haydon	Cold Norton Parish Council	Standard method for assessing housing need. Periodic review of projections and trends should be made to verify continued applicability.	The Council will be updating the LHNA prior to finally setting the housing target and will be assessing whether the housing requirement should be higher than the Standard Methodology.
Lee	Foster		LDP should respect the local area of outstanding beauty that we are lucky enough to enjoy and encourage further use not ruin it for everyone by enforcing major oversized developments	Comment noted, it is a requirement of the local plans that they now use the standard methodology for the calculation of the housing requirement. Maldon District does not have any areas of outstanding natural beauty in terms of a national designation
Vanessa	Horner		Maldon and Purleigh do not fit standard methodology. They are unique environment with specific needs and utilisation of facilities. A shop in wickford is very different from a community shop in Purleigh which is just a essential service not a supermarket. Also a cricket pavilion with a small kitchen and showers does not constitute an indoor sports facility or centre. Also an old people's residents should not be classed as a care home.	At the present time the Council cannot comment on whether individual settlements can or cannot accommodate future growth.The LDP Review process has to plan for future growth and it will have to be accommodated within the District. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and this was one of the reasons for the Issues and Options Consultation. In the coming months work will be undertaken to make the necessary decision using the evidence prepared as part of the LDP Review work.
Brian	Howson	Pharmaceutical company	I think there needs to be a wider conversation in the U.K government which sets the expectations for increased development about controlling migration to the U.K and making the inner cities (which have already lost most of their wildlife) a better place to live. Presently, it's quite clear to me, many people are leaving London / bigger / inner cities as they and their families don't feel safe	The LDP Review cannot take into account national migration conversations.
Marion	Gunn		Periodic reviews should be carried out to ensure continued applicability of methodology used	Comment noted, local plan have a legal obligation to be reviewed every 5 years.
BRIAN	COLLINS		Numerically yes as Government are driving policy, however I feel greater efforts should be used to minimise Urban sprawl.	Support noted
Peter	Lampard		However, I have reservations as I do not understand how it works.	Comment noted, it is a requirement of the local plans that they now use the standard methodology for the calculation of the housing requirement.

Question 8

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 8. Do you agree with the Council using the standard methodology in the calculation of its housing target for the period 2023 – 2043?	COUNCILS RESPONSE
Tim	Chilvers		It is agreed that the standard methodology should be used for calculating the housing target. This is a national planning policy requirement and the District does not face any particularly unusual challenges which would justify a deviation from this approach. It is considered that the housing market area, which includes Braintree and Chelmsford, is also appropriate and accepted that there is no overwhelming justification for Maldon to accommodate any of its neighbours unmet need. It is however noted that the District has a high cost of housing and a lack of rental housing supply, especially in the south of the District. The median housing prices to earnings ratio is 11.87 (2019) which is the highest in Essex, factors which have exacerbated the supply of affordable housing. While it is acknowledged that an uplift has been included to recognise the median house price to earnings ratio, it is considered that the local housing needs assessment should be revisited. Table 13.1 of the housing needs assessment identified a need of 174 affordable rental homes per annum. This is only the rental element of affordable housing and would require the affordable housing delivery to exceed 50% on every site if an annual delivery target of 308 homes is used. Clearly additional housing growth should be applied to the minimum annual target of 308 homes to take into account the housing demand necessary to support more ambitious economic growth and to redress the social imbalance which has arisen due to the lack of affordable housing delivery in recent years. The NPPF emphasises the Government policy which is to 'significantly boost' housing supply. Relying on a minimum (emphasis added) annual housing figure of only 308 homes is not considered to be aspirational and is far less likely to secure sufficient delivery of the right new homes in the right places. If the District genuinely wants to deliver high quality beautiful new communities, which meet its carbon reduction targets along with affordable housing needs, it needs to positively encourage competition in the housing market. The success and legacy of this new Local Plan hinges on its ability to release sufficient land in the right locations, with our client's site to the north of Goldhanger Road being an absolute prime example of a site that is capable of being forward-planned to create a logical extension to a high-order settlement	Support noted. The Council acknowledges that it must consider whether there needs to be an uplift to the housing requirement in order to deliver the affordable housing target. The Council cannot at this stage comment on individual settlements.
Elliott	George		Yes. Paragraph 61 of the NPPF states:"To determine the minimum number of homes needed, strategic policies should be informed by a local housing need assessment, conducted using the standard method in national planning guidance – unless exceptional circumstances justify an alternative approach which also reflects current and future demographic trends and market signals" We are not aware of an exceptional circumstances in the District and accordingly the Government's standard method should be used, a position we note the Council agrees with. The Maldon District Local Housing Needs Assessment (May 2021) identifies a housing requirement for the District which we are satisfied follows the correct methodology although this now needs updating to respond to the latest affordability data and continue to consider household growth over the next 10 years from the present day, prior to the submission of the emerging Local Plan for examination, in line with the planning practice guidance.	Support noted. The Council acknowledges that it must consider whether there needs to be an uplift to the housing requirement in order to deliver the affordable housing target. The Council cannot at this stage comment on individual settlements.
Kate	Ellis		I believe that the methodology used needs to be appropriate to the area being looked at. All areas throughout the country are unique and need to reflect this. Whilst it is appreciated that there may be a need for housing and targets, it needs to be carefully balanced with a true reflection of the actual need.	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced, therefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months.
Kevin	Ashman	Estates and Agency Strategic Land	The consultation document sets out an assessment of need. The Council needs to overlay issues related to land supply and infrastructure capacity and environmental impact in considering whether this can be sustainably accommodated.	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced, therefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months.

Question 8

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 8. Do you agree with the Council using the standard methodology in the calculation of its housing target for the period 2023 – 2043?	COUNCILS RESPONSE
Jake	Nugent	Endurance Estates Ltd	No. Exceptional circumstances exist to demonstrate that the Objectively Assessed Housing Need is higher than the Local Housing Need Standard Methodology as set out in the Planning Practice Guidance and the overall housing target should be a minimum of 7,350 dwellings, not 6,216 under the Standard Method, in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development as set out in paragraph 11 of the NPPF. Paragraph 10.1 of the consultation states that: "The 2021 NPPF (paragraphs 60-67) requires local authorities to meet locally established needs. This should be informed by a local housing needs assessment, (LHNA) conducted using the standard method in national guidance unless exceptional circumstances justify an alternative approach." This is not entirely correct. Paragraph 61 makes clear that the Local Housing Need Standard Method (LHNSM) only determines the minimum number of homes needed. Paragraph 11, the presumption in favour of sustainable development, makes clear that "strategic policies should as a minimum, provide for objectively assessed needs for housing". The only link between LHNSM and OANH is in footnote 21 of the NPPF. This explains that a plan is positively prepared when it provides a strategy which, as a minimum, seeks to meet the area's OANH, as assessed using a clear and justified method, as set out in paragraph 61. I.e., if exceptional circumstances exist that would suggest the OANH, taking an alternative approach to calculating housing need, is higher than the LHNSM then the OANH must take precedence otherwise the plan cannot be positively prepared. This ensures that whatever the final calculation the outcome complies with NPPF paragraph 60 and the Government's objective to significantly boost the supply of homes. Paragraph 2a-010 of the PPG explains when exceptional circumstances may exist (emphasis added): "The government is committed to ensuring that more homes are built and supports ambitious authorities who want to plan for growth. The standard method for assessing local housing need provides a minimum starting point in determining the number of homes needed in an area. It does not attempt to predict the impact that future government policies, changing economic circumstances or other factors might have on demographic behaviour. Therefore, there will be circumstances where it is appropriate to consider whether actual housing need is higher than the standard method indicates." Planning inspectors examining local plans have consistently required local authorities to confirm whether exceptional circumstances exist that might lead to the OANH being higher than the LHNSM. This is essential to ensure the Local Plan is justified, taking into account reasonable alternatives and based on proportionate evidence in accordance with NPPF paragraph 35. Bidwells	Comments noted, the LHNA will need to be updated prior to finally setting the housing requirement and the Council will be advised by that piece of work as to what the final requirement should be.
John	Buchanan		Clearly there is a considerable ammount of work that has gone on here however I cannot properly comment on this as I am not an experty on this field.	Comment noted, it is a requirement of the local plans that they now use the standard methodology for the calculation of the housing requirement.
Tim	Bradford	leadenhall	Until the roads etc can be properly maintained and doctors found any expansion is unwise.	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced, therefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months.
Jacky	Bannerman	Woodham Walter Parish Council	How can a LHNA be accurate when the base information is incorrect? An inaccurate LHNA leads potentially to poor decisions that can destroy communities. There are however a significant number of inaccuracies appertaining to the survey purported to have been carried out on the village in 2021 and recorded in the consultation documentation. IIt creates a false impression as to the requirements and as to how communities are able to absorbe new development. The inaccurate information also creates a false impression of sustainability in some smaller and medium sized villages.	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced, therefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months. The LHNA is the document which assists the Council with making an evidenced decision on the minimum housing requirement.
Mark	Tentori	Mazdev Limited	In accordance with the NPPF (para 11, b)) the housing needs should be identified as minimum targets. .	Support noted
Peter	Ingram		I think this is looking too far ahead. Although a long term approach is advisable, planning needs to be more focused to current needs.	The minimum length of a Local Plan is set down in National Planning Policy and is 15 years.
Jane	Pilgrim		Do we actually know how many more houses need to be built, as most reports say the birth rate in England is set to drop and that we will have too few young people soon to support the older generation, and thus will need fewer homes not more.	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced, therefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months.
Judith	Radcliffe		Need to argue with the central government for recognition of the schemes already given approval but not yet built, and more leverage with the developers not achieving the earlier targets	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced, therefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months.
Christopher	Mabbutt	Burnham Primary School	The standard methodology must be considered against the need to provide quality education provision within a sustainable distance from any new housing.	The Council consult ECC Education Authority on all planning applications and on the review of the LDP and the Council have to be advised by them concerning education provision.
Mary	Putt		If a figure is required it has to be calculated but the area, its populations and habitat are surely more important than figures. Over populating an area that is not adequately set up for development is just poor practise and likely to fail.	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced, therefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months.

Question 8

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 8. Do you agree with the Council using the standard methodology in the calculation of its housing target for the period 2023 – 2043?	COUNCILS RESPONSE
Alan	Shrimplin	N/A	From the HELA report section 5.2 states that 13 sites with 3275 house were included in the 2017 LDP up till 2021 2228 are to be completed, but only 4 of the 13 have been so far. Of the 3275, 483 will not be built and 554 will run past the current LDP time plan, that is 1/3rd of the allocated house in the LDP, This is unacceptable. The Report only identifies 20 new dwellings on Brown field site, nearly all sites identified for development are green field sites, this suits the developers as it cost less to develop green field sites. The report states that 203 sites have been identified, with the potential of 11549 new builds, with the average household being 2.4 people, that gives 23098 in population growth, yet the spatial picture gives a population growth to 2038 of 6200, the population growth estimates and house required are miss matched. With the estimated population growth only 2583 new houses are needed. From meeting the housing needs, we have 4492 new builds to meet MDC requirements this is a population growth of 10780, half of what the report says. The Local housing needs, does state that more people +65 year will be in the MDC district, and more houses will be required, But what must not happen is these must not be built in the wrong location and not be suitable or affordable to local people, as is happening with the build on BOC (land rear of No 2 Maldon Road, Carbuncle) this was forced through planning to meet a target for all of MDC district, which was wrong, the build will not meet the needs of locals, is not supported by NHS and should not have happened, houses for the + 65 people, needs to be in a location with good links to amenities, not stuck out on the edge of a town, it is a just for profit build	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced, therefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months. The Council cannot comment on individual sites at the present time.
Valerie	Coleby	Berrys	As suggested above we feel given the areas challenges with respect to affordability and local economy the Council should factor in these challenges and add an aspirational growth to the basic housing needs requirement in the light of local circumstances. As set out in the associated guidance on assessing housing needs, Local Planning Authorities can take into account of factors that are not captured by demographic projection trends to acknowledge undersupply, market signals and future job growth	Growth figures above the standard methology housing requirement do need to be evidenced at this point in time the Council has no evidence to uplift the housing requirement other than to add on a buffer which is normal practise.
Kevin	Bruce		Any calculation should be based on what the district REALLY NEEDS and not be based on central government demands. Or basically rural nature should be a primary consideration in allocating land for housing. Consolidate on existing urban areas.	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced, therefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months
William	Shepherd		Housing development should be based on what the surrounding infrastructure can support in terms of ready access to health care, education, road network, sewerage and social amenities	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced, therefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months including looking at infrastructure.
victoria	newson	Childrens Nursery	You have to be able to provide the services including schooling to those already living here before extending the population and making the problems even worse with thousands if new people flooding into the area.	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced, therefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months including looking at infrastructure.
David	Banfield		Without going through the document exhaustively the The LDP may be inaccurate with families moving into the area rather than within the area in recent years. E. G. 4 families moving into the village of Purleigh to both owner occupier and social rented are from London/ Stanford le Hope and possibly S. Africa (moved again) in the last few years. 2 relatives to at least one of these families who grew up in London had previously moved into Hatfield Peveral and Purleigh.	The Council cannot control who moves into an area. The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced, therefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months
Phillip	Wright	CALA Homes (North Home Counties) Ltd	We agree that MDC should follow the national standard methodology and ensure that this is used to set the District's overall housing target. This should be the minimum figure that the Council seeks to provide for. Not all proposed housing provision will come forward. Consequently, we support the incorporation of a 20% buffer, as set out in Table 1 within the consultation document: Table 1 - Proposed Housing Figure for the Period 2023 - 2043 2023 - 2043 308 homes per annum 6,160 Plus 20% buffer 1,232 Subtotal 7,392 Less existing commitments -3,161 Sub total 4,231 Plus, shortfall on completions from 2014 +261 Total 4,492 In terms of the stated 3,161 dwelling supply from existing commitments, we assume that this figure does not include 'windfalls'. We note that the conclusions of the Maldon District Local Housing Needs Assessment Final Report (May 2021), which was produced by Iceni Projects, supports the use of the 308 dpa figure and has found that the standard method would support sufficient labour supply growth for any of the economic scenarios set out by the Economy Study. We also note that the Assessment's findings that Maldon is no longer considered to represent a single Housing Market Area, but instead should now be viewed as forming part of the Braintree, Chelmsford and Maldon Housing Market Area.	Support noted

Question 8

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 8. Do you agree with the Council using the standard methodology in the calculation of its housing target for the period 2023 – 2043?	COUNCILS RESPONSE
.	.	SN Developments	Paragraph 61 of the NPPF expects the standard method to be used to determine the minimum number of houses needed. Section Id.2a of the Planning Practice Guidance explains how housing and economic needs assessments should be undertaken, including how to calculate local housing needs using the standard method. Paragraph 010 of Id.2a makes it clear that the standard method is the minimum starting point for determining local housing needs. Therefore, it is agreed that the standard method should be used to calculate the minimum housing requirement in emerging MLP. Paragraph 024 of Id.2a of the Planning Practice Guidance explains how the need for affordable housing is calculated, and it is suggested that the overall housing target should be increased where it could help deliver the required number of affordable homes. It is noted in the latest monitoring data (for 2019/20 published in December 2020) demonstrates a poor delivery of affordable housing against identified needs and policy requirements. There is an identified need to provide 182 affordable dwellings per annum, and a policy requirement to provide 40% affordable housing. The Local Housing Needs Assessment (prepared by Iceni Projects Ltd in May 2021) identified a need for 174 affordable dwellings per annum, which is broadly similar to previously identified needs. The monitoring data demonstrates that the annual average target and affordable housing requirement were not met in any of the years between 2014/15 and 2019/20. A total of 275 affordable dwellings were delivered in that five year period, compared with an affordable housing requirement of 910 dwellings, which represents a substantial shortfall in affordable housing delivery. For these reasons it is requested that emerging MLP should make an upward adjustment to the housing requirement derived from the standard method, to address poor delivery of affordable housing in the past and to ensure that current identified affordable housing	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced, or increased at this present time therefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months. An assssment of affordable housing need will be updated in the coming months.
.	.	Cooper Property Holdings Ltd	Paragraph 61 of the NPPF expects the standard method to be used to determine the minimum number of houses needed. Section Id.2a of the Planning Practice Guidance ('PPG') explains how housing and economic needs assessments should be undertaken, including how to calculate local housing needs using the standard method. Paragraph 010 of Id.2a makes it clear that the standard method is the minimum starting point for determining local housing needs. Therefore, it is agreed that the standard method should be used to calculate the minimum housing requirement in the emerging MLP. Paragraph 024 of Id.2a of the PPG explains how the need for affordable housing is calculated, and it is suggested that the overall housing target should be increased where it could help deliver the required number of affordable homes. It is noted in the latest monitoring data (for 2019/20 published in December 2020) demonstrates a poor delivery of affordable housing against identified needs and policy requirements. There is an identified need to provide 182 affordable dwellings per annum, and a policy requirement to provide 40% affordable housing. The Local Housing Needs Assessment (prepared by Iceni Projects Ltd in May 2021) identified a need for 174 affordable dwellings per annum, which is broadly similar to previously identified needs. The monitoring data demonstrates that the annual average target and affordable housing requirement were not met in any of the years between 2014/15 and 2019/20. A total of 275 affordable dwellings were delivered in that five year period, compared with an affordable housing requirement of 910 dwellings, which represents a substantial shortfall in affordable housing delivery. For these reasons it is requested that the emerging MLP should make an upward adjustment to the housing requirement derived from the standard method, to address poor delivery of affordable housing in the past and to ensure that current identified affordable housing needs are met during the plan period.	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced, or increased at this present time therefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months. An assssment of affordable housing need will be updated in the coming months.

Question 8

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 8. Do you agree with the Council using the standard methodology in the calculation of its housing target for the period 2023 – 2043?	COUNCILS RESPONSE
Jane	Coleman	Maldon Town Council	Maldon Town Councillors challenge the need to review the LDP at this stage at all. Analysis of the housing supply indicates that it is more than adequate to meet the District's requirements over the period of the Plan. Further details are given in Appendix 1. Councillors do not support the proposal to address the identified housing shortfall in the first five years from the present but support taking a longer-term view to better reflect the cycles in the market. Therefore, the Five Year requirement is calculated to be 1,946 dwellings as against the Housing Update estimate which estimates a yield of 2,412 dwellings which seems perfectly adequate. Appendix 1 Councillors support (MM163) to amend 2.24 of the Plan to reflect the Objectively Assessed Housing Need (OAN) of 260 dwellings per annum (dpa). The increase of 50 dpa to 310 dpa should be regarded as an increase to the requirement, rather than as a component of the OAN and challenge whether this is required to create a further 2000 jobs. When considered against the annualised Plan target of 310 dpa, Table 3 of the Five-Year Supply Statement shows a shortfall of 303 dwellings since 2014/15, the beginning of this plan period. The District Council is proposing to address this in the first five years from the present, rather than spreading it across the whole plan period. A 5% buffer is applied, and the shortfall is included within this percentage calculation. Notwithstanding the more recent shortfall, the performance against the East of England Plan could not be described as a record of persistent under delivery warranting a 20% buffer. Councillors consider it is more appropriate to consider the longer-term picture, which better reflects the cycles in the market. Taking account of all this, the five-year requirement is calculated to be 1,946 dwellings. With the inclusion of the full windfall allowance, the Housing Update estimates that the supply of deliverable sites will yield 2,412 new homes in the five-year period between 2016/17 and 2020/21. When considered against the five-year requirement, that amounts to around 6.2 years' worth of housing land. Along with the 5% discount used, the degree to which the five-year requirement is exceeded represents a buffer in the event that delivery does not proceed entirely as anticipated. This is reassuring, and bolsters the confidence the District Council should have about the existence of a five year supply. Reserve Sites - The reserve sites proposed are in or on the edge of Maldon, Heybridge and Burnham. They would rely on the infrastructure serving these settlements, however, the highways and/or school capacity at each of these three settlements is constrained to the point where the Council agrees main modifications are needed to ensure the Plan will "strictly limit the capacity for growth". There is no evidence to demonstrate that local highways and schools could satisfactorily accommodate the level of housing envisaged on the	The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2017 section 4 states that the strategic policies in local plans must be legally reviewed every 5 years, the Council therefore started its review only a year early. The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced, therefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months. This response looks like it was one to a previous consultation, there are no reserve sites yet because the Council has not chosen its option for growth yet and the East of England Plan was revoked a number of years ago, no further comment can be made therefore.
Roy	Martin	Mr Roy Martin	Haven't enough information to comment fully, but note that single large developer led estates are not bringing forward required infrastructure and smaller more dispersed development across the district is acknowledged as more effective and manageable as far as providing or adapting supporting infrastructure is concerned.	Comment noted, it is a requirement of the local plans that they now use the standard methodology for the calculation of the housing requirement.
Simon	Butler-Finbow	Pigeon Investment Management	The NPPF states that the Standard Method should be used as the 'starting point' in determining the 'minimum' local housing need unless exceptional circumstances suggest that another approach should be taken, and that other factors should then be taken into account in order to arrive at a 'housing requirement' for inclusion in the LDPR, We are not aware that there are any such exceptional circumstances that suggest that alternative approach other than the Standard Method should be taken. The document 'Maldon District Local Housing Needs Assessment' (Iceni, May 2021) takes this approach and identifies a Standard Method Local Housing Need (LHN) of 308 dwellings per annum (dpa) as at August 2021 (this will vary slightly over time and should be recalculated in due course). The May 2021 Assessment also concludes (p. 53) that: "There are no circumstances in Maldon District relating to growth funding, strategic infrastructure improvements or affordable housing need which indicate that 'actual' housing need is higher than the standard method indicates." However, there is a need to ensure that unmet housing needs of neighbouring authorities or those in the same HMA are also addressed wherever possible. MDC has stated in the LDPR (Paragraph 10.2) that "there is no evidence of any unmet housing need in these neighbouring local authority areas which would potentially need to be considered as to how it might be addressed." It is not clear on what basis this assertion has been made. The lack of evidence and Duty-to-Cooperate statements to demonstrate an agreed position with neighbouring authorities in the HMA, or further afield, regarding housing needs is of concern and must be addressed before the next consultation if this stance is to be carried forward into the Plan. The PPG is clear in that 'housing need' is not the same as a Local Plan 'housing requirement' At present the LDPR does not propose a 'housing requirement' but rather confuses the terms 'need', 'requirement', 'target' and 'figure' and eventually sets out a 'Proposed Housing Figure for the Period 2023 – 2043' in the form of Table 1. It would appear from Table 1 that the LDPR document is proposing a 'housing requirement' of 7,392 homes, which includes a 20% buffer on top of the Standard Method LHN minimum. Table 1 goes on to make allowances for existing commitments (-3,161) and a shortfall on completions since 2014 (+261), arriving at a figure of 4,492, which is presumable the number of new homes for which the emerging Plan will seek to make provision. We have been unable to arrive at the same figures and on our analysis, adopting a 2023 start to the new plan period and a 20-year plan period, the detailed trajectory and evidence most recently published by MDC suggests existing commitments of 2,671 but no need to make an allowance for a shortfall on completions, thus arriving at a figure of 4,731 homes for which additional provision	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced, therefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months.

Question 8

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 8. Do you agree with the Council using the standard methodology in the calculation of its housing target for the period 2023 – 2043?	COUNCILS RESPONSE
sara	doran		I am unclear from the information what the definition of a home is within the housing needs. I can see that there is a requirement to deliver 4492 homes between 2023 and 2043 - which is a rate of approx 225 per year compared to the current build programme of 308 per year. There has been an accelerated programme of building locally since 2014. I think that there are concerns about recognising the aging population and also the young population(who from the report) seem likely to be outpriced from joining the housing owner market. There is a change in how people live that is now moving to the rural communities as it has done in urban areas with co-living becoming more frequent. I think it likely that the local area is more likely to need multigenerational households due to the aging population. I think that there could be clarity about what is meant by homes - and that the council should seriously consider using the 20 year timeframe to develop a proposal for a new town before the infrastructure of the existing towns can no longer manage the traffic, the amenity access, school access, health access. A new town should be distinctly separate from existing parishes and rather than a blemish could show how to develop a town where people really want to live, that is beautiful and rich in community - and is built to the highest green spec - perhaps similar to Poundbury - which houses 4200 people (this would of course depend on availability of land)	Comments noted. Option 5 in the Issues and Options Consultation does ask about an extension to an existing settlement and would in effect depending on where it was be the creation of potential new town.
Colin	Horner	Villageretreat	Maldon and Purleigh do not fit standard methodology, they are unique environments with very specific needs and utilisation of facilities. A shop in Wickford is very different from a community shop in Purleigh which is just a essential support service not a supermarket. Equally a Cricket pavilion with small kitchen and showers does not constitute an indoor sports facility or centre. An old peoples residence is not a care home.	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced, therefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months
Robert	Scott	Lewis & Scott Retirement Living Ltd	Lewis & Scott have already provided the Council with a detailed assessment (titled '220121 - ErrorReport_MDC_LocalHousingNeedsAssessment') on the 'Maldon District Local Housing Needs Assessment' produced by Iceni Projects for the Council, which highlights significant flaws in the assessment of need. A copy of this assessment will be sent to the Council again to support these representations. In summary, if the Council uses the 'Maldon District Local Housing Needs Assessment' as a basis to assess need, there will be a significant negative impact on the health and wellbeing of the	The Council is going to be doing an update on the LHNA prior to finally setting its housing requirement and the comments already made on this document have been noted and will be taken into account in that reassessment.
Rob	Bard		Have concerns with the building of houses on green spaces in rural areas.	Unfortunately the district does not have a history of industrial development and therefore the amount of brownfield land available for development is limited. It is therefore inevitable that greenfield land will have to be use to accommodate the Districts housing requirement
Tim	Hann		Having read the 182page ICENI Report, I am still not 100% clear on how figures are calculated or what denotes 'affordable housing'	Comment noted, it is a requirement of the local plans that they now use the standard methodology for the calculation of the housing requirement, it is quite complicated to understand and the Council will try to make sure that the local plan clearly explains the details about housing numbers and affordable housing.
Burnham	Town Council	Burnham on Crouch Town Council	In principle as long as it provides substantial key worker and affordable housing.	Comment noted, housing for specialist needs is part of the Councils considerations when making policies for the district.
Justin	Barkham	Self employed	However the Council should also include whether infrastructure capacity can be sustainably accommodated and have minimal to no environmental impact Site GB1 does not achieve these goals	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced, therefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months, this will include work on future infrastructure provision. The Council cannot comment further on individual sites at this time.
Poppy	Vidler	Crown Consumer Ltd	Yes so long as infrastructure, environmental impact and land supply can all be done sustainably and with low impact.	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced, therefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months, this will include work on future infrastructure provision
Stephen	Sutton		MDC should be looking to maintain current population levels	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced, therefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months
Tim	Madelin		Recognise that the standard methodology is used and it's issue are well documented elsewhere	Support noted
Joanna	Jeffery	Althorne Parish Clerk	Detailed analysis still in progress.	Comment noted, it is a requirement of the local plans that they now use the standard methodology for the calculation of the housing requirement.
Paul	Coppin		The consultation document needs to ensure that the issues relating to the supply of land and the infrastructure can be sustained.	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced, therefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months, this will include work on future infrastructure provision

Question 8

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 8. Do you agree with the Council using the standard methodology in the calculation of its housing target for the period 2023 – 2043?	COUNCILS RESPONSE
Steven	Bardwell	S P Bardwell Ltd	Developments should not swamp small villages.	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced, therefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months, this will include work on future infrastructure requirements.
David	Oxford	Lloyds Banking Group	The housing target calculation is not on question. This is about the viability of the sites ALT2 being a 269% percent increase on the current small village housing. I understand ALT3 was also previously declined	The Council cannot respond on site specifics at this stage of LDP Review. Work on site allocations will be undertaken in the coming months with a Preferred Options consultation being carried out at the end of this period.
Stephen Francis	Dewick	Curry Farm	This has resulted in over housing targets and mistakes being made in the numbers needed	The Council is not aware of any mistakes in the housing requirement. The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced, therefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months.
George	Dixon		Maldon District Council is rural in nature with a number of small villages currently facing massive developments, which are altering the aesthetic and accessibility to services in the area. Despite repeated promises, new developments do not add amenity or services, and do not account for additional road usage. This is not being addressed in current standard methodology and is repeatedly ignored.	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced, therefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months. This will include work on future infrastructure requirements.
Douglas	Channer	Private	The reason I do not know is because quite frankly you are expecting an ordinary resident to have the time to open the link and read a massive document and make sense of it when we have limited time to read it let alone study it and make sense of all the content. Again all appears based on 2023 to 2043 so what about to 2038. The attachment no doubt will be understood by developers and agents many of whom have RTPI qualifications etc. This consultation appears in my opinion to perhaps be loaded towards developers and agents and other such stakeholders rather than the ordinary resident. Therefore answers may be slanted and hence considerations of the answers will be skewed. I have to ask myself are you really keen to hear the views of the general public as so far most questions have been reliant on us reading a load of text /try to understand it all and think of it in the right context . It will mean something /make sense to planners, developers, agents and those that work with them. I am not wishing to appear rude but this consultation is not in my view overtly public friendly. I actually think that all methodology/formulas or whatever for housing need ,housing requirements need a review as I think it distorts what is actually needed . Some numbers seem too high and with the Levelling UP Agenda and the Planning White paper being reviewed and many aspects to be altered or removed then further thought needs to be applied .	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced, therefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months.
Lynda	Bugg		The calculation produces too high a figure.	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced, therefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months.
Paul	Burgess	None	Maldon has a unique spacial signature, with the housing market strongly influenced by out-commuting, business structure, home ownership profile and demographics. By disproportionately inflating house prices compared to earnings growth, artificially depressed interest rates mean that the housing needs assessment model is distorted. Regarding methodology, the Gold Standard i.e. locally based assessment process should have been used. The Silver Standard applied, using a standardised broader regional base, generates anomalies. The Affordability Adjustment model used inflates actual housing demand. Analysis of the Icenei Maldon District Housing Need Review suggests a base housing requirement of 207 units pa rises to 308 units pa, +49%, using a Workplace based ratio. A Residence based ratio better reflects district housing/employment dynamics. The workplace-based ratio is 11.87, compares to a residence-based ratio of 9.09. Application of the latter gives a reduced housing need of around 77 units, c284 units pa, -8%. Not enough to fill the two-year site shortfall in the five-year land bank,	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. There is no other method now advocated by national policy for calculating housing requirement. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced, therefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months.
D	Cooper		Is as required by NPPF	Support noted

Question 8

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 8. Do you agree with the Council using the standard methodology in the calculation of its housing target for the period 2023 – 2043?	COUNCILS RESPONSE
C/O Agent	C/O Agent		Whilst we agree that using the standard methodology is the appropriate method for calculating the Plan's housing target for the period 2023 – 2043, the Local Housing Needs Assessment report arrives at the minimum number of homes to be planned for and there may be circumstances where a higher housing requirement is necessary. The use of 308 dwellings per annum as the identified housing need for Maldon represents the minimum starting point in national policy. The Council recognises that contingency should be provided through a buffer of 20% in addition to the minimum figure for housing needs. Currently, the Local Plan has a shortfall of 261 dwellings not delivered in accordance with the housing requirement of the adopted Maldon Local Plan (310 dwellings per annum) for the period 2014 to 2021. The Council acknowledges that this should be made up as part of the requirement for the 2023 to 2043 plan period, together with provision for the current calculation of local housing need using the standard method - figure of 308 dwellings (using the 2014-based household projections and the latest affordability ratio (2018)), which the Issues and Options Report addresses. It is highly likely that the level of shortfall to be made up will exceed for the period 2021 to 2023, as recognised by the Council. The Government considered potential revisions to the calculation of local housing need using the standard method in part of its consultation on proposed changes to the planning system in Summer 2020. In its response to those consultation proposal the Government announced that the same approach would be maintained in all areas, except those subject to the urban and cities uplift (not applicable to Maldon). This is to provide stability for the purposes of plan-making. The PPG continues to specify use of the 2014-based population and household projections for the purposes of calculation of the standard method while emphasising the importance of the affordability adjustment including its role in accounting for past under-delivery and suppressed household formation (ID: 2a-006-20190220). The Council's own evidence base in the Local Housing Needs Assessment documents the pronounced deterioration in affordability over the last 10 years (see Table 4.9). The LHNA also concludes that there are no circumstances to indicate that actual housing need is greater than the standard method indicates. This conclusion is disputed. The PPG (ID: 2a-010-20201216) specifically states that levels of housing delivery in an area may be greater than indicated by the result of the standard method. This issue is not explored in sufficient detail within the LHNA evidence base. The 2014-based population and household projections which provide inputs to the standard method correspond to the delivery of an average 112 homes per annum (CLG Live Table 122). In the last five years	The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced, or increased other than to take into account past underdelivery and an appropriate buffer, therefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months.
Zoe	May	East of England Ambulance Service NHS Trust	All options require health commissioners to review the suitability and provision of health infrastructure to meet the needs of the local population. EEAST will work with commissioner and the local authority to deliver effective and efficient emergency ambulance services for the local community. Any CIL/S106 legal agreement should support all aspects of health - acute, community, mental health and emergency ambulance services	Comment noted, it is a requirement of the local plans that they now use the standard methodology for the calculation of the housing requirement.
Roger	Woodcock		Has the Authority done all it can to reduce the housing quota to be imposed upon it? Has it made the most of the character of the area with its coastal areas and salt marshes to argue for a modified methodology?	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced, therefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months
Braxted and Blackwater Conservation Grou	BBCG	The Braxted and Blackwater Conservation Group (BBCG)	The consultation document sets out an assessment of need. The Council needs to overlay issues related to land supply and infrastructure capacity and environmental impact in considering whether this can be sustainably accommodated.	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced, therefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months. Work will be undertaken in the coming months to also assess future infrastructure provision.
raymond	dundas	Householder	I believe that the target is too high by about 20%	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced, therefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months
John	Watson		In terms of strategy selected there are important factors in terms of sustainability from a climate change mitigation perspective Agents in Rural South East Lower again describe a buoyant housing market, despite the area being predominantly the Dengie National Nature Reserve. Agents suggest a high proportion of buyers are retirees who live away from the commuter towns and older families looking for a quieter pace of life,for example in Tillingham. There is a trend for buyers in Maldon District to come from the eastern side of London, such as Dagenham and Romford, as well as Thurrock. Overall, there is an increasing number of purchasers coming from outside of the district, agents attributed this to buyers wanting to have more space especially as commuter patterns may change in light of Covid-19 pandemic	Comment noted but where in migrants come from does not affect the standard methodology other than in migration is built into the 2014 population projections which the method uses.

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 8. Do you agree with the Council using the standard methodology in the calculation of its housing target for the period 2023 – 2043?	COUNCILS RESPONSE
Josh	Plant	Gladmans	National policy guidance is clear that the standard method for calculating local housing need represents the minimum number of homes that a local authority should plan for through the strategic policies of their Plan. The PPG further highlights that the Standard Method does not account for the impact of future government policies, changing economic circumstances or other factors which may impact demographic behaviour, before providing circumstances where it be may appropriate to increase housing need which includes unmet need from neighbouring authorities. In addition, it is noted that assessments of need such as Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) may conclude higher housing needs than the outcome of the Standard Method. Therefore, it is clear that the minimum housing need figure that should be planned for in Maldon at the present moment in time is 308 new homes per annum. In July 2021, the Council published a report on the 'Maldon District Local Housing Needs Assessment' which considered economic and housing development including the implications and need for affordable housing alongside potential unmet need from neighbouring authorities. The report highlighted that there was no evidence that the District needed to address any unmet housing needs from neighbouring authorities at the time of publication. Gladman do not challenge this conclusion but highlight that Duty to Cooperate is a process of engagement and collaboration that should be undertaken on an ongoing basis with neighbouring authorities on cross-boundary strategic issues throughout the process of Plan preparation. Whilst Gladman recognise that the Duty to Cooperate is a process of ongoing engagement and collaboration, as set out in the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) it is clear that it is intended to produce effective policies on cross-boundary strategic matters. Furthermore, the report identified that there is, "…a notable need for affordable housing, and it is clear that provision of new affordable housing is an important and pressing issue in the District" Alongside noting: "The evidence does however suggest that affordable housing delivery should be maximised where opportunities arise" Indeed, the study found that there is an affordable rented net need up to 2040 of 174 dwellings per annum, while the affordable home ownership net need to 2040 is identified as 35 dwellings per annum (dpa). This equates to a net affordable housing need to 2040 of 209 dwellings per annum, which is 67.8% of the minimum housing needs figure of 308 dpa, calculated using the standard methodology. Although the standard method calculation does account for affordability through the house price to income ratio, it does not account for	Comments noted. The Council will be updating the LHNA prior to setting its final housing requirement and affordable housing need is still a matter which needs to be considered.
*	*		It is agreed that the standard methodology should be used for calculating the housing target. This is a national planning policy requirement and the District does not face any particularly unusual challenges which would justify a deviation from this approach. It is considered that the housing market area which includes Braintree and Chelmsford is also appropriate and accepted that there is no overwhelming justification for Maldon to accommodate any of its neighbours unmet need. It is, however, noted that the District has a very high cost of housing and a lack of rental housing supply, especially in the south of the District. The median housing prices to earnings ratio is 11.87 (2019) which is the highest in Essex, a factor which has exacerbated the supply of affordable housing. While it is acknowledged that an uplift has been included to recognise the median house price to earnings ratio, it is considered that the local housing needs assessment should be revisited. Table 13.1 of the housing needs assessment identified a need of 174 affordable rental homes per annum. This is only the rental element of affordable housing and would require the affordable housing delivery to exceed 50% on every site, if an annual delivery target of 308 homes only is applied. A further uplift must be applied to the minimum annual target of 308 homes to take into account the housing demand necessary to support more ambitious economic growth and to redress the social imbalance which has arisen due to the lack of affordable housing delivery in recent years. The NPPF emphasises the Government policy is to 'significantly boost' housing supply. Relying on a minimum (emphasis added) annual housing figure of only 308 homes is not considered to be aspirational and is far less likely to secure sufficient delivery of the right new homes in the right places. Furthermore, it will not address the District's acute affordable housing need. If the District genuinely wants to deliver high quality beautiful new communities which meet its carbon reduction targets along with affordable housing needs, it needs to positively encourage competition in the housing market to enable it to better control the quality of developments which are delivered without having to make compromises in order to maintain supply. Ensuring sufficient allocations such as our clients site at Scotts Hill, Southminster to come forward will be the key to the success of the new Local Plans strategy. It is also important that sufficient allocations are located in the Southminster area as this is where there is currently the greatest demand for affordable housing in the District.	Comments noted. The Council will be updating the LHNA prior to setting its final housing requirement and affordable housing need is still a matter which needs to be considered. The Council cannot respond on site specifics at this stage of LDP Review. Work on site allocations will be undertaken in the coming months with a Preferred Options consultation being carried out at the end of this period.

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 8. Do you agree with the Council using the standard methodology in the calculation of its housing target for the period 2023 – 2043?	COUNCILS RESPONSE
*	Willmott		It is agreed that the standard methodology should be used for calculating the housing target. This is a national planning policy requirement and the District does not face any particularly unusual challenges which would justify a deviation from this approach. It is considered that the housing market area which includes Braintree and Chelmsford is also appropriate and accepted that there is no overwhelming justification for Maldon to accommodate any of its neighbours unmet need. It is however noted that the District has a very high cost of housing and a lack of rental housing supply, especially in the south of the District. The median housing prices to earnings ratio is 11.87 (2019) which is the highest in Essex, a factor which has exacerbated the supply of affordable housing. While it is acknowledged that an uplift has been included to recognise the median house price to earnings ratio, it is considered that the local housing needs assessment should be revisited. Table 13.1 of the housing needs assessment identified a need of 174 affordable rental homes per annum. This is only the rental element of affordable housing and would require the affordable housing delivery to exceed 50% on every site, if an annual delivery target of 308 homes only is applied. A further uplift must be applied to the minimum annual target of 308 homes to take into account the housing demand necessary to support more ambitious economic growth and to redress the social imbalance which has arisen due to the lack of affordable housing delivery in recent years. The NPPF emphasises the Government policy is to 'significantly boost' housing supply. Relying on a minimum (emphasis added) annual housing figure of only 308 homes is not considered to be aspirational and is far less likely to secure sufficient delivery of the right new homes in the right places. Furthermore, it will not address the District's acute affordable housing need. If the District genuinely wants to deliver high quality beautiful new communities which meet its carbon reduction targets along with affordable housing needs, it needs to positively encourage competition in the housing market to enable it to better control the quality of developments which are delivered without having to make compromises in order to maintain supply. Ensuring sufficient allocations, including the policy requirement of 10% small sites, such as our clients site at Stow Maries come forward will be the key to the success of the new Local Plans strategy.	Comments noted. The Council will be updating the LHNA prior to setting its final housing requirement and affordable housing need is still a matter which needs to be considered. The Council cannot respond on site specifics at this stage of LDP Review. Work on site allocations will be undertaken in the coming months with a Preferred Options consultation being carried out at the end of this period.
Ivor	Watson		We note that the Local Development Plan Issues and Options (LDPIO) suggests a housing requirement of 308dpa, based on the findings of the Maldon District Local Housing Needs Assessment (HNA) (2021). The HNA 2021's arrives at a figure of 308dpa by using the standard method (SM), as per the NPPF and its accompanying guidance (PPG). However, it should be recognised that the PPG expressly confirms that the SM does not produce the housing requirement – simply the minimum number of new homes that should be planned for. The HNA (2021) makes reference to the need to consider factors that might require an increase in the housing requirement beyond the minimum SM figure, but then fails to robustly address these. The HNA (2021) in respect of unmet housing need, we are aware that there is considerable unmet housing need across Essex (including in areas adjoining Maldon District). Local Authorities in Essex saw some of the worst Housing Delivery Test 2021 measurements in the country, and a large number are without a five-year housing land supply. There are also a number of Local Authorities in Essex that are constrained by Green Belt, again including those that neighbour Maldon District. We suggest that it will be necessary to considered whether Maldon District could sustainability and practically accommodate some of this unmet need. The HELAA 2022 suggests there is scope to deliver more homes than the minimum local housing need through suitable sites. Separately, there is also the issue of Maldon District's affordable housing need. The HNA (2021) identifies a need for 209 additional affordable homes per year. This need clearly will not be met by met through a total housing target of 308dpa. Despite this, the HNA (2021) suggests that affordable housing need does not justify an increase in the overall requirement. The justification for this view is highly questionable, and appears based on the combination of two views: one that 209 affordable homes per year is not likely to represent the true extent of future affordable housing needs in the District (if this is the case it will be necessary to identify what is the actual need); and secondly that there is only merit in uplifting the housing requirement if this would enable the affordable housing need in full to be met, but to do so would not be feasible In respect of this last point, it is clearly illogical to suggest that in circumstances where it is not possible to deliver affordable housing needs in full, there would be no merit in seeking to deliver a greater proportion of needs. Prior to the next stage in the LDP we suggest it will be necessary for the Council to explore provision of a greater number of homes than 309dpa in order for the final LDP to be capable of being found sound.	Comments noted. The Council will be updating the LHNA prior to setting its final housing requirement and affordable housing need is still a matter which needs to be considered. The Council is meeting neighbouring authorities in regard to the Duty to Co-operate and would give due consideration to them if they requested that the District accommodate some of their growth.

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 8. Do you agree with the Council using the standard methodology in the calculation of its housing target for the period 2023 – 2043?	COUNCILS RESPONSE
*	*		We welcome the use of the Standard Method to determine the minimum number of new homes to be provided through the LPD. The LPDIO reports this to be 308 dwellings per annum (dpa). The NPPF and accompanying PPG make very clear that the Standard Method should be used to determine minimum housing needs, ensuring a consistent approach is taken by Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) and that housing requirements adopted contribute towards the Government's objective of significantly boosting housing supply. In light of the NPPF's exhortation to use the Standard Method to determine minimum requirements, and in the absence of any evidence of exceptional circumstances that might justify an alternative approach, it is considers such an approach is the only way to ensure the LPD can be considered sound. It is important to recognise that the Standard Method does not establish the housing requirement for the LPD, merely the minimum housing need, as confirmed by the PPG1. We note the Council has commissioned the preparation of the Maldon District Local Housing Needs Assessment (May 2021) ('the LHNA'). This considers the housing requirement for the LDP. Whilst the LHNA acknowledges that the Standard Method provides the minimum figure, and that there are factors that may justify a greater number, in our view it then fails to robustly consider whether such factors are present in Maldon. The LHNA, referring to the PPG, recognises the factors that could justify a greater housing requirement include: where funding is in place to facilitate additional growth; strategic infrastructure improvements are likely to drive an increase in homes needed locally; a Local Planning Authority (LPA) agreeing to take on unmet need from a neighbouring authority, as set out in statement of common ground; and where an increase in housing need may help deliver the required number of affordable homes. Paragraph: 002 Reference ID: 2a-002-20190220 In respect of affordable housing, and whether an increase to the minimum housing need should be applied to help meet this requirement, the LHNA identifies an affordable housing need in Maldon of 209dpa. This represents 68% of the total minimum housing need calculated using the Standard Method. The LHNA also notes that only 19% of all completions between 2014 and 2020 were affordable homes. On this basis, there would appear to be a clear justification for increasing the housing requirement in order to help meet affordable housing needs. The LHNA suggests otherwise. However, in our view the basis for this conclusion is far from robust. The LHNA's view on this appears to be based on doubts as to whether 209dpa represents a robust assessment of actual affordable housing need (in which case, a revised, robust assessment of affordable housing needs	Comments noted. The Council will be updating the LHNA prior to setting its final housing requirement and affordable housing need is still a matter which needs to be considered. The Council is meeting neighbouring authorities in regard to the Duty to Co-operate and would give due consideration to them if they requested that the District accommodate some of their growth.
*	*		It is agreed that the standard methodology should be used for calculating the housing target. This is a national planning policy requirement and the District does not face any particularly unusual challenges which would justify a deviation from this approach. It is considered that the housing market area which includes Braintree and Chelmsford is also appropriate. It is however noted that the District has a high cost of housing and a lack of rental housing supply. The median house prices to earnings ratio is 11.87 (2019) which is the highest in Essex. While it is acknowledged that an uplift has been included to recognise the median house price to earnings ratio, it is considered that the local housing needs assessment should be revisited. Table 13.1 of the housing needs assessment identified a need of 174 affordable rental homes per annum. Clearly a further uplift should be applied to the minimum annual target of 308 homes to take into account the housing demand necessary to support more ambitious economic growth and to redress the social imbalance which has arisen due to the lack of affordable housing delivery in recent years, while maintaining viable developments. The NPPF emphasises the national policy aim to 'significantly boost' housing supply. Relying on a minimum (emphasis added) annual housing figure of only 308 homes is not considered to be aspirational and is far less likely to secure sufficient delivery of the right homes in the right places. If the District genuinely seeks to deliver high quality beautiful new communities which meet its carbon reduction targets along with affordable housing needs, it needs to positively encourage competition in the housing market to enable it to control the quality of development without having to make compromises in order to maintain supply. Ensuring sufficient allocations in sustainable locations, such as our clients land at Sadds Wharf, will be the key to the success of the new Local Plans strategy. It is also important that sufficient allocations are located in the Maldon area as this is where there is great demand for housing remains in the	Comments noted. The Council will be updating the LHNA prior to setting its final housing requirement and affordable housing need is still a matter which needs to be considered. The Council cannot respond on site specifics at this stage of LDP Review. Work on site allocations will be undertaken in the coming months with a Preferred Options consultation being carried out at the end of this period.

Question 8

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 8. Do you agree with the Council using the standard methodology in the calculation of its housing target for the period 2023 – 2043?	COUNCILS RESPONSE
*	*		It is agreed that the standard methodology should be used for calculating the housing target. This is a national planning policy requirement and the District does not face any particularly unusual challenges which would justify a deviation from this approach. It is considered that the housing market area which includes Braintree and Chelmsford is also appropriate. It is however noted that the District has a high cost of housing and a lack of rental housing supply, especially in the south of the District. The median housing prices to earnings ratio is 11.87 (2019) which is the highest in Essex. While it is acknowledged that an uplift has been included to recognise the median house price to earnings ratio, it is considered that the local housing needs assessment should be revisited. Table 13.1 of the housing needs assessment identified a need of 174 affordable rental homes per annum. This is only the rental element of affordable housing and would require the affordable housing delivery to exceed 50% on every site if an annual delivery target of 308 homes is used. Clearly a further uplift should be applied to the minimum annual target of 308 homes to take into account the housing demand necessary to support more ambitious economic growth and to redress the social imbalance which has arisen due to the lack of affordable housing delivery in recent years, while maintaining viable developments. The NPPF emphasises the national policy to 'significantly boost' housing supply. Relying on a minimum (emphasis added) annual housing figure of only 308 homes is not considered to be aspirational and is far less likely to secure sufficient delivery of the right homes in the right places. If the District genuinely seeks to deliver high quality beautiful new communities which meet its carbon reduction targets along with affordable housing needs, it needs to positively encourage competition in the housing market to enable it to control the quality of development without having to make compromises in order to maintain supply. Ensuring sufficient allocations such as our clients site at Land South of Limebrook Way and West of Mundon Road, Maldon come forward will be the key to the success of the new Local Plans strategy. It is also important that sufficient allocations are located in the Maldon area as this is where there is great demand for affordable housing in the District.	Comments noted. The Council will be updating the LHNA prior to setting its final housing requirement and affordable housing need is still a matter which needs to be considered. The Council cannot respond on site specifics at this stage of LDP Review. Work on site allocations will be undertaken in the coming months with a Preferred Options consultation being carried out at the end of this period.
*	*		t is agreed that the standard methodology should be used for calculating the housing target. This is a national planning policy requirement and the District does not face any particularly unusual challenges which would justify a deviation from this approach. It is considered that the housing market area which includes Braintree and Chelmsford is also appropriate. It is however noted that the District has a high cost of housing and a lack of rental housing supply, especially in the south of the District. The median housing prices to earnings ratio is 11.87 (2019) which is the highest in Essex. While it is acknowledged that an uplift has been included to recognise the median house price to earnings ratio, it is considered that the local housing needs assessment should be revisited. Table 13.1 of the housing needs assessment identified a need of 174 affordable rental homes per annum. This is only the rental element of affordable housing and would require the affordable housing delivery to exceed 50% on every site if an annual delivery target of 308 homes is used. Clearly a further uplift should be applied to the minimum annual target of 308 homes to take into account the housing demand necessary to support more ambitious economic growth and to redress the social imbalance which has arisen due to the lack of affordable housing delivery in recent years, while maintaining viable developments. The NPPF emphasises the national policy to 'significantly boost' housing supply. Relying on a minimum (emphasis added) annual housing figure of only 308 homes is not considered to be aspirational and is far less likely to secure sufficient delivery of the right homes in the right places. If the District genuinely seeks to deliver high quality beautiful new communities which meet its carbon reduction targets along with affordable housing needs, it needs to positively encourage competition in the housing market to enable it to control the quality of development without having to make compromises in order to maintain supply. Ensuring sufficient allocations such as our clients site at Whitecap Mushroom Farm, Mill Road, Mayland, come forward will be the key to the success of the new Local Plans strategy. It is also important that sufficient allocations are located in the Maldon area as this is where there is great demand for affordable housing in the District.	Comments noted. The Council will be updating the LHNA prior to setting its final housing requirement and affordable housing need is still a matter which needs to be considered. The Council cannot respond on site specifics at this stage of LDP Review. Work on site allocations will be undertaken in the coming months with a Preferred Options consultation being carried out at the end of this period.

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 8. Do you agree with the Council using the standard methodology in the calculation of its housing target for the period 2023 – 2043?	COUNCILS RESPONSE
*	*		It is agreed that the standard methodology should be used for calculating the housing target. This is a national planning policy requirement and the District does not face any particularly unusual challenges which would justify a deviation from this approach. It is considered that the housing market area which includes Braintree and Chelmsford is also appropriate. It is however noted that the District has a high cost of housing and a lack of rental housing supply, especially in the south of the District. The median housing prices to earnings ratio is 11.87 (2019) which is the highest in Essex. While it is acknowledged that an uplift has been included to recognise the median house price to earnings ratio, it is considered that the local housing needs assessment should be revisited. Table 13.1 of the housing needs assessment identified a need for 174 affordable rental homes per annum. This is only the rental element of affordable housing and would require the affordable housing delivery to exceed 50% on every site if an annual delivery target of 308 homes is used. Clearly a further uplift should be applied to the minimum annual target of 308 homes to take into account the housing demand necessary to support more ambitious economic growth and to redress the social imbalance which has arisen due to the lack of affordable housing delivery in recent years, while maintaining viable developments. The NPPF emphasises the national policy to 'significantly boost' housing supply. Relying on a minimum (emphasis added) annual housing figure of only 308 homes is not considered to be aspirational and is far less likely to secure sufficient delivery of the right homes in the right places. If the District genuinely seeks to deliver high quality, beautiful new communities which meet its carbon reduction targets along with affordable housing needs, it needs to positively encourage competition in the housing market to enable it to control the quality of development, without having to make compromises in order to maintain supply. Ensuring sufficient allocations, such as our client's site at Fambridge Road, come forward, will be the key to the success of the new Local Plan's strategy. It is also important that sufficient allocations are located in the Maldon area as this is where there is the greatest demand for affordable housing in the District.	Comments noted. The Council will be updating the LHNA prior to setting its final housing requirement and affordable housing need is still a matter which needs to be considered. The Council cannot respond on site specifics at this stage of LDP Review. Work on site allocations will be undertaken in the coming months with a Preferred Options consultation being carried out at the end of this period.
*	*		It is agreed that the standard methodology should be used for calculating the housing target. This is a national planning policy requirement and the District does not face any particularly unusual challenges which would justify a deviation from this approach. It is considered that the housing market area, which includes Braintree and Chelmsford, is also appropriate. It is however noted that the District has a high cost of housing and a lack of rental housing supply, especially in the south of the District. The median housing prices to earnings ratio is 11.87 (2019) which is the highest in Essex. While it is acknowledged that an uplift has been included to recognise the median house price to earnings ratio, it is considered that the local housing needs assessment should be revisited. Table 13.1 of the housing needs assessment identified a need for 174 affordable rental homes per annum. This is only the rental element of affordable housing and would require the affordable housing delivery to exceed 50% on every site if an annual delivery target of 308 homes is used. Clearly a further uplift should be applied to the minimum annual target of 308 homes to take into account the housing demand necessary to support more ambitious economic growth and to redress the social imbalance which has arisen due to the lack of affordable housing delivery in recent years, while maintaining viable developments. The NPPF emphasises the national policy to 'significantly boost' housing supply. Relying on a minimum (emphasis added) annual housing figure of only 308 homes is not considered to be aspirational and is far less likely to secure sufficient delivery of the right homes in the right places. If the District genuinely seeks to deliver high quality and beautiful new communities, which meet its carbon reduction targets along with affordable housing needs, it needs to positively encourage competition in the housing market to enable it to control the quality of development without having to make compromises in order to maintain supply. Ensuring sufficient allocations, such as our client's site at Church Hill, come forward will be the key to the success of the new Local Plan's strategy. It is also important that sufficient allocations are located in the Maldon area as this is where there is great demand for affordable housing in the District.	Comments noted. The Council will be updating the LHNA prior to setting its final housing requirement and affordable housing need is still a matter which needs to be considered. The Council cannot respond on site specifics at this stage of LDP Review. Work on site allocations will be undertaken in the coming months with a Preferred Options consultation being carried out at the end of this period.
*	*		BDW Eastern strongly supports this. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that strategic policies should be informed by a local housing needs assessment, conducted using the standard method (Paragraph 61). Therefore, the standard method should be a minimum requirement for the number of houses across the Plan Period. The key is to increase the number of required homes should there be a shortfall on past completions. Given MDC's shortfall provision over the past years, it is important for the Council to include the 20% buffer (NPPF Paragraph 74(c)). As well as the 20% buffer, MDC has rightly included the provision of its recent shortfall in its housing requirements to provide a more realistic housing requirement number for the emerging Plan Period. To ensure soundness with the NPPF and NPPG, this strategy should be followed through to adoption. Consistent with the Duty to Cooperate, Maldon must also ensure it works closely with the Neighbouring Authorities of Rochford, Chelmsford, Braintree, Colchester and Basildon. Many of these Authorities are heavily constrained by Green Belt, and any shortfall within those Authorities should be considered to be provided within Maldon District, irrespective of whether this would go beyond the Standard Method, so as to ensure housing need is met and delivered upon across all the Districts.	Comments noted. The Council will be updating the LHNA prior to setting its final housing requirement and affordable housing need is still a matter which needs to be considered. The Council is meeting neighbouring authorities in regard to the Duty to Co-operate and would give due consideration to them if they requested that the District accommodate some of their growth.
Ben	Binder	University of Adelaide		
Lorraine	Bailey	Wickham Bishops Parish Council		
Ali	Aldis			
David	Smye	The Maldon Society		

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 8. Do you agree with the Council using the standard methodology in the calculation of its housing target for the period 2023 – 2043?	COUNCILS RESPONSE
Stewart	Newlands	Fambridge Lake		
Stewart	Newlands	Fambridge Lake		
Paula	Stanbury			
Sonia	Whiskin	Financial Services		
Geoffrey	Charge	n/a		
Robert	Collins			
Ben	Thornett			
Matthew	Wood	Phase 2 Planning		
Tim	Aves			
Helen	James			
Kathy	Day			
Peter	Wakling			
Sara	Howarth			
Eissa	Leo			
Michele	Williams			
Tara	Strydom			
Jenny	Ball			
Cliff	Baron			
Gill	Winsor	Tesco		
Emily	Benham	Servoca complex care and nursing		
Laura	Cannon			
Shaneen	Illanes			
Merryl	Quilter			
Bear	Keen			
Jessica	Cox			
Robert	Burton			
Yvonne	Wade			
Louise	Bywaters-Smith	Hospitality		
Brooke	Roberts-Morgan			
Patricia	Bunkle			
Marc	Rawinsky	M R Sovereign Services Ltd		
Roger	Tiffn			
Kathryn	Beighton	Publishing		
Roy	Warren	Sport England		
STUART	SOWTER			
Mark	Raffray			
April	Rowley			
Bill	Withers			
joanna	jeffery			
John	Mitchell			
Peter	Layley			
Rex	Davenport			
Lesley	Mitchelmore	Danbury Parish Council		
Karen	Neath	Tolleshunt Major Parish Council		
N	DA			
Dorreen	Linton	our group consists of adults, playschool and brownies group		
John	Wileman			
Richard	Courtney	University Of East London		
sue	Rawlinson	Evolve		
Douglas	Milsted	Heybridge Basin Conservation Society		
Alan	Outlaw	Self Emplyed		
Lindsey	Squire	North Fambridge Parish Council		
K	Jeffries			
John	Lakin	?		
Samantha	Weeks			
Carlie	Mayes			
Richard	Martin	Scott Properties		
Mike	Spurgeon	Phase 2 Planning and Development		
C/O Agent Mike	Spurgeon	Phase 2 Planning & Development		
Amanda	Mickelsen			
Samuel	Newton	Anglo European School		
Mary-Ann	Munford			

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 8. Do you agree with the Council using the standard methodology in the calculation of its housing target for the period 2023 – 2043?	COUNCILS RESPONSE
Jo	Harvey			
Terry	Fleming			
Philip	Davies			
Susan	Cumming	not applicable		
Ronald	Edge	Construction Industry		
Gordon	Mussett	Little Braxted Parish Council		
Ronnie	Tongue	state school		
Sue	Dobson	Essex Bridleways Association		
David	Webb			
Andrew	Marsh	Historic England		
Brian	Haydon			
Hazel	Notley			
Jean	Brown			
Joanne	McGinity			
Stuart	Dedman	Nil		
Kerry	McKenna			
Penny	McCauley	Tiptree dental		
Jane	Phillips	Solicitors		
David	Rees			
Darren	Weeks			
Phil	Manning			
Peter	Clack			
Doug	Lockwood	National Grid		
Sally	George			
Vara	Szajkowski			
Bob	Calver			
Tessa	Lambert	Natural England		
Dawn	Howles			
natasha	frith			
Anthony	Bates			
Russell	Howles	WSP		
Gillian	Hollamby			
Brian	Townsend			
Malcolm	Finch			
Peter	Taylor	Retired		
Chris	Melbourne			
Robert	Hollamby			
Kate	Priest	Purleigh Community Primary School		
Gary	SPICER			
Helen	Bridge			
Melanie	Allen	Government		
Adam	Medlycott			
Joanne	Maloney			
Portia	Roelofs			
Lisa	Singh	Direct Call Centres Ltd		
Kevin	Head			
Elizabeth	Sawyer Bayliss			
Michael	Partridge			
Kenneth	Northfield			
Jerry	Petts			
Frederick	McMahon			
Tracey	Merritt	Dengie Hounds and Horses		
Jo	Crump	Servoca Secure Soutions		
Susan	ARCHER			
Winifred	Sutherland			
Chris	clark			
Jeremy	Richardson			
Cheryl	Carter	Education		
Susan	Mason			
Melad	Kamlow			
Dave	Draper	The Hartford Insurance Group		
Kevin	Cooper			
Katherine	Whitehouse			
Linda	Soul			
Robert	Wilson			
Sarah-Jayne	Hunt	SJ Aesthetics LTD		
Jonathan	Hunt			

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 8. Do you agree with the Council using the standard methodology in the calculation of its housing target for the period 2023 – 2043?	COUNCILS RESPONSE
Deborah	de Boltz	Farleigh Hospice		
Tim	Murphy			
Claire	McGrane			
Tracey	Munford	NA		
Rowan	Rampersad			
LUKE	MACFARLANE	S A RAVEN		
Anna	Wombwell	Morris Farm		
Ronald	Owen	Not applicable		
Elizabeth	Johns			
Colin	Day			
Natalie	Bradford			
Harriet	Hurst-Smith			
Tony	Vanner			
Josie	Vanner			
Tracy	Carroll			
Ian	Roberts	N/A		
Tony	Ashton	none		
mandy	SHORT			
Kevin	Money	St. Lawrence Parish Council		
Claire	Udall	1		
Linda	Raffray			
John	Cooper			
Leah	Jewiss			
Elaine	Ketley	South Woodham Ferrers Town Council		
Ruth	Bull	The Othona Communty		
Mark	Jackson	Mark Jackson Planning		
ann	cutting			
Sharon	Cushen			
Ian	Tooley			
Sally	Tokeley			
Christina	Chan			
Tim.	Holdsworth			
Graham	Snow			
Sarah	Packard			
Martin	Cook			
Clifford	Brown			
Steve	Gallant	Crouch Valley Defence Group		
Lesley	Woodley			
Kirsty	Rowsell			
Philip	Wakeling			
David	Brock			
Niki	Halls			
Stewart	Geden			
Anita	Thomas	Bank		
Andrew	Ashworth			
michael	smith			
Simon	Priest			
Philippa	Marshall			
Lewis	Cook	Form Architecture Ltd.		
EDWARD	GITTINS	Edward Gittins & Associates		
Steve	Williamson			
James	Cowell	E & B R Cowell		
Colin	Hawkes			
Ronald	PIPER			
John	McLarty			
John	McLarty			
Norman	Branch	N/A		
John	McLarty			
James	Clarke			
David	Stilwell			
Ann	Thomas			
michael	harris			
Geoffrey	Cox			
John	McLarty			
Barrington	Thomas			
Richard	Edwards			
Robyn	Woloszczuk			
Lesley	Speller			

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 8. Do you agree with the Council using the standard methodology in the calculation of its housing target for the period 2023 – 2043?	COUNCILS RESPONSE
Nicola	O'Dean	Balgores Motors		
Alexander	Romang			
Hayley	Holgate	ECC		
Eirlys	Parry	N/A		
Michael	Unwin	N/A		
Tony	Barber			
Nick	Mason	ECOClassics		
Melanie	Osborne	Motor Trade		
Stuart	Turner	Essex search and rescue		
Mike	Carpenter	CODE Development Planners Ltd		
ian	wilson	cm36pt		
c/o Agent	c/o Agent			
kelly	tilley			
Catherine	Bicknell	Mid and South Essex Health and Care Partnership		
N	Baseley	IBA Planning Ltd		
Sue	White			
Sarah	Yates			
Leonard	Lewis			
R	Minney			
Tim	Grant	Evolution Town Planning		
ANNE	OSBORN	Purleigh Community Shop		
Stephen	Hodgkinson			
c/o Agent	c/o Agent	Maldon Wick Limited		
ZOE	HOSTY			
S	Swain			
Kevin	Coleman	Phase 2 Planning		
John	Lawrence			
Diane	Wallace			
Jonathan	Aldis	Good life Countryside Services		
Grace	Godwin			
Sue	Hillman			
michael	carr	NHS		
Simon	Plater	Plater+Claiborne		
Mark	Anderson			
Karen	Wellum			
Emma	Wright			
Linda	Coom			
Caitlin	Soul			
Michelle	Curtis	Tollesbury Parish Council		
Mary	Hammond			
Ian	Drinkwater			
john	hand	N/A		
Emma	Smith	Bradwell on Sea Parish Council		
Tim	Dixon			
Nicola	Taylor	Elixirr		
Graham	Johnson	graham v johnson		
Chris	Yates			
Sally	Everritt	Community360		
Mark	Garrett			
Paul	Vidler			
Victoria	Long			
Victor	Staines			
Jayne	Moore	Essex County Fire and Rescue Service		
Kevin	Bennett			
Nicholas	Matthams			
Christian	van Stolk	RAND Europe		
Nicholas	Jepson			
Pamela	Lacey			
Chloe	Soul			
carole	kirk			
Sharon	Jackson			
RICHARD	GROUT			
Charles	Bishop			
Paul	Jewiss	Self Employed		
Deborah	Anderson	NHS		

Question 8

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 8. Do you agree with the Council using the standard methodology in the calculation of its housing target for the period 2023 – 2043?	COUNCILS RESPONSE
John	Pilgrim	Self employed		
Gloria	Gold	London Design and Engineering UTC		
Linda	Curry			
Lucy	Waterhouse			
Jon	Mayhew			
James	Goody	James Goody refurbishments		
Johanna	Dale			
Tracy	Kinnane			
Carlos	Rodriguez			
Rebecca	Tucker			
Mark	Faraway			
T	Ketteley			
Elizabeth	Weston			
Jacky	Barber			
Ursula	Benjafield			
Paul	Mitchell			
Kristian	Tokeley	CTC Construction Ltd		
Ziyad	Thomas	Churchill Retirement Living / McCarthy Stone		
James	Campbell	HMPPS		
William	Moss			
Simon	Mackenzie Smith			
Richard	Udall			
Rosalind	Bishop			
John	Symington			
Michael	Manning			
Jack	Inglis	Kelvedon Hall		
Peggy	Shields			
Dawn	Adams	Catesby Estates		
Wayne	Tilley	RTG Group Limited		
David	Dronfield	Braxted park		
John	Peirson			
Ron	Brown	Corporate		
Roger	HAWES			
Anne	Hull	Elmwood Equestrian Centre		
Matthew	Bloxham	Matt		
Julia	Morris			
Amanda	MacKenzie			
Jenny	Shepherd			
Jack	Ellum			
Bernard	Steeples			
Anna	mccomb	NHS Property Services Ltd		
Natalie	Kermath	Environment Agency		
Peter	Knights			
Unknown	Unknown	Ministry of Defence		
Duncan	Clark			
Patricia	Smith			
Mick	Sargeant			
John	Cockerell	Hatfield Peverell Parish Council		
Catherine	Williams	C/O Savills (Agent)		
Tom	Kelly			
Linda	Gemmill			
Linda	Gemmill			
Mark	Norman	Highways England		
Thomasin	Foster			
*	*			
Alan	Massow			
*	*			
Ian	Butt			
Sarah	Sayer			
*	*			

Question 9

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 9. Should the Council have a contingency or buffer figure in its housing target to ensure that it always has a continuous supply of housing over the plan period and if so what should that buffer be?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Jenny	Clemo	Langford & Ulting Parish Council	LDP Housing Needs Assessment 2021 Table 2.8: The Parish Council strongly objects to being included in a sub area with Heybridge. Paragraph 3.25: 'Higher proportions of terraced and flatted properties are then seen in Maldon Town and Heybridge and Langford .....' This comment is incorrect. According to the 2011 Census, there are 39 detached properties in Langford, plus an additional 11 detached properties built at John Thresh Way and 2 adjacent to Langford Lee since the Census, 25 semi-detached properties and 2 terraced properties. There are no flatted properties.	The Local Housing Needs Assessment will be reviewed again prior to the submission of the LDP review examination.
Gavin	Rowsell		A target is not a target without a reality buffer.	Support noted
Gareth	Davies	N / A	The affordability of housing in the District depends on availability /supply (as well as other factors). There is a shortage of affordable housing for local people (in particular locally employed young people) and the "buffer" should be establiched and used to acheive affordability for local people.	Identifying additional housing supply provides crucial flexibility within the overall approach to housing delivery a key theme of the NPPF (paras 14 and 50) and this will help to ensure that the Plan is deliverable. In practice not every site identified in a housing trajectory needs to or will come forward exactly as proposed in order to meet the housing requirement over the Plan period. Having a housing buffer recognises that the housing market will be subject to various fluctuations and some potential slippage over the Plan period. Building in this recognition from the outset of the Plan provides much needed flexibility and therefore certainty that the Plan's housing requirement will be delivered. It is better to over-provide than under-provide. This is a sound planning approach in line with the NPPF it also allows for the additional provision of affordable housing.
Jackie	Gibbs			
Mike	Hayes		30% at a minimum to avoid the council falling into the same situation it currently finds itself.	Comment and support noted
David	Sismey			
Stuart	Willsher	Persimmon Homes Essex		Comment and support noted
Anthony	Fittock		I would suggest that this cannot be determined until there has been an analysis done on the preferred option vs the Infrastructure requirements to support that option. The danger is that if a windfall buffer were agreed vs strategic there can be no timely planning for infrastructure by ECC.	Identifying additional housing supply provides crucial flexibility within the overall approach to housing delivery a key theme of the NPPF (paras 14 and 50) and this will help to ensure that the Plan is deliverable. In practice not every site identified in a housing trajectory needs to or will come forward exactly as proposed in order to meet the housing requirement over the Plan period. Having a housing buffer recognises that the housing market will be subject to various fluctuations and some potential slippage over the Plan period. Building in this recognition from the outset of the Plan provides much needed flexibility and therefore certainty that the Plan's housing requirement will be delivered. It is better to over-provide than under-provide. This is a sound planning approach in line with the NPPF
Daniel	McAllister	Robert Mulholland And Company Limited		Comment and support noted
Sarah	Sapsford		I don't believe it is needed as this will happen due to NPPF and natural interest of developers. Housing developers cannot be forced so just having a huge number 'just in case' is unnecessary	Identifying additional housing supply provides crucial flexibility within the overall approach to housing delivery a key theme of the NPPF (paras 14 and 50) and this will help to ensure that the Plan is deliverable. In practice not every site identified in a housing trajectory needs to or will come forward exactly as proposed in order to meet the housing requirement over the Plan period. Having a housing buffer recognises that the housing market will be subject to various fluctuations and some potential slippage over the Plan period. Building in this recognition from the outset of the Plan provides much needed flexibility and therefore certainty that the Plan's housing requirement will be delivered. It is better to over-provide than under-provide. This is a sound planning approach in
Stephanie	Ireland		More provision could be made for those that need social housing as the amount allocated on the new developments seem very small. This would possibly need a buffer figure but I do not have enough knowledge to answer yes.	A buffer can provide more opportunity for affordable housing to come forward because the overall quantum of development would be greater. However, the amount of affordable housing for each development is established based on a district wide viability assessment this sets the minimum requirement for affordable housing on each site
e	e	e	Having no contingency would put our supply at risk, and expose the District to being forced into allowing developments that could otherwise be refused.	Comment and support noted
Kevin	Lagan		only have the minimum needed developments. .	Identifying additional housing supply provides crucial flexibility within the overall approach to housing delivery a key theme of the NPPF (paras 14 and 50) and this will help to ensure that the Plan is deliverable. In practice not every site identified in a housing trajectory needs to or will come forward exactly as proposed in order to meet the housing requirement over the Plan period. Having a housing buffer recognises that the housing market will be subject to various fluctuations and some potential slippage over the Plan period. Building in this recognition from the outset of the Plan provides much needed flexibility and therefore certainty that the Plan's housing requirement will be delivered. It is better to over-provide than under-provide. This is a sound planning approach in

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 9. Should the Council have a contingency or buffer figure in its housing target to ensure that it always has a continuous supply of housing over the plan period and if so what should that buffer be?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Bethany	Jones	Colchester Borough Council	Yes. It is considered appropriate to include a contingency or buffer figure in housing targets, as this allows for flexibility in terms of any housing allocations not delivering their full anticipated quantum of units and for any unprecedented delays to deliverability. This will also help enable the Council to maintain a 5 year housing land supply. A buffer or contingency of at least 10% would be considered appropriate, particularly given that Maldon has an existing shortfall from the period 2014 - 2021. A contingency may help prevent further shortfalls in the future. Regardless of the percentage buffer or contingency selected, the reason for this should be explained fully. It is essential that the term 'contingency' is used to avoid any confusion with the term 'buffer' used in the NPPF and the Housing Delivery Test related to under delivery.	Comment and support noted
magnus	Magnusson	Parker Planning Services	Yes, the Council should have a contingency or buffer figure built into its housing target. The buffer should be at least 10% of the OAN, i.e., 449 dwellings based on the current needs assessment.	Comment and support noted
Nick	Whiteley			
Linda	Flowers	Self Employed	Keep numbers the same, as they are already arguably higher than other ways of measuring demand in the iceni paper. There is only a requirement for a 5% buffer, I believe, in the NPPF which is sufficient. The Council needs to ensure that land owners compete to provide what is needed and that the sites, where identified and included in the plans are realistic and deliverable. There are high numbers of windfall sites being delivered and potentially available so allocated sites don't need to be oversubscribed upfront. The suggested buffers built into the 20 year demand are too high. Given this, plus the fact that the plan has been extended by 5 years, dramatically overstates shortfalls. Adding substantial buffers is admitting defeat and admits poor planning. It also creates fear of residents who see unnecessary sites being lauded as potential (and potentially imminent) when they're not necessary to attain targets and may never be built. Not even in 15 years time. The oversupply of the last two years has been ignored as far as I can see and this is worrying as people are genuinely concerned about the numbers and may feel pressured into giving a mandate for over provision, but they're not seeing the full picture. Reporting this once a year isn't helpful either as the 5 year supply of housing I could find and quoted in the 3.26 years available in the issues paper is nearly a year out of date.	It is not possible to have an oversupply of housing because the market manages supply, permissions will be delayed in their building out. Identifying additional housing supply provides crucial flexibility within the overall approach to housing delivery a key theme of the NPPF (paras 14 and 50) and this will help to ensure that the Plan is deliverable. In practice not every site identified in a housing trajectory needs to or will come forward exactly as proposed in order to meet the housing requirement over the Plan period. Having a housing buffer recognises that the housing market will be subject to various fluctuations and some potential slippage over the Plan period. Building in this recognition from the outset of the Plan provides much needed flexibility and therefore certainty that the Plan's housing requirement will be delivered. It is better to over-provide than under-provide. This is a sound planning approach in line with the NPPF. Windfall sites have not ensured that there is a 5 year supply of housing in the District, it is more appropriate to plan for flexibility in a plan.
Peter	Holmes			
Colin	Pryke			
John	Hitcham		10% average buffer, tapered high at the begining of the period, low at the end	Comment and support noted - the housing trajectory in any plan sets out the delivery rates for the whole plan period.
Richard	Kelly	Croudace Homes	Over and above the delivery 308 dwellings per annum ('dpa'), the Council should continue with the inclusion of a 20% buffer as provisioned in the Housing Needs Survey. This represents the delivery of 370 dpa and although higher than the standard method, in accordance with paragraph 11b of the National Planning Policy Framework ('NPPF'), this should be a minimum target.	Comment and support noted
Andy	Quelch			
James	Rushton		It makes sense to plan with the inclusion of a contingency.	Comment and support noted
Catherine	Champion			
Terence	Hughes	Burnham-on-Crouch constituent	Unless all the services and infrastructure is in place then no building should be allowed.	The LDP has an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which was approved through its examination, infrastructure is agreed with statutory providers such as the NHS and ECC and should be to mitigate the impact of development. Infrastructure is being provided under the terms of S106 legal agreements and will be assessed further as part of the LDP Review work. Unfortunately, it is very rare for major infrastructure to be provided up front it is normally funded in stages and therefore built toward the end of a development
John	Tompkins		There should be greater flexibility in stated targets and stronger control over developers as targets will be driven by new build completions and thses should be linked to the planning process. Newbuild completions will be affected by 'external' matters such as national economy etc reinforcing the need for graeter flexibility	Identifying additional housing supply provides crucial flexibility within the overall approach to housing delivery a key theme of the NPPF (paras 14 and 50) and this will help to ensure that the Plan is deliverable. In practice not every site identified in a housing trajectory needs to or will come forward exactly as proposed in order to meet the housing requirement over the Plan period. Having a housing buffer recognises that the housing market will be subject to various fluctuations and some potential slippage over the Plan period. Building in this recognition from the outset of the Plan provides much needed flexibility and therefore certainty that the Plan's housing requirement will be delivered. It is better to over-provide than under-provide. This is a sound planning approach in
Jeremy	Potter	Chelmsford City Council		
Daniel	Goodman	Rochford District council	See Response to Question 8	Comment and support noted
Chris	Harvey			
Jane	Senior		It should have a contingency/buffer but a reduction on what is planned.	Comment and support noted
Amanda	Clack			
Daphne	Scott			
Kenny	Alexander	Thomas Gainsborough School		

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 9. Should the Council have a contingency or buffer figure in its housing target to ensure that it always has a continuous supply of housing over the plan period and if so what should that buffer be?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
David	Kennedy		The district's infrastructure has to-date failed to even keep pace with development and the commensurate increase in population any contingency or buffer in housing stock will ony serve to exacerbate this situation.	The LDP has an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which was approved through its examination, infrastructure is agreed with statutory providers such as the NHS and ECC and should be to mitigate the impact of development. Infrastructure is being provided under the terms of S106 legal agreements and will be assessed further as part of the LDP Review work. Unfortunately, it is very rare for major infrastructure to be provided up front it is normally funded in stages and therefore built toward the end of a development
Mark	Behrendt	Home Builders Federation	In order to maintain five-year housing land supply across the plan period and to avoid having to regularly update local plans when they are reviewed it is necessary to plan for more homes than the minimum required. Such a buffer ensures that any delays in delivery of larger sites or over estimates in windfall delivery, as has been experienced in Maldon, do not have significant consequences for the Council's short- and long-term ability to meet housing needs. With regard to the level of buffer required, the HBF recommends that a 20% buffer should be sufficient to address any uncertainties in the delivery of allocated sites. However, it is also important that supply is made up of a wider variety of sites that deliver a consistent supply of homes across the plan period. A plan that has a 20% buffer but still sees the majority of homes delivered in the later stages of the plan would not be an effective approach to meeting housing needs as the risks to meeting needs in full would not be mitigated by such an approach.	Comment and support noted
Matthew	Cooper			
Terry	Inkpen	None	Having a buffer will encourage extra building and help create inward migration into the district, which is already getting overcrowded for what is considered a rural area with inadequate infrastructure.	Inward migration is part of the population growth of the District, this is not something that the Council can control. The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth, the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months
christine	collins		I believe the housing need was overestimated at the last LDP	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced, therefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months. The previous housing requirement was examined by an Inspector and approved and is being delivered across the District.
Stuart	Williams	Ace group		
Reegan	Howles		Why is there a buffer on the development of homes and not on other important infrastructural improvements like schools and hospitals? Public infrastructure is operating at breaking point, and are already struggling to meet the additional housing needs. If we are to add contingencies to residential development we should have the same contingencies on investments in the public sector.	There is no requirement to provide a buffer on infrastructure. Infrastructure provision is a planning obligation and therefore can only be provided in order to mitigate the impact of development. It is not legally possible to require additional provision over and above what is required as recommended by infrastructure providers
jasbir	Singh			
Janice	Jackson		see above, REDUCE the housing target - this small part of Essex cannot cope.	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth, the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced
Roy A	Clare	Charities		
Felicity	Gale			
Lindsey	Wright			
David	Hill	Dandara Ltd	Yes, it should. This will allow for flexibility in the strategy and will help maintain a five-year housing land supply across the plan period, which will in turn avoid having to update the local plan soon after adoption. Any buffer will help account for delays and non-delivery of strategic-scale sites as has been the case with the previous plan. A buffer of 20% will mean that the plan will endure much longer than the previous iteration did. A figure in excess of 20% may mean that the plan will not require a review within 5-10 years	Comment and support noted
Steven	Potter		There will always be windfall sites.	There will be windfall sites but the delivery of housing should not rely on them and a plan has to be flexible in order to support them coming forward.
Vysian	Banyard	TKPC	Mandatory, surely? 5% or 20% depending on whether delivery targets are being met.	A buffer could not be just if delivery targets are not being met, it would have to be built into the amount of housing to be allocated.
Diane	Carter		5%	Comment noted though 5% buffer may not provide enough quantum of housing to deliver the critical infrastructure needed for the district.
Luke	Garrett	Obsidian Strategic Asset Management Ltd	Obsidian Strategic considers it imperative for the District Council to include a contingency or buffer to ensure that its housing target exceeds the minimum number of homes needed. It is considered that this is needed for the District Council to maintain a Five-Year Housing Land Supply, achieve its housing delivery requirements and to avoid having to regularly update its local planning policies. Such an approach will also assist with mitigating any delay in the delivery of larger sites, together with over-estimates in windfall, as historically experienced by the District Council, and therefore its ability to meet short and long-term housing needs. Having regard to the requirements of NPPF Paragraph 74, Obsidian Strategic considers it appropriate for the District Council to apply a 20% buffer	Comment and support noted
Robin	Fanshawe		I can only deal with my particular concerns which solely relate to the proposals for the overwhelming new development in Purleigh	Comment noted and no decisions have been made at this stage in the LDP revew as to the location of growth.

Question 9

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 9. Should the Council have a contingency or buffer figure in its housing target to ensure that it always has a continuous supply of housing over the plan period and if so what should that buffer be?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
John	Brown		No, no, no! Don't use up even more precious land on housing. Leave some green and pleasant land left for future generations to enjoy.	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced, therefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months.
Chris	Waumsley	Inovo Consulting	The standard methodology should be a starting point for calculating the housing target but to ensure delivery, choice and to remedy the current shortfall in housing supply an additional 10% should be added to the target over the standard methodology figure.	Comment and support noted
Phil	Jacklin		There should only be one contingency figure as agreed in Q8. I understand that there is also a 5 Year Housing Supply figure which has further correction factors.	A buffer is a matter for the council to consider and is not part of the standard methodology for calculating the housing requirement over the plan period. The 5 year supply calculation has an automatic buffer of 5% which has to be applied and a buffer of 20% if a Council is failing the Housing Delivery Test. At the present time Maldon District is a 5% authority. These two matters are separate from each other.
Robert	Jones	The University of Reading	Yes, but at a lover level	Comment noted, a lower level may not be sufficient to ensure the provision of critical infrastructure.
Robert	Stephens	N/A		
Pete	Butcher		My understanding is that there has to be a buffer - If that is the case, then the question becomes how big should the buffer be. I would have thought that a 5 year supply of housing does not require a buffer, because there should be plenty of time to react to a shortage if it occurs. However, if a 5 year supply of housing is the minimum requirement of MDC to be able to rebuff unwanted wanted housing then I guess a buffer is important. How big that buffer should be would depend on how confident MDC are of planned development reaching fruition..... This is not something I can comment on	Comment and support noted
JO	COOMBES			
Jonney	Aldridge			
Mark	Hurley	Selfridges	Population is increasing and ntherefore thewre shoudl be ongoing plans to cater for this.	Support noted
Neil	Burke	Bradwell Power Generation Company Limited	Bradwell B do not have any specific comments to make on this question.	N/A
Lynne	Goodbourn		Too much new housing already in progress and planned which is having detrimental impact on infrastructure and culture of the southern areas of our district	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced, therefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months. The LDP has an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which was approved through its examination, infrastructure is agreed with statutory providers such as the NHS and ECC and should be to mitigate the impact of development. Infrastructure is being provided under the terms of S106 legal agreements and will be assessed further as part of the LDP Review work.
Christopher	Kent		It need to concentrate on building on sites where planning permission has been approved.	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced, therefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months.
Sophie	Pryor		Yes. This would also need to take into account the timing of the delivery of housing across the District. There are current affordability issues which need to be addressed and a number of larger housing schemes in the District have been delayed. A 20% buffer figure should be applied to ensure housing delivery does not curtail the economic aspirations of the District.	Comment and support noted
c/o Agent	c/o Agent	Clarion Housing		
Stephanie	Jones	home	Yes, but at a lower level.	Comment and support noted
Phillipa	Griffiths			
Matthew	Taylor			
Anne	Bailey		We must be sensible and not se important agricultural land, as with present climate and political situations we need to be as self sufficient as posible, with out have to create carbon issues by transporting food from other countries.	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced, therefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months.
Lucien	Taylor			
David	Baker			
Glenna	Wilkins		Unless residents know the details of present and proposed housing, this question is impossible to answer.	Comment noted there will be further consultations as the LDP Review moves through its processes.
Danny	Soul		If all councils added a buffer of 20% then this would lead to excessive overdevelopment - any contingency should be held back until needed and then allocated appropriately rather than blanket 20% across the board.	Identifying additional housing supply provides crucial flexibility within the overall approach to housing delivery a key theme of the NPPF (paras 14 and 50) and this will help to ensure that the Plan is deliverable. In practice not every site identified in a housing trajectory needs to or will come forward exactly as proposed in order to meet the housing requirement over the Plan period. This will provide flexibility in the plan and help to ensure a five year supply of housing.
Fiona	Barkham	Private Individual		

Question 9

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 9. Should the Council have a contingency or buffer figure in its housing target to ensure that it always has a continuous supply of housing over the plan period and if so what should that buffer be?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Isabel	Adcock		We didn't forsee the pandemic and the need for country homes with more space both in and around	Comment noted, though the response does not relate to the question so no further comment can be made.
alan	johnson	sky broadcasting		
Victoria	Cutmore	Endurance Estates	Endurance Estates considers that a contingency or buffer figure in a housing target is a necessary but not sufficient condition to ensure a continuous supply of housing over the Plan period. Although the term "buffer" is usually employed in the context of the calculation of the years supply figure for housing land, we support for plan-making purposes the figure of 20% set out in Table 1 in Section 10.	Comment and support noted
Jane	Potter	Purleigh Parish Council	The District Council should not have a contingency or buffer figure in its housing target. There will always be windfall sites.	Identifying additional housing supply provides crucial flexibility within the overall approach to housing delivery a key theme of the NPPF (paras 14 and 50) and this will help to ensure that the Plan is deliverable. In practice not every site identified in a housing trajectory needs to or will come forward exactly as proposed in order to meet the housing requirement over the Plan period. Having a housing buffer recognises that the housing market will be subject to various fluctuations and some potential slippage over the Plan period. Building in this recognition from the outset of the Plan provides much needed flexibility and therefore certainty that the Plan's housing requirement will be delivered. It is better to over-provide than under-provide. This is a sound planning approach in line with the NPPF. Windfall sites will only come forward if the Plan is flexible enough to accommodate them and it is better to over allocate because allocations are planned alongside their accompanying infrastructure.
Brian	Haydon	Cold Norton Parish Council	10.4: Contingency uplift to housing target Percentage uplift to be based on historical performance.	Identifying additional housing supply provides crucial flexibility within the overall approach to housing delivery a key theme of the NPPF (paras 14 and 50) and this will help to ensure that the Plan is deliverable. In practice not every site identified in a housing trajectory needs to or will come forward exactly as proposed in order to meet the housing requirement over the Plan period. Having a housing buffer recognises that the housing market will be subject to various fluctuations and some potential slippage over the Plan period. Building in this recognition from the outset of the Plan provides much needed flexibility and therefore certainty that the Plan's housing requirement will be delivered. It is better to over-provide than under-provide. This is a sound planning approach in
Lee	Foster			
Vanessa	Horner		Housing allocation should be defined in the LDP potential areas as candidate for development will cause residents to leave and force houses down in value. It will leave useful farming land fallow in the hope of being granted and profits for the land owner people need to know where they stand.	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced, therefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months.
Brian	Howson	Pharmaceutical company		
Marion	Gunn			
BRIAN	COLLINS		provided that above comments are taken into account. suggest 10 year plan	The previous comments relate to minimising urban sprawl. Comments noted
Peter	Lampard			
Tim	Chilvers		Given our comments in respect of Question 8 above it is clearly sensible that a buffer should be applied. Housing allocations need to reflect changes in the economy which influence the housing market. We have recently witnessed the unforeseen consequences of the COVID 19 pandemic and also supply issues associated with Brexit and other global events. Such uncertainties are further fuelled by the Government's continued, albeit diluted, planning reforms. It is therefore essential that any minimum housing target is supported by a suitable buffer. The Council's lack of five-year housing land supply suggests that a minimum 20% buffer should be applied.	Comment and support noted
Elliott	George		Yes - Paragraph 74 of the NPPF sets out the need for local authorities to update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites to provide a minimum of five years worth of housing measured against their requirement, and that the supply of such sites should include a buffer. This buffer ranges from 5% to 20%. Having regard to the Housing Delivery Test results 2021, the Council would need to apply a 5% buffer however that is only in the context of maintaining a five year supply. Buffers should also be considered for the housing requirement as a whole in order to account for non-implementation and ensure the plan is sufficiently flexible to respond to change. The adopted Maldon Local Plan includes a 10% buffer, however through the Council's latest published housing land supply position it is demonstrable that this has failed to ensure the Council has a continuous supply of new homes, with supply at only 3.26 years, significantly short of the requirements set out in national policy (paragraph 74). Accordingly, Taylor Wimpey wholly supports the current approached outlined in the emerging Local Plan to apply a 20% buffer as this will maximise the prospect of an up to date plan remaining in place for the lifetime of the plan. It should also be emphasised that the standard method represents a minimum housing figure (see paragraph 11b, 35a and 61 of the NPPF) and that the implementation of buffer would, at the very least, serve to significantly boost the supply of new homes (paragraph 60 of the NPPF).	Comment noted and supported

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 9. Should the Council have a contingency or buffer figure in its housing target to ensure that it always has a continuous supply of housing over the plan period and if so what should that buffer be?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Kate	Ellis		Again, it is important to consider what is actually needed.	Identifying additional housing supply provides crucial flexibility within the overall approach to housing delivery a key theme of the NPPF (paras 14 and 50) and this will help to ensure that the Plan is deliverable. In practice not every site identified in a housing trajectory needs to or will come forward exactly as proposed in order to meet the housing requirement over the Plan period. Having a housing buffer recognises that the housing market will be subject to various fluctuations and some potential slippage over the Plan period. Building in this recognition from the outset of the Plan provides much needed flexibility and therefore certainty that the Plan's housing requirement will be delivered. It is better to over-provide than under-provide. This is a sound planning approach in
Kevin	Ashman	Estates and Agency Strategic Land	Yes, the Local Plan should provide a buffer. The scale of the buffer should have regard to the overall development strategy for the District. The buffer should make provision for slippage to housing delivery. There should not be an over-reliance on single sites.	Comment and support noted
Jake	Nugent	Endurance Estates Ltd	Yes, the Council is correct to apply a buffer of 20% to determine the amount of housing land that should be identified in order to achieve its requirement. To not provide a buffer is unrealistic since it is inevitable that over a 21-year period some land that is identified now will not come forward for development as anticipated for a multitude of reasons. Therefore, while the housing requirement should be a minimum of 7,350 dwellings, the Council should seek to identify land for 8,820 dwellings to ensure the sufficient flexibility and the achieving the requirement is realistic. This will include any commitments as of 1st April 2022, which can be	Comment and support noted
John	Buchanan		Clearly there is a considerable amount of work that has gone on here however I cannot properly comment on this as I am not an expert on this field. What I will say though is that there are a lot of houseowners elsewhere in Essex where house prices are higher who, on retirement, will consider moving to Maldon. This fact will naturally encourage developers to build and price housing to suit them. It would be better for our local youngsters if more cheaper housing could be made available to suit their needs. Building a contingency of higher priced housing will make no difference to them, it would simply encourage more migration into the district.	Creating a slight over supply of housing can help to keep prices of housing more stable, it is a shortage of supply that normally drives market prices upwards. Building in flexibility into the local plan can help to assist this process and maintain a 5 year supply of housing.
Tim	Bradford	leadenhall	Do the basics properly before expanding.	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced, therefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months.
Jacky	Bannerman	Woodham Walter Parish Council	There should be greater flexibility in stated targets and stronger control over developers as targets will be driven by new build completions and thses should be linked to the planning process. Newbuild completions will be affected by 'external' matters such as national economy etc reinforcing the need for graeter flexibility	Coments and support noted
Mark	Tentori	Mazdev Limited	The fact that the 2017 Local Plan has resulted in undersupply and the Council dropping below 5 year housing land supply evidences the need to have a contingency/buffer figure for housing supply. The NPPF (para 11 b)) is clear that strategic policies should provide for objectively assessed needs as a minimum. The buffer of 20% (in accordance with the NPPF para 74) should be added given the repeated poor delivery of housing both pre and post adoption of the 2017 Local Plan.	Comment and support noted
Peter	Ingram		The biggest fear is over development	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced, therefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months.
Jane	Pilgrim		See answer to question 8.	The response has been made to question 8.
Judith	Radcliffe			
Christopher	Mabbutt	Burnham Primary School		
Mary	Putt			
Alan	Shrimplin	N/A	Yes but a reasonable number so as not to encourage developers over speculating, and applying for unreasonable planning applications, just for profit.	Development requiring planning permission is assessed against the development plan and national planning policy. The Council works to ensure that the development approved within the District is appropriate.
Valerie	Coleby	Berrys		
Kevin	Bruce		The target is worryingly too high already	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth, the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months. The Housing Target is based on a standard national model which the Council is expected to deliver as a minimum with the LDP.
William	Shepherd		Housing development should be based on what the surrounding infrastructure can support in terms of ready access to health care, education, sewerage, road network and social amenities	The LDP has an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which was approved through its examination, infrastructure is agreed with statutory providers such as the NHS and ECC and should be to mitigate the impact of development. Infrastructure is being provided under the terms of S106 legal agreements and will be assessed further as part of the LDP Review work.

Question 9

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 9. Should the Council have a contingency or buffer figure in its housing target to ensure that it always has a continuous supply of housing over the plan period and if so what should that buffer be?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
victoria	newson	Childrens Nursery	However these need to be in the correct most appropriate locations with adequate services and more than anything be AFFORDABLE to local people to buy.	Providing an additional buffer to the housing requirement should enable a higher percentage of affordable housing delivery which will assist those that residents who cannot access the open housing market.
David	Banfield			
Phillip	Wright	CALA Homes (North Home Counties) Ltd	We support a buffer of 20% in order to ensure that Maldon has a continuous supply of housing sites over the Plan period. It is important that the District Council ensures that it has a pool of sites that can deliver in the short to medium-term in order to quickly address Maldon's current lack of a 5-Year Housing Land Supply.	Coments and support noted
.	.	SN Developments		
.	.	Cooper Property Holdings Ltd		
Jane	Coleman	Maldon Town Council	See previous comments on double counting	Comments noted
Roy	Martin	Mr Roy Martin	The present call for sites initiative is reported to have more than sufficient areas to be able to deliver the number of additional units required under this review, it should not need to create additional contingencies above the provision of housing generated from those sites identified as appropriate for development ('windfall' would suffice).	The HELAA and the call for sites is part of the baseline evidence for the LDP Review and whilst the sites for allocation may be taken from those sites, other sites may come forward for consideration and the buffer would be part of site allocations. It is more appropriate to plan for the housing requirement rather than allow it to be delivered in a more adhoc way through windfall development.
Simon	Butler-Finbow	Pigeon Investment Management	It is clear in the NPPF that a buffer is required to be applied to ensure housing delivery over the plan period. The amount of buffer to be applied will vary dependant in part on historic delivery rates and windfalls. MDC has a confirmed lack of 5-Year Housing Land Supply (5YHLS), a supply that has reduced periodically since the adoption of the current Plan. Prior to the adoption of the current Plan, MDC had an extended period without a 5YHLS. Arguably therefore, based on these circumstances alone a higher buffer could be supported. In this regard, paragraphs 74 and 75 of the NPPF make clear the need to maintain a 5 year housing land supply, and the need for a 20% buffer to be applied when "there has been significant under delivery of housing over the previous three years, to improve the prospect of achieving the planned supply". Whilst MDC has delivered well against the most recent Housing Delivery Test results, given the identified shortfall in housing sites, particularly in the short term (owing in part to the number of larger strategic sites in the district) it would be logical for a 20% buffer to be applied to ensure consistent and reliable housing delivery over the entirety of the forthcoming plan period. The figures for the commitments remaining as at 1st April 2023 make it clear that smaller allocations, such as those at Burnham-on-Crouch, will have been delivered relatively faster and more comprehensively than the larger allocations. The submitted sites can therefore make a very valuable contribution to housing delivery within the early stages of the forthcoming plan period, providing a reliable source of deliverable homes irrespective of what buffer is applied to the identified housing need.	Coments and support noted
sara	doran		Population demographics are changing considerably, so there is no clear certainty about population growth/need over the next 20 years - for example some reduction in family size, aging population but also risks of significant pandemic effects over the next few years may reduce population growth locally.	The Council has to produce an LDP with up to date evidence and at the moment there is no evidence that the population of the District is going to fall. This is monitored as population projections are produced and the Government will adjust the standard methodology if population circumstances alter.
Colin	Horner	Villageretreat	Housing allocation should be defined in the LDP and not left open . Potential areas identified as candidates for development will cause residents to leave the area and force houses down in value. It will leave useful farming land fallow in the hope of planning being granted and wind fall profits for the land owners. People need to know where they stand.	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced, therefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months.
Robert	Scott	Lewis & Scott Retirement Living Ltd	Yes - there should not be a 'cap' on the delivery of affordable specialist housing given the lack of delivery since the current local plan was adopted. Providing specialist development can demonstrate sustainability, and the are no objections from statutory consultees, the titled balance in favour of sustainable development should apply.	Comments noted
Rob	Bard			
Tim	Hann		Unfortunately, a community needs, geography of the land, infrastructure, etc, cannot be covered by a 'one size fits all' approx . An algorithm commissioned Whitehall should not dictate the number of houses a Local Authority should build that has an additional contingency & buffer allowance. It should be a decision implemented (if required) at local level, by those who know the area.	Unfortunately, this is not a choice that the Council can make, it is a requirement of national planning policy that the standard methodolgy be used to set the housing requirement for an area. There is no evidence that the Council should deviate from that figure.
Burnham	Town Council	Burnham on Crouch Town Council	Not sure how much. Possibly 5% .	Comment and support noted
Justin	Barkham	Self employed		
Poppy	Vidler	Crown Consumer Ltd		
Stephen	Sutton			
Tim	Madelin			

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 9. Should the Council have a contingency or buffer figure in its housing target to ensure that it always has a continuous supply of housing over the plan period and if so what should that buffer be?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Joanna	Jeffery	Althorne Parish Clerk	Having a buffer will encourage extra building and help create inward migration into the district, which is already getting overcrowded for what is considered a rural area with inadequate infrastructure.	Identifying additional housing supply provides crucial flexibility within the overall approach to housing delivery a key theme of the NPPF (paras 14 and 50) and this will help to ensure that the Plan is deliverable. In practice not every site identified in a housing trajectory needs to or will come forward exactly as proposed in order to meet the housing requirement over the Plan period. Having a housing buffer recognises that the housing market will be subject to various fluctuations and some potential slippage over the Plan period. Building in this recognition from the outset of the Plan provides much needed flexibility and therefore certainty that the Plan's housing requirement will be delivered. It is better to over-provide than under-provide. This is a sound planning approach in line with the NPPF. The LDP has an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which was approved through its examination, infrastructure is agreed with statutory providers such as the NHS and ECC and should be to mitigate the impact of development. Infrastructure is being provided under the terms of S106 legal agreements and will be assessed further as part of the LDP Review work.
Paul	Coppin		no comment	N/A
Steven	Bardwell	S P Bardwell Ltd		
David	Oxford	Lloyds Banking Group	Yes however based on the sustainability of the local lanscape, heritage and carbon emmission targets	Comment and support noted
Stephen Francis	Dewick	Curry Farm	This means using every available green space in the longer term	Unfortunately Maldon District does not have very much brownfield land to develop on that's because it does not have a history of industrial development. However, brownfield first should be a consideration when making site allocations and any suitable site allocations
George	Dixon			
Douglas	Channer	Private	It appears to me that regarding numbers of housing required if buffers are added you never get to the end of the road to that which is required. It creates a perpetuation of development and the road just keeps going on and on. The brakes have to be put on at some stage before what was a pleasant rural /coastal district may become more akin to urban sprawl form interspersed with patches of countryside .	Population growth is continuous and therefore identifying additional housing supply provides crucial flexibility within the overall approach to housing delivery a key theme of the NPPF (paras 14 and 50) and this will help to ensure that the Plan is deliverable. In practice not every site identified in a housing trajectory needs to or will come forward exactly as proposed in order to meet the housing requirement over the Plan period. Having a housing buffer recognises that the housing market will be subject to various fluctuations and some potential slippage over the Plan period. Building in this recognition from the outset of the Plan provides much needed flexibility and therefore certainty that the Plan's housing requirement will be delivered. It is better to over-provide than under-provide. This is a sound planning approach in line with the NPPF
Lynda	Bugg		20%	Support noted
Paul	Burgess	None	Only modest c 5%	Comment noted, though this may not be a large enough buffer to ensure the delivery of critical infrastructure needed for the district.
D	Cooper		20% as recommended by the Government given historic undersupply. Sufficient flexibility/opportunity will need to be built into policy to allow for sustainable sites to be brought forward - ie windfalls and also as organic growth to existing settlements.	Comment and support noted
C/O Agent	C/O Agent		In order to maintain a robust five-year housing land supply position across the plan period, and to avoid having to regularly update the Local Plan when it is up for review, it is necessary to plan for more homes than the minimum required. Such a buffer would ensure that any delays in delivery of any proposed larger sites or overestimates in windfall delivery do not have significant consequences for the Council's short- and long-term ability to meet housing needs. It is recommended that a 20% buffer be applied and this should be sufficient to address any uncertainties in the delivery of allocated sites. It is however our client's view that supply generally is made up of a variety of sites that deliver a consistent supply across the district and over the plan	Comment and support noted
Zoe	May	East of England Ambulance Service NHS Trust		
Roger	Woodcock			
Braxted and Blackwater Conservation Grou	BBCG	The Braxted and Blackwater Conservation Group (BBCG)	No comment	N/A
raymond	dundas	Householder	5%	Comment noted, though this may not be a large enough buffer to ensure the delivery of critical infrastructure needed for the district.
John	Watson		We would suggest that this cannot be determined until there has been an analysis done on the preferred option vs the Infrastructure required to support that option. The danger is that if a windfall buffer were agreed vs strategic there can be no timely planning for infrastructure by ECC.	The buffer would not be a windfall buffer it would be against site allocations.
Josh	Plant	Gladmans	Gladman supports the Home Builders Federation's recommendation that local plans should seek to identify sufficient deliverable sites to provide a 20% buffer between the housing Maldon District Council Local Development Plan Review 2021+ - Issues and Options requirement and supply. This ensures the Council can maintain a continuous supply of housing over the plan period and safeguards against delays and non-delivery of sites, as has occurred during the current Local Plan.	Comment and support noted

Question 9

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 9. Should the Council have a contingency or buffer figure in its housing target to ensure that it always has a continuous supply of housing over the plan period and if so what should that buffer be?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
*	*		Given our comments in respect of Question 8 above, it is clearly imperative that a buffer should be applied. Housing allocations need to allow for changes in the economy which influence the housing market. We have recently witnessed the unforeseen consequences of the COVID 19 pandemic and also supply issues associated with Brexit. Most recently, the consequences of the conflict in the Ukraine whilst unknown at present could be significant. Such uncertainties are further fuelled by the Government's continued, albeit diluted planning reforms. It is, therefore, essential that any minimum housing target is supported by a suitable buffer. The Council's lack of five-year housing land supply suggests that a minimum 20% buffer should be applied.	Comment and support noted
*	Willmott		Given our comments in respect of Question 8 above it is clearly imperative that a buffer should be applied. Housing allocations need to allow for changes in the economy which influence the housing market. We have recently witnessed the unforeseen consequences of the COVID 19 pandemic and also supply issues associated with Brexit. Most recently, the consequences of the conflict in the Ukraine whilst unknown at present could be significant. Such uncertainties are further fuelled by the Government's continued, albeit diluted planning reforms. It is therefore essential that any minimum housing target is supported by a suitable buffer. The Council's lack of five year housing land supply suggests that a minimum 20% buffer should be applied.	Comment and support noted
Ivor	Watson			
*	*		The proposed buffer to be applies to any requirement is supported. It is considered consistent with the NPPF and PPG, and is consistent with the approach found sound through examination of other Local Plans. For example, in respect of the Guildford Local Plan, a headroom of 3,984 dwellings / 37% was found to be a sound approach. Notably, this was despite such a headroom necessitating additional Green Belt release – something that is required to be justified by exceptional circumstances, and not applicable to Maldon. In the case of the Guildford Local Plan Examination, the Inspector concluded such a scale of headroom was justified, notwithstanding the additional loss of Green Belt this would involve, as it would help ensure a robust strategy for meeting needs in the event that there is slippage in the delivery of housing from the allocated or committed sites; as well as helping provide for the anticipated level of unmet need from neighbouring Woking, where the was an identified undersupply of housing. Separately, a headroom of South Oxfordshire Local Plan for example, a headroom of 27% (equating to over 6,500 dwellings) was found to be sound, despite objections and such a headroom again requiring further loss of Green Belt and exceptional circumstances to be demonstrated. Responding to those who had objected and proposed a reduction in housing numbers, the Examination Inspector concluded that a smaller headroom would make the Plan "much less resilient in the face of potential delays to one or more of the strategic allocations." The Chelmsford Local Plan 2020 incorporate a headroom of 18%, or 3,328 dwellings, above the NPPF 2012 housing requirement identified for the administrative area. In the Examination of this Local Plan, the Inspector concluded that over 21,000 homes were deliverable against an identified requirement of c.18,500 dwellings, and that the headroom was appropriate noting this represented "a suitable buffer to ensure that the Plan remains robust in the event that there is slippage in the delivery of any of the allocated or committed sites. It also supports the provision of more affordable housing, improving overall affordability in Chelmsford".This last point is of particular relevance to Maldon given the worsening affordability in the District the LDPIO recognises, and the scale of affordable housing need	Comments and support noted
*	*		Given our comments in respect of Question 8 above it is clearly imperative that a buffer should be applied. Recent years have highlighted that Maldon is reliant on too few sites and is not resilient to changing circumstances on such sites. A buffer may assist with avoiding such situations in the future and applying a higher expectation for the delivery of homes each year, to ensure that any changes in the circumstances of any particular site will be less likely to result in an actual drop below the housing requirement in any given year. Given the current issues in relation to delivery, we recommend that a 20% buffer would be prudent and could reasonably be applied.	Comment and support noted
*	*		Given our comments in respect of Question 8 above it is clearly imperative that a buffer should be applied. Recent years have highlighted that Maldon is reliant on too few sites and is not resilient to changing circumstances on such sites. A buffer may assist with avoiding such situations in the future and applying a higher expectation for the delivery of homes will ensure that any changes in the circumstances of any particular site will be less likely to result in an actual drop below the housing requirement in any given year. Given the current issues in relation to delivery, we recommend that a 20% buffer would be prudent and could reasonably be applied.	Support noted
*	*		Given our comments in respect of Question 8 above it is clearly imperative that a buffer should be applied. Recent years have highlighted that Maldon is reliant on too few sites and is not resilient to changing circumstances on such sites. A buffer may assist with avoiding such situations in the future and applying a higher expectation for the delivery of homes will ensure that any changes in the circumstances of any particular site will be less likely to result in an actual drop below the housing requirement in any given year. Given the current issues in relation to delivery, we recommend that a 20% buffer would be prudent and could reasonably be applied and that medium sized sites would be beneficial to ensure a more resilient approach to site delivery.	Comment and support noted

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 9. Should the Council have a contingency or buffer figure in its housing target to ensure that it always has a continuous supply of housing over the plan period and if so what should that buffer be?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
*	*		Given our comments in respect of Question 8 above, it is imperative that a buffer should be applied. Recent years have highlighted that Maldon is reliant on too few large sites and is not resilient to changing circumstances on such sites. A buffer may assist with avoiding such situations in the future and applying a higher expectation for the delivery of homes will ensure that any changes in the circumstances of any particular site will be less likely to result in an actual drop below the housing requirement in any given year. Given the current issues in relation to delivery, we recommend that a 20% buffer would be prudent and could reasonably be applied. This would help to maintain the churn of delivery that is required to achieve a five-year supply of housing	Comment and support noted
*	*		Given our comments in respect of Question 8 above, it is clearly imperative that a buffer should be applied. Recent years have highlighted that Maldon is reliant on too few sites and is not resilient to changing circumstances on such sites. A buffer may assist with avoiding such situations in the future and applying a higher expectation for the delivery of homes will ensure that any changes in the circumstances of any particular site will be less likely to result in an actual drop below the housing requirement in any given year. Given the current issues in relation to delivery, we recommend that a 20% buffer would be prudent and could reasonably be applied.	Coments and support noted
*	*		As per the response to Question 8, BDW Eastern strongly agrees that MDC should have a suitable buffer to make sure that there is a continuous supply of housing. MDC's latest Five Year Housing Land Supply Statement (April 2021) stands at 3.26 years, so well below the five years required by Government, detailed in the NPPF (Paragraph 74). This means that the current policies are out of date and so the Council is subject to more speculative development. Speculative developments would continue if the Council still fails to meet its five year housing Land Supply target. The provision of the 20% buffer, as recommended by Government, should contribute towards maintaining the five year housing land supply position and therefore, this is considered appropriate by BDW Eastern. In order to maintain a five year supply across the Plan Period, it is important that MDC seeks to allocate sites of all types and sizes from new settlements/urban extensions to growth of villages. Aside from other benefits that the development can bring to the Village of North Fambridge, the extension of the North Fambridge Village alone on the proposed parcels of land can provide short to medium term supply for MDC over the next Local Plan Period, in a sustainable location, enabling the Council to maintain its five year housing land supply.	Comment and support noted. At the present time the Council cannot comment on whether individual settlements can or cannot accommodate future growth.The LDP Review process has to plan for future growth and it will have to be accommodated within the District. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and this was one of the reasons for the Issues and Options Consultation. In the coming months work will be undertaken to make the necessary decision using the evidence prepared as part of the LDP Review work.
Ben	Binder	University of Adelaide		
Lorraine	Bailey	Wickham Bishops Parish Council		
Ali	Aldis			
David	Smye	The Maldon Society		
Stewart	Newlands	Fambridge Lake		
Stewart	Newlands	Fambridge Lake		
Paula	Stanbury			
Sonia	Whiskin	Financial Services		
Geoffrey	Charge	n/a		
Robert	Collins			
Ben	Thornett			
Matthew	Wood	Phase 2 Planning		
Tim	Aves			
Helen	James			
Kathy	Day			
Peter	Wakling			
Sara	Howarth			
Eissa	Leo			
Michele	Williams		Planning policy should be in line with National requirements	Identifying additional housing supply provides crucial flexibility within the overall approach to housing delivery a key theme of the NPPF (paras 14 and 50) and this will help to ensure that the Plan is deliverable. In practice not every site identified in a housing trajectory needs to or will come forward exactly as proposed in order to meet the housing requirement over the Plan period. Having a housing buffer recognises that the housing market will be subject to various fluctuations and some potential slippage over the Plan period. Building in this recognition from the outset of the Plan provides much needed flexibility and therefore certainty that the Plan's housing requirement will be delivered. It is better to over-provide than under-provide. This is a sound planning approach in
Tara	Strydom			
Jenny	Ball			
Cliff	Baron			
Gill	Winsor	Tesco		
Emily	Benham	Servoca complex care and nursing		

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 9. Should the Council have a contingency or buffer figure in its housing target to ensure that it always has a continuous supply of housing over the plan period and if so what should that buffer be?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Laura	Cannon			
Shaneen	Illanes			
Merryl	Quilter			
Bear	Keen			
Jessica	Cox			
Robert	Burton		You can't build just in case, use old industrial areas for redevelopment	Unfortunately Maldon District does not have very much brownfield land to develop on that's because it does not have a history of industrial development. However, brownfield first should be a consideration when making site allocations and any suitable sites that are brownfield in areas chosen for growth would be considered first for allocation.
Yvonne	Wade			
Louise	Bywaters-Smith	Hospitality		
Brooke	Roberts-Morgan			
Patricia	Bunkle			
Marc	Rawinsky	M R Sovereign Services Ltd		
Roger	Tiffn			
Kathryn	Beighton	Publishing	There is no need to assume a possible extra 20% when the demographic is ageing so demand will fall. If there must be a buffer, then 5% maximum	Identifying additional housing supply provides crucial flexibility within the overall approach to housing delivery a key theme of the NPPF (paras 14 and 50) and this will help to ensure that the Plan is deliverable. In practice not every site identified in a housing trajectory needs to or will come forward exactly as proposed in order to meet the housing requirement over the Plan period. Having a housing buffer recognises that the housing market will be subject to various fluctuations and some potential slippage over the Plan period. Building in this recognition from the outset of the Plan provides much needed flexibility and therefore certainty that the Plan's housing requirement will be delivered. It is better to over-provide than under-provide. This is a sound planning approach in line with the NPPF. The population of the District is predicted to grow irrespective of an aging population.
Roy	Warren	Sport England		
STUART	SOWTER			
Mark	Raffray		With due regard to NPPF guidance, inclusion of a buffer is warranted. However, as to the selection of a 20% buffer, which is assumed to be in accord with NPPF para 74 options, the Issues and Options commentary does not set out metrics and an evidence that the shortfall over the last 3 consecutive years represents a situation of *significant* under-delivery.	Identifying additional housing supply provides crucial flexibility within the overall approach to housing delivery a key theme of the NPPF (paras 14 and 50) and this will help to ensure that the Plan is deliverable. In practice not every site identified in a housing trajectory needs to or will come forward exactly as proposed in order to meet the housing requirement over the Plan period. Having a housing buffer recognises that the housing market will be subject to various fluctuations and some potential slippage over the Plan period. Building in this recognition from the outset of the Plan provides much needed flexibility and therefore certainty that the Plan's housing requirement will be delivered. It is better to over-provide than under-provide. This is a sound planning approach in line with the NPPF. The actual amount of the buffer has not yet been
April	Rowley			
Bill	Withers		The 20% buffer seems a little high, but yes a buffer should exist.	Comment and support noted
joanna	jeffery			
John	Mitchell			
Peter	Layley			
Rex	Davenport			
Lesley	Mitchelmore	Danbury Parish Council		
Karen	Neath	Tolleshunt Major Parish Council		
N	DA			
Dorreen	Linton	our group consists of adults, playschool and brownies group		
John	Wileman			
Richard	Courtney	University Of East London		
sue	Rawlinson	Evolve		
Douglas	Milsted	Heybridge Basin Conservation Society	WHATEVER IT TAKES TO PREVENT DEVELOPERS GATE CRASHING THE PLANNING SYSTEM. MDC NEED S TO BE SMARTER THAN THEM!	Development requiring planning permission is assessed against the development plan and national planning policy. The Council works to ensure that the development approved within the District is appropriate.
Alan	Outlaw	Self Emplyed	I think the 20% buffer is about right.	Comment and support noted
Lindsey	Squire	North Fambridge Parish Council	However 20% would seem to be too large a buffer.	Comment noted, though anything less than 20% may not be a large enough buffer to ensure the delivery of critical infrastructure needed for the district.
K	Jeffries			
John	Lakin	?		
Samantha	Weeks		A buffer sounds a good idea but unsure of what the best methodology should be to calculate it.	Comment and support noted
Carlie	Mayes			
Richard	Martin	Scott Properties	A 20% buffer would be appropriate to help guarantee delivery of at least the housing target.	Comment and support noted

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 9. Should the Council have a contingency or buffer figure in its housing target to ensure that it always has a continuous supply of housing over the plan period and if so what should that buffer be?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Mike	Spurgeon	Phase 2 Planning and Development		
C/O Agent Mike	Spurgeon	Phase 2 Planning & Development		
Amanda	Mickelsen			
Samuel	Newton	Anglo European School		
Mary-Ann	Munford			
Jo	Harvey			
Terry	Fleming		uncertain on percentage but a buffer will build in resilience	Comment and support noted
Philip	Davies		10% buffer should be sufficient.	Comment and support noted
Susan	Cumming	not applicable		
Ronald	Edge	Construction Industry		
Gordon	Mussett	Little Braxted Parish Council	15% supply	Comment and support noted
Ronnie	Tongue	state school		
Sue	Dobson	Essex Bridleways Association		
David	Webb			
Andrew	Marsh	Historic England		
Brian	Haydon			
Hazel	Notley			
Jean	Brown			
Joanne	McGinity			
Stuart	Dedman	Nil	No longer applicable	N/A
Kerry	McKenna			
Penny	McCauley	Tiptree dental		
Jane	Phillips	Solicitors		
David	Rees			
Darren	Weeks			
Phil	Manning			
Peter	Clack			
Doug	Lockwood	National Grid	It should state a number and not exceed it if approved.	Comment noted, though housing figures are always a minimum not a maximum and can be exceeded.
Sally	George			
Vara	Szajkowski			
Bob	Calver		250	Comment noted, though housing figures are always a minimum not a maximum and can be exceeded.
Tessa	Lambert	Natural England		
Dawn	Howles			
natasha	frith			
Anthony	Bates			
Russell	Howles	WSP		
Gillian	Hollamby			
Brian	Townsend			
Malcolm	Finch			
Peter	Taylor	Retired		
Chris	Melbourne		Any buffer needs to be conditional on relevant increases in the local infrastructure, sadly this is never the case... the roads are is disrepair and the Dengie is a peninsular with one main road on and off, already at breaking point. Gosport is a case in point, overdeveloped peninsular which has come to a standstill as a fine example of where we will end up with an unrealistic housing target	Infrastructure provision is a planning obligation and therefore can only be provided in order to mitigate the impact of development. It is not legally possible to require additional provision over and above what is required as recommended by infrastructure providers.
Robert	Hollamby			
Kate	Priest	Purleigh Community Primary School		
Gary	SPICER			
Helen	Bridge		Builders should build the houses they have been granted permission for, not land bank them waiting for prices to rise further.	Comment noted there is no evidence that developers are land banking in the District, sites with planning permission do appear to be being built out.
Melanie	Allen	Government	There are empty second houses that can be used in the area. Finish the developments already in place before adding more.	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced, therefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months. Empty second homes cannot be taken into account when calculating the housing requirement.
Adam	Medlycott			
Joanne	Maloney			
Portia	Roelofs			

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 9. Should the Council have a contingency or buffer figure in its housing target to ensure that it always has a continuous supply of housing over the plan period and if so what should that buffer be?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Lisa	Singh	Direct Call Centres Ltd	The council should ensure that developers who had previously submitted land and that land was granted planning should build and not be dormant. This only creates the need for more land to be put into the plan.	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced, therefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months
Kevin	Head		In applying the housing target towards housing allocations in the Plan, we believe that the figure should have a 10%-20% increase. Many allocations which will be hoped to contribute towards the housing target may face unforeseen constraints such as infrastructure difficulties or finance issues and subsequently be stalled in coming forward for development. This has been experienced with the delivery of the two major Garden Suburbs in Maldon and Heybridge as acknowledged in paragraph 6.32. If an over-reliance on larger scale developments continue it will result in further future under delivery or supply problems persisting and the Local Plan must account for this. A higher contingency threshold applied to the housing target will account for any unforeseen delivery issues with particular sites and will further help ease affordability pressures in the district.	Comment and support noted
Elizabeth	Sawyer Bayliss			
Michael	Partridge			
Kenneth	Northfield			
Jerry	Petts			
Frederick	McMahon			
Tracey	Merritt	Dengie Hounds and Horses		
Jo	Crump	Servoca Secure Soutions		
Susan	ARCHER			
Winifred	Sutherland			
Chris	clark			
Jeremy	Richardson			
Cheryl	Carter	Education		
Susan	Mason			
Melad	Kamlow		Difficult to put an exact figure, however this housing buffer should not exceed the capacity and infrastructure of these small villages, which the current proposals do.	The LDP has an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which was approved through its examination, infrastructure is agreed with statutory providers such as the NHS and ECC and should be to mitigate the impact of development. Infrastructure is being provided under the terms of S106 legal agreements and will be assessed further as part of the LDP Review work
Dave	Draper	The Hartford Insurance Group		
Kevin	Cooper			
Katherine	Whitehouse			
Linda	Soul			
Robert	Wilson		A buffer will only increase the number of houses allowed so should not be included	Identifying additional housing supply provides crucial flexibility within the overall approach to housing delivery a key theme of the NPPF (paras 14 and 50) and this will help to ensure that the Plan is deliverable. In practice not every site identified in a housing trajectory needs to or will come forward exactly as proposed in order to meet the housing requirement over the Plan period. Having a housing buffer recognises that the housing market will be subject to various fluctuations and some potential slippage over the Plan period. Building in this recognition from the outset of the Plan provides much needed flexibility and therefore certainty that the Plan's housing requirement will be delivered. It is better to over-provide than under-provide. This is a sound planning approach in
Sarah-Jayne	Hunt	SJ Aesthetics LTD		
Jonathan	Hunt			
Deborah	de Boltz	Farleigh Hospice		
Tim	Murphy			
Claire	McGrane			
Tracey	Munford	NA		
Rowan	Rampersad			
LUKE	MACFARLANE	S A RAVEN		
Anna	Wombwell	Morris Farm		
Ronald	Owen	Not applicable		
Elizabeth	Johns			
Colin	Day			
Natalie	Bradford			
Harriet	Hurst-Smith			
Tony	Vanner			
Josie	Vanner			
Tracy	Carroll			
Ian	Roberts	N/A		
Tony	Ashton	none		
mandy	SHORT			
Kevin	Money	St. Lawrence Parish Council		

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 9. Should the Council have a contingency or buffer figure in its housing target to ensure that it always has a continuous supply of housing over the plan period and if so what should that buffer be?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Claire	Udall	1		
Linda	Raffray			
John	Cooper			
Leah	Jewiss			
Elaine	Ketley	South Woodham Ferrers Town Council	N/A	N/A
Ruth	Bull	The Othona Community		
Mark	Jackson	Mark Jackson Planning	If required based on previous provision against housing targets.	Identifying additional housing supply provides crucial flexibility within the overall approach to housing delivery a key theme of the NPPF (paras 14 and 50) and this will help to ensure that the Plan is deliverable. In practice not every site identified in a housing trajectory needs to or will come forward exactly as proposed in order to meet the housing requirement over the Plan period. Having a housing buffer recognises that the housing market will be subject to various fluctuations and some potential slippage over the Plan period. Building in this recognition from the outset of the Plan provides much needed flexibility and therefore certainty that the Plan's housing requirement will be delivered. It is better to over-provide than under-provide. This is a sound planning approach in
ann	cutting			
Sharon	Cushen			
Ian	Tooley			
Sally	Tokeley		Given the significant volumes for the area then I do not believe a buffer needs to be considered at this point	Identifying additional housing supply provides crucial flexibility within the overall approach to housing delivery a key theme of the NPPF (paras 14 and 50) and this will help to ensure that the Plan is deliverable. In practice not every site identified in a housing trajectory needs to or will come forward exactly as proposed in order to meet the housing requirement over the Plan period. Having a housing buffer recognises that the housing market will be subject to various fluctuations and some potential slippage over the Plan period. Building in this recognition from the outset of the Plan provides much needed flexibility and therefore certainty that the Plan's housing requirement will be delivered. It is better to over-provide than under-provide. This is a sound planning approach in
Christina	Chan			
Tim.	Holdsworth			
Graham	Snow			
Sarah	Packard			
Martin	Cook			
Clifford	Brown			
Steve	Gallant	Crouch Valley Defence Group		
Lesley	Woodley			
Kirsty	Rowsell			
Philip	Wakeling			
David	Brock			
Niki	Halls			
Stewart	Geden			
Anita	Thomas	Bank		
Andrew	Ashworth			
michael	smith			
Simon	Priest			
Philippa	Marshall			
Lewis	Cook	Form Architecture Ltd.		
EDWARD	GITTINS	Edward Gittins & Associates		
Steve	Williamson			
James	Cowell	E & B R Cowell		
Colin	Hawkes			
Ronald	PIPER			
John	McLarty		The identification of additional housing sites in consultation with Parish's should be considered.	Parish Councils are statutory consultees on both planning applications and the LDP Review.
John	McLarty		The Council needs to plan for the future and the economic changes that can affect the residential sector. Having a contingency or buffer figures allows a continuous supply across the district and plan period.	Comment and support noted
Norman	Branch	N/A		
John	McLarty		The identification of additional housing sites in consultation with Parish's should be considered.	Parish Councils are statutory consultees on both planning applications and the LDP Review.
James	Clarke			
David	Stilwell			
Ann	Thomas			
michael	harris			
Geoffrey	Cox			
John	McLarty		The identification of additional housing sites in consultation with Parish's should be considered.	Parish Councils are statutory consultees on both planning applications and the LDP Review.

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 9. Should the Council have a contingency or buffer figure in its housing target to ensure that it always has a continuous supply of housing over the plan period and if so what should that buffer be?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Barrington	Thomas			
Richard	Edwards			
Robyn	Woloszczuk			
Lesley	Speller			
Nicola	O'Dean	Balgores Motors		
Alexander	Romang			
Hayley	Holgate	ECC		
Eirlys	Parry	N/A		
Michael	Unwin	N/A		
Tony	Barber			
Nick	Mason	ECOClassics		
Melanie	Osborne	Motor Trade		
Stuart	Turner	Essex search and rescue		
Mike	Carpenter	CODE Development Planners Ltd		
ian	wilson	cm36pt		
c/o Agent	c/o Agent			
kelly	tilley			
Catherine	Bicknell	Mid and South Essex Health and Care Partnership		
N	Baseley	IBA Planning Ltd		
Sue	White		Increasing population via refugees and immigration, putting additional strain on housing. The was in Ukraine will likely require the authority to help refugees settle in safety.	There is no evidence to support that the population of the District is increasing due to international immigration, the main cause of population increase is the formation of new households from within the District and national inmigration of older persons
Sarah	Yates			
Leonard	Lewis			
R	Minney			
Tim	Grant	Evolution Town Planning		
ANNE	OSBORN	Purleigh Community Shop		
Stephen	Hodgkinson		In applying the housing target towards housing allocations in the Plan, we believe that the figure should have a 10%-20% increase. Many allocations which will be hoped to contribute towards the housing target may face unforeseen constraints such as infrastructure difficulties or finance issues and subsequently be stalled in coming forward for development. This has been experienced with the delivery of the two major Garden Suburbs in Maldon and Heybridge as acknowledged in paragraph 6.32. If an over-reliance on larger scale developments continue it will result in further future under delivery or supply problems persisting and the Local Plan must account for this. A higher contingency threshold applied to the housing target will account for any unforeseen delivery issues with particular sites and will further help ease affordability pressures in the district.	Comments and support noted
c/o Agent	c/o Agent	Maldon Wick Limited		
ZOE	HOSTY			
S	Swain			
Kevin	Coleman	Phase 2 Planning		
John	Lawrence			
Diane	Wallace			
Jonathan	Aldis	Good life Countryside Services		
Grace	Godwin			
Sue	Hillman			
michael	carr	NHS		
Simon	Plater	Plater+Claiborne		
Mark	Anderson			
Karen	Wellum			
Emma	Wright			
Linda	Coom		I would always rather err on the side of too little housing than too much.	Identifying additional housing supply provides crucial flexibility within the overall approach to housing delivery a key theme of the NPPF (paras 14 and 50) and this will help to ensure that the Plan is deliverable. In practice not every site identified in a housing trajectory needs to or will come forward exactly as proposed in order to meet the housing requirement over the Plan period. Having a housing buffer recognises that the housing market will be subject to various fluctuations and some potential slippage over the Plan period. Building in this recognition from the outset of the Plan provides much needed flexibility and therefore certainty that the Plan's housing requirement will be delivered. It is better to over-provide than under-provide. This is a sound planning approach in
Caitlin	Soul			
Michelle	Curtis	Tollesbury Parish Council		
Mary	Hammond			

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 9. Should the Council have a contingency or buffer figure in its housing target to ensure that it always has a continuous supply of housing over the plan period and if so what should that buffer be?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Ian	Drinkwater		The area is already at capacity in my view	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced, therefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months.
john	hand	N/A		
Emma	Smith	Bradwell on Sea Parish Council		
Tim	Dixon			
Nicola	Taylor	Elixirr	the standard methodology if applied should sure take into consideration possible fluctuations and therefore adding a buffer is unnecessary inflation of the figures.	Identifying additional housing supply provides crucial flexibility within the overall approach to housing delivery a key theme of the NPPF (paras 14 and 50) and this will help to ensure that the Plan is deliverable. In practice not every site identified in a housing trajectory needs to or will come forward exactly as proposed in order to meet the housing requirement over the Plan period. Having a housing buffer recognises that the housing market will be subject to various fluctuations and some potential slippage over the Plan period. Building in this recognition from the outset of the Plan provides much needed flexibility and therefore certainty that the Plan's housing requirement will be delivered. It is better to over-provide than under-provide. This is a sound planning approach in
Graham	Johnson	graham v johnson		
Chris	Yates			
Sally	Everritt	Community360		
Mark	Garrett		15% supply	Comment noted, though this may not be a large enough buffer to ensure the delivery of critical infrastructure needed for the district.
Paul	Vidler			
Victoria	Long			
Victor	Staines			
Jayne	Moore	Essex County Fire and Rescue Service		
Kevin	Bennett			
Nicholas	Matthams			
Christian	van Stolk	RAND Europe		
Nicholas	Jepson			
Pamela	Lacey			
Chloe	Soul			
carole	kirk			
Sharon	Jackson		A buffer will encourage extra building in the district, which is already becoming overcrowded for what is considered a rural area with inadequate infrastructure.	Identifying additional housing supply provides crucial flexibility within the overall approach to housing delivery a key theme of the NPPF (paras 14 and 50) and this will help to ensure that the Plan is deliverable. In practice not every site identified in a housing trajectory needs to or will come forward exactly as proposed in order to meet the housing requirement over the Plan period. Having a housing buffer recognises that the housing market will be subject to various fluctuations and some potential slippage over the Plan period. Building in this recognition from the outset of the Plan provides much needed flexibility and therefore certainty that the Plan's housing requirement will be delivered. It is better to over-provide than under-provide. This is a sound planning approach in line with the NPPF. The LDP has an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which was approved through its examination, infrastructure is agreed with statutory providers such as the NHS and ECC and should be to mitigate the impact of development. Infrastructure is being provided under the terms of S106 legal agreements and will be assessed further as part of the LDP Review work.
RICHARD	GROUT			
Charles	Bishop			
Paul	Jewiss	Self Employed		
Deborah	Anderson	NHS		
John	Pilgrim	Self employed	You would need a crystal ball to be more accurate.	Comment noted but it is important that the Council try and set a realistic growth target for the local plan to delivery the needs of the District.
Gloria	Gold	London Design and Engineering UTC		
Linda	Curry			
Lucy	Waterhouse			
Jon	Mayhew			
James	Goody	James Goody refurbishments		
Johanna	Dale			
Tracy	Kinnane			
Carlos	Rodriguez			
Rebecca	Tucker			
Mark	Faraway			

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 9. Should the Council have a contingency or buffer figure in its housing target to ensure that it always has a continuous supply of housing over the plan period and if so what should that buffer be?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
T	Ketteley		No buffer required.	Comment noted, though without a buffer we may not be able to ensure the delivery of critical infrastructure needed for the district.
Elizabeth	Weston			
Jacky	Barber			
Ursula	Benjafield			
Paul	Mitchell			
Kristian	Tokeley	CTC Construction Ltd		
Ziyad	Thomas	Churchill Retirement Living / McCarthy Stone		
James	Campbell	HMPPS		
William	Moss			
Simon	Mackenzie Smith			
Richard	Udall			
Rosalind	Bishop			
John	Symington		Please see Section 3 of our submitted representations for details.	Have had a look through the responses and can find no response relating to Question 9
Michael	Manning			
Jack	Inglis	Kelvedon Hall		
Peggy	Shields			
Dawn	Adams	Catesby Estates	Yes. In order to maintain five-year housing land supply across the plan period and to avoid having to regularly update local plans when they are reviewed it is necessary to plan for more homes than the minimum required. Such a buffer ensures that any delays in delivery of larger sites or over-estimates in windfall delivery, as has been experienced in Maldon, do not have significant consequences for the Council's short- and long-term ability to meet housing needs. With regard to the level of buffer required, we consider that a 20% buffer should be sufficient to address any uncertainties in the delivery of allocated sites. However, it is also important that previous mistakes made through the allocation of a few large-scale sites are not repeated. In this respect, we consider that a larger number of sites located across the districts most sustainable settlements (i.e. main towns and larger villages) will ensure a sustainable balance between ensuring delivery and locating development in the	Comment and support noted
Wayne	Tilley	RTG Group Limited		
David	Dronfield	Braxted park		
John	Peirson			
Ron	Brown	Corporate		
Roger	HAWES			
Anne	Hull	Elmwood Equestrian Centre		
Matthew	Bloxham	Matt		
Julia	Morris			
Amanda	MacKenzie			
Jenny	Shepherd			
Jack	Ellum			
Bernard	Steeples			
Anna	mccomb	NHS Property Services Ltd		
Natalie	Kermath	Environment Agency		
Peter	Knights			
Unknown	Unknown	Ministry of Defence		
Duncan	Clark			
Patricia	Smith			
Mick	Sargeant		This should overcome the present situation of no 5 year supply and hence open season for opportunist development	Comment and support noted
John	Cockerell	Hatfield Peverell Parish Council		
Catherine	Williams	C/O Savills (Agent)		
Tom	Kelly			
Linda	Gemmill			
Linda	Gemmill			
Mark	Norman	Highways England		
Thomasin	Foster			
*	*			
Alan	Massow			
*	*			
Ian	Butt			
Sarah	Sayer			
*	*			

Question 10

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 10. Should the plan period be longer than 15 years, should the period be 20 years, so that infrastructure can be planned in over a longer period?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Jenny	Clemo	Langford & Ulting Parish Council	Basically new infrastructure is required now. The Plan period therefore does not correlate with the need for new infrastructure. The main limitation on new infrastructure is lack of financing available.	The present LDP has an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which was approved through its examination, infrastructure is agreed with statutory providers such as the NHS and ECC and should be to mitigate the impact of development. Infrastructure is being provided under the terms of S106 legal agreements and will be assessed further as part of the LDP Review work. The matter in the majority of cases is not that infrastructure has not been provided but that its trigger points such as the number of homes completed has not been reached. This matter is monitored carefully and contributions pursued as they become liable.
Gavin	Rowsell		Flexibility is key.	Comment noted and agreed having a flexible plan should ensure delivery of its key priorities during the lifetime of the plan.
Gareth	Davies	N / A	Infrastructure (and infrastructure funding) benefits from long term planning and management. Development of a long term infrastructure plan will enable the Council to show that the LDP (not planning inspectors' discretion) is the credible arbiter of development in the District.	The present LDP has an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which was approved through its examination, infrastructure is agreed with statutory providers such as the NHS and ECC and should be to mitigate the impact of development. It is not at the planning inspectors discretion it is a plan put forward in partnership with the Council and infrastructure providers, the Inspector checks to ensure it is deliverable and viable. Infrastructure is being provided under the terms of S106 legal agreements and will be assessed further as part of the LDP Review work. The LDP Review will have an update on this infrastructure delivery plan.
Jackie	Gibbs		I strongly believe that all infrastructure should be put in place prior to housing as seen in Spain & other EU countries. It appears (as with the new road for South Woodham Ferrers) that these are promised and then deemed unviable...this is totally unacceptable.	The present LDP has an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which was approved through its examination, infrastructure is agreed with statutory providers such as the NHS and ECC and should be to mitigate the impact of development. Infrastructure is being provided under the terms of S106 legal agreements and will be assessed further as part of the LDP Review work. The matter in the majority of cases is not that infrastructure has not been provided but that its trigger points such as the number of homes completed has not been reached. This matter is monitored carefully and contributions pursued as they become liable.
Mike	Hayes		Plan periods longer than 15 years routinely find themselves speculative in their targets and quickly become out of date.	Comment noted it will be more difficult to guarantee delivery of the plans key priorities, the Council will have to work closely with delivery proposers.
David	Sismey		Too long to readjust for future housing needs. Making too much of a model-based assumption today for housing need.	
Stuart	Willsher	Persimmon Homes Essex	The NPPF states at para.22 that Local Plans should look to deliver a 15 year period from adoption, unless larger scale developers and infrastructure requirements dictate a longer plan period. The Issues and Options document identifies the following major infrastructure projects it foresees in the emerging plan period: • 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. The Council may also wish to include two NSIPs currently underway for the Maldon District: • Bradwell B New Nuclear Power Station; and • A12 Junction Upgrade and Widening Scheme. Given that some of the above predate the existing plan, it may be sensible for the LPA to plan to a 20 year period to plan for the above infrastructure; providing that the evidence base supports such an approach.	Support noted for a 20 year plan period
Anthony	Fittock		There is absolutly no reason why infrastructure cannot be planned for using the start date of the prior LDP... The delivery of Infrastructure and timing will depend largely upon the strategy chosen not the growth as suggested in Government guidance such as Securing developer contributions for education November 2019	The present LDP has an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which was approved through its examination, infrastructure is agreed with statutory providers such as the NHS and ECC and should be to mitigate the impact of development. Infrastructure is being provided under the terms of S106 legal agreements and will be assessed further as part of the LDP Review work. The matter in the majority of cases is not that infrastructure has not been provided but that its trigger points such as the number of homes completed has not been reached. The present system of funding for infrastructure does not actively support front loading and consideration should be given that a school could sit empty whilst population growth catches up. This matter is monitored carefully and contributions pursued
Daniel	McAllister	Robert Mulholland And Company Limited	20 years will allow a longer view of infrastructure needs to be accommodated and planned for.	Support noted for a 20 year plan period
Sarah	Sapsford		It can be longer and that may help, but the issue is the way infrastructure is funded and built. That is why Maldo has a huge issue with health (go surgeries) and school places. I don't think this will alleviate the problem.	The present LDP has an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which was approved through its examination, infrastructure is agreed with statutory providers such as the NHS and ECC and should be to mitigate the impact of development. Infrastructure is being provided under the terms of S106 legal agreements and will be assessed further as part of the LDP Review work. The matter in the majority of cases is not that infrastructure has not been provided but that its trigger points such as the number of homes completed has not been reached. The present system of funding for infrastructure does not actively support front loading and consideration should be given that a school could sit empty whilst population growth catches up. This matter is monitored carefully and contributions pursued

Question 10

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 10. Should the plan period be longer than 15 years, should the period be 20 years, so that infrastructure can be planned in over a longer period?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Stephanie	Ireland		Infrastructure needs to be in place before the housing in order for the community to have the appropriate services they need. Delaying it further will cause further distress to the community already living in the area.	The present LDP has an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which was approved through its examination, infrastructure is agreed with statutory providers such as the NHS and ECC and should be to mitigate the impact of development. Infrastructure is being provided under the terms of S106 legal agreements and will be assessed further as part of the LDP Review work. The matter in the majority of cases is not that infrastructure has not been provided but that its trigger points such as the number of homes completed has not been reached. The present system of funding for infrastructure does not actively support front loading and consideration should be given that a school could sit empty whilst population growth catches up. This matter is monitored carefully and contributions pursued
e	e	e		
Kevin	Lagan		No. We do not know what the future residents need so do not plan for the future generations needs as we do not know how they want to live.	Part of planning work is to plan for future needs which in the main will not differ greatly from the needs of the population today, therefore it is the statutory duty of the Council to plan for future housing and infrastructure requirements.
Bethany	Jones	Colchester Borough Council	It is common practise for Local Plans to have a 15 year plan period. Given that it has already been identified in Maldon that infrastructure delivery including from the current Adopted Local Plan has not run parallel to the delivery of housing (see Key Issue 7 – Ensuring that infrastructure meets residents, visitors and business and Paragraphs 22.4 and 23.3 of the Issues and Options Consultation Document); it may not be advantageous to extend the plan period for infrastructure to be planned and delivered over a longer period. Response is subject to call in until 15 March.	Comment noted, though the Council may have to consider a longer time period because it will be the only way to deliver key infrastructure.
magnus	Magnusson	Parker Planning Services	The NPPF (2021, para. 22) identifies that strategic policies should look ahead over a minimum 15-year period from adoption, to anticipate and respond to long-term requirements and opportunities, such as those arising from major improvements in infrastructure. The NPPF2021 further identifies that where larger scale developments, such as new settlements or significant extensions to existing villages and towns form part of the strategy for the area, policies should be set within a vision that looks further ahead (at least 30 years), to consider the likely timescale for delivery. Given our client's preferred strategy is accommodating new development on 'significant' urban extensions to existing settlements within the district and including Burnham-on-Crouch, we would suggest, in accord with the NPPF2021,	The Council can consider 30 years and this is supported by the NPPF, it will be a matter which will need further discussion depending on what the future infrastructure provision is for the District and if it can be accommodated over a minimum of 20 years or is more time required.
Nick	Whiteley		Yes, planning for the 'far' future is sometimes logically more viable than short-term future, providing a better understanding of what needs are there. However, reviewing this midway to make sure that it is still relevant would be useful	
Linda	Flowers	Self Employed	Poor infrastructure is a significant current and future risk you don't need a 20 year housing supply to know where poor infrastructure is a constraint or current issue. Hopefully population growth will lessen in the future and demand will lessen and then countryside erosion can slow. Countryside is a finite resource. Planning for exponential growth and stable rising markets would likely lead to an urban map that would spark outward migration. The latest HELAA is incendiary and gives a picture many won't want to see or stay around to see. Consideration should be given to potential outward migration too, which could hasten if the area keeps changing radically.	The present LDP has an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which was approved through its examination, infrastructure is agreed with statutory providers such as the NHS and ECC and should be to mitigate the impact of development. Infrastructure is being provided under the terms of S106 legal agreements and will be assessed further as part of the LDP Review work. The matter in the majority of cases is not that infrastructure has not been provided but that its trigger points such as the number of homes completed has not been reached. The present system of funding for infrastructure does not actively support front loading and consideration should be given that a school could sit empty whilst population growth catches up. This matter is monitored carefully and contributions pursued as they become liable. It is unlikely that population growth will significantly slow in the future, demographic predications show it increasing year on year.
Peter	Holmes			
Colin	Pryke			
John	Hitcham		Lack of infrastructure delivery is the biggest falldown area of LDPI Anything that improves the situation can only be good	Comment noted and agreed having a flexible plan should ensure delivery of its key priorities during the lifetime of the plan.
Richard	Kelly	Croudace Homes	The Plan period should be for 20 years as this strategy will allow development to be considered in a comprehensive manner across the life of the Plan in both a sustainable and economic way. Such a strategy will also assist the Council in achieving the objectives and thereby its vision by allocating a deliverable supply of dwellings in the right locations supported by the necessary and correct infrastructure. The longer Plan-period will also ensure any intermediate reviews can be undertaken within a stable Plan-led environment rather than at a point where the old plan is close	Support noted for a 20 year plan period
Andy	Quelch			
James	Rushton		A longer period seems more realistic.	Support noted for a 20 year plan period
Catherine	Champion			
Terence	Hughes	Burnham-on-Crouch constituent		
John	Tompkins		The plan should be over more than 15 years to afford the opportunity of the infrastructure to catch up with what there is at present let alone what will be the case in the future. Setting the Settlement Pattern will require the provision of up-to-date data that is currently not the case. It will also require assessments as to how any proposed development will impact on existing settlements. It is clear from the published data on the Call for Sites that this has not been done and the data to facilitate the assessment is incorrect	Comment noted. The Rural Facilities Study is an up to date piece of work and comments from this consultation on individual settlements will be fed into it to ensure that it is accurate.
Jeremy	Potter	Chelmsford City Council		

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 10. Should the plan period be longer than 15 years, should the period be 20 years, so that infrastructure can be planned in over a longer period?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Daniel	Goodman	Rochford District council		
Chris	Harvey			
Jane	Senior		Infrastructure should not take so long to be planned. it should be the priority on planning where the additional housing should go. I think it would be hard to provide extra infrastructure in the area without taking rural land away from the vicinity.	The present LDP has an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which was approved through its examination, infrastructure is agreed with statutory providers such as the NHS and ECC and should be to mitigate the impact of development. Infrastructure is being provided under the terms of S106 legal agreements and will be assessed further as part of the LDP Review work. The matter in the majority of cases is not that infrastructure has not been provided but that its trigger points such as the number of homes completed has not been reached. The present system of funding for infrastructure does not actively support front loading and consideration should be given that a school could sit empty whilst population growth catches up. This matter is monitored carefully and contributions pursued
Amanda	Clack		Infrastructure provision and considerations alongside development provision is essential. Much of the development in the District has been given the green light without adequate consideration and impetus given to the necessary accessibility impacts and infrastructure provision. For example, the developments in Burnham-on-Crouch have increased population without consideration on the need to increase health services (particularly GP and local hospital provision) and schools with families being told their children cannot get places locally and need to be taken to Brightlingsea (a minimum of a 1 hour journey). It is important proper consideration and consultation on the impact and mitigation provision are	
Daphne	Scott		A 20 year period would be better, however, the council should be regularly reviewing availability to ensure future development	
Kenny	Alexander	Thomas Gainsborough School	Otherwise a change in government, local council could prevent the plans initiated.	
David	Kennedy		As has been exampled by the impact of Covid-19 the future is unpredictable. Planning needs to be for a reasonable time period but not excessive, this will allow for adaptation as circumstances change	Comment noted having a flexible plan should ensure delivery of its key priorities during the lifetime of the plan.
Mark	Behrendt	Home Builders Federation	Not only will it allow for a greater degree of forward thinking with regard to infrastructure it will also ensure that the plan looks forward at least 15 years from adoption as required by paragraph 22 of the NPPF. Given that from submission a local plan will take at least 18 months to be adopted, but probably longer, the HBF consider a 20-year time frame from the year of submission to be an appropriate approach	Support noted for a 20 year plan period
Matthew	Cooper			
Terry	Inkpen	None	Concentrate on getting the infrastructure in place for current needs. Think about future needs realistically nearer the time, and make sure infrastructure and facilities are in place when building starts, not when a percentage of housing has already been put in place.	The present LDP has an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which was approved through its examination, infrastructure is agreed with statutory providers such as the NHS and ECC and should be to mitigate the impact of development. Infrastructure is being provided under the terms of S106 legal agreements and will be assessed further as part of the LDP Review work. The matter in the majority of cases is not that infrastructure has not been provided but that its trigger points such as the number of homes completed has not been reached. The present system of funding for infrastructure does not actively support front loading and consideration should be given that a school could sit empty whilst population growth catches up. This matter is monitored carefully and contributions pursued
christine	collins		there does not seem to have been any demonstrable change in the infrastructure for what has been built in the dengie already	The present LDP has an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which was approved through its examination, infrastructure is agreed with statutory providers such as the NHS and ECC and should be to mitigate the impact of development. Infrastructure is being provided under the terms of S106 legal agreements and will be assessed further as part of the LDP Review work. The matter in the majority of cases is not that infrastructure has not been provided but that its trigger points such as the number of homes completed has not been reached. The present system of funding for infrastructure does not actively support front loading and consideration should be given that a school could sit empty whilst population growth catches up. This matter is monitored carefully and contributions pursued
Stuart	Williams	Ace group		
Reegan	Howles		Any housing plans should be responsive to socioecological and environmental changes. I understand that the development of an LDP is important to guide the developments in the local area, but society changes and it would be irresponsible to rely on an LDP and housing plan that will be 15 or 20 years out of date. The coronavirus pandemic has brought about many changes in the way we operate and where we live. It may be that the current housing demand in the district will slow down, as people move away from areas within a commuter distance of London, due to an increase in work from home culture. We need to be able to actively respond to this and readily	It is unlikely that population will decline, demographic predications see it rising in the future and the Council has to adopt the standard method for calculating the housing requirement.
jasbir	Singh			
Janice	Jackson			
Roy A	Clare	Charities	Twenty years. Take a long view. Opens more options for infrastructure.	
Felicity	Gale			
Lindsey	Wright			

Question 10

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 10. Should the plan period be longer than 15 years, should the period be 20 years, so that infrastructure can be planned in over a longer period?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
David	Hill	Dandara Ltd	The plan should be longer than 15 years, to allow for a greater degree of forward thinking in relation to infrastructure and allow for necessary flexibility. This will also be in accordance with paragraph 22 of the updated NPPF (2021), which specifies that "policies should be set within a vision that looks further ahead (at least 30 years), to take into account the likely timescale for delivery." To develop a strategy that can properly endure and look beyond the short term, a 30-year plan period should be considered.	The Council can consider 30 years and this is supported by the NPPF, it will be a matter which will need further discussion depending on what the future infrastructure provision is for the District and if it can be accommodated over a minimum of 20 years or is more time required.
Steven	Potter			
Vysian	Banyard	TKPC		
Diane	Carter		15 years is fine.	Support noted for a 15 year plan
Luke	Garrett	Obsidian Strategic Asset Management Ltd	Obsidian Strategic considers it imperative for the Plan-period to be 20-years to allow the District Council to anticipate and respond to long-term requirements and opportunities, such as those arising from major improvements in infrastructure. In addition, and given that it is likely that the Local Plan will take at least 18-months to be adopted following its submission to the Secretary of State for independent Examination, then a 20-year Plan-period from point of submission is considered appropriate and consistent with NPPF Paragraph 22.	Support for 20 year plan noted
Robin	Fanshawe			
John	Brown		I'm not sure that planning that far ahead is reasonable. I would like to think that in far less than that, more people will work from home, reduce commuting and the requirements will be completely different. Unpredictable.	Comment noted though the Council has a statutory duty to produce a local plan which is for a minimum 15 years
Chris	Waumsley	Inovo Consulting		
Phil	Jacklin		Shpould be extented to 20 years or more so as to how climate and political situation trans spire.	Support for 20 year plan noted
Robert	Jones	The University of Reading	The longer time scale the better as the level of population within the UK, and hence the demand for new housing in any specific area, is basically unknowable in the face of political changes, changing patters of migration, pestilence and war.	Comment noted, though there is no indication at present that the population will fall in the future.
Robert	Stephens	N/A		
Pete	Butcher		The longer the plan period the more likely it is to go out of date. Only plan for the period that you can reliably predict the direction of events. Alternatively, plan for a longer period but have a review at certain intervals to check the objectives are being met. The latter option may put a greater strain on resources and provide less certainty for the community and developers. On balance, I think a 15 year planning period is about right.	Support for a 15 year plan period noted. The Council has a statutory duty to review its local plan every 5 years anyway, even if that review shows no alterations to the plan are required.
JO	COOMBES		I would favor 20-50 years. This would allow for proper planning and protection of environmental resources. Although developers will want a shorter plan period to grab profits as quickly as possible.	
Jonney	Aldridge		Not sure, we need to plan for the long term (like 100 years) but needs reviewing and probably rewriting in quite short term (3 years) as things changes so quickly.	
Mark	Hurley	Selfridges	Not just 20 years, this needs to be ongoing. - The housing plans need to align to road planning and social services planning.	The council has a statutory duty to review its local plan every 5 years and make any necessary adjustments including ensuring that the housing requirement and infrastructure needs are still on target.
Neil	Burke	Bradwell Power Generation Company Limited	Bradwell B do not have any specific comments to make on this question.	Noted
Lynne	Goodbourn			
Christopher	Kent		The infrastructure is inadequate now. 15 or 20 years is not helping the present.	The present LDP has an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which was approved through its examination, infrastructure is agreed with statutory providers such as the NHS and ECC and should be to mitigate the impact of development. Infrastructure is being provided under the terms of S106 legal agreements and will be assessed further as part of the LDP Review work. The matter in the majority of cases is not that infrastructure has not been provided but that its trigger points such as the number of homes completed has not been reached. This matter is monitored carefully and contributions pursued as they become liable.
Sophie	Pryor		Yes. In order to effectively plan for infrastructure and the forecasted changes in the population in the future we recommend the plan period should be 20 years. The District has experienced delays in the past and it is currently unclear what the timings and likely outcome of the DCO for the nuclear power station will be. It is therefore necessary to plan for 20 rather than 15 years to ensure the associated impact and potential growth is planned for.	Support for 20 year plan noted
c/o Agent	c/o Agent	Clarion Housing		
Stephanie	Jones	home		
Phillipa	Griffiths			
Matthew	Taylor		The plan period can be longer, but it still needs to be kept under continuous review to ensure that the nature of infrastructure being delivered suits demand in a rapidly changing environment post Covid, with people now choosing to work and shop closer to home.	Comment noted having a flexible plan should ensure delivery of its key priorities during the lifetime of the plan.
Anne	Bailey		Shpould be extented to 20 years or more so as to how climate and political situation trans spire.	Support for a 20 year plan noted
Lucien	Taylor			
David	Baker		To plan for longer periods would tend to increase the opportunity to get it wrong.	The council has a statutory duty to review its local plan every 5 years and make any necessary adjustments including ensuring that the housing requirement and infrastructure needs are still on target.
Glenna	Wilkins		It needs a period of at least 15 years to see how things have developed.	Comment noted 15 years is the minimum timeframe a local plan should be set over.

Question 10

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 10. Should the plan period be longer than 15 years, should the period be 20 years, so that infrastructure can be planned in over a longer period?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Danny	Soul		Any planning over long periods should be dependent upon infrastructure. Many development projects have infrastructure built at the end of housing development - but in many cases what is promised is not delivered. For any long term planning, it would only work if the promised infrastructure (extra transport links, GP surgeries, schools etc) where built early in the project.	The present LDP has an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which was approved through its examination, infrastructure is agreed with statutory providers such as the NHS and ECC and should be to mitigate the impact of development. Infrastructure is being provided under the terms of S106 legal agreements and will be assessed further as part of the LDP Review work. The matter in the majority of cases is not that infrastructure has not been provided but that its trigger points such as the number of homes completed has not been reached. This matter is monitored carefully and contributions pursued as they become liable.
Fiona	Barkham	Private Individual	The plan period needs to balance a number of uncertainties which may develop and should react to infrastructure delivery and technological changes. Incorporation of large sites does not enable that flexibility	National Planning Policy does not advocate a mixture of site sizes including 10% on sites of less than 1.0 hectare, this should allow for more flexibility. The Council also has a statutory duty to review its local plan every five years that this allows the Council to check to ensure that the plan is deliverying what it says it is going to
Isabel	Adcock		There should be forward planning of 10's of years as I personally am fed up with millions being spent on infrastructure that is already out of date when the project starts.	A Local Plan is a statutory land-use planning document that sets out how the Council should be developed over the next 15 years, in line with the requirements of national policy and legislation. A lesser timeframe for the local plan is not allowed
alan	johnson	sky broadcasting	there is no point planning infrastructure if you only plan it, it has to actually happen, you need better access links, a rail line and sufficient health provision already before building a ton more houses	The present LDP has an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which was approved through its examination, infrastructure is agreed with statutory providers such as the NHS and ECC and should be to mitigate the impact of development. Infrastructure is being provided under the terms of S106 legal agreements and will be assessed further as part of the LDP Review work. The matter in the majority of cases is not that infrastructure has not been provided but that its trigger points such as the number of homes completed has not been reached. This matter is monitored carefully and contributions pursued as they become liable.
Victoria	Cutmore	Endurance Estates	In accordance with the NPPF, strategic policies should look ahead over a minimum 15 year period from adoption. The current timescales for the review of the Plan anticipate adoption in late autumn 2023, and any delay to this would result in a Plan which does not comply with the requirements of national policy. As such it is considered that sufficient flexibility should be incorporated into the Plan period in order to future proof this against any potential delays to the timetable	Comments noted
Jane	Potter	Purleigh Parish Council	The Local plan should not be longer than 15 years. It needs to be flexible enough to be able to respond quickly to changing circumstances, whilst having the longevity to plan infrastructure projects.	Support for a 15 year plan period noted. The Council has a statutory duty to review its local plan every 5 years anyway, even if that review shows no alterations to the plan are required.
Brian	Haydon	Cold Norton Parish Council	It is considered that adding a further 5 years to the existing 15 year horizon provides very limited advantage relative to the cost and time commitment required except in cases of infrastructure of such scale and lead-time that the principle planning and approval authority would be at a higher administrative level	Support for a 15 year plan period noted. The Council has a statutory duty to review its local plan every 5 years anyway, even if that review shows no alterations to the plan are required.
Lee	Foster			
Vanessa	Horner		The plan at 15-20 years will enable the plan to be established and delay the infrastructure further but will still create problems	The present LDP has an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which was approved through its examination, infrastructure is agreed with statutory providers such as the NHS and ECC and should be to mitigate the impact of development. Infrastructure is being provided under the terms of S106 legal agreements and will be assessed further as part of the LDP Review work. The matter in the majority of cases is not that infrastructure has not been provided but that its trigger points such as the number of homes completed has not been reached. This matter is monitored carefully and contributions pursued as they become liable.
Brian	Howson	Pharmaceutical company		
Marion	Gunn			
BRIAN	COLLINS			
Peter	Lampard		Cannot predict that far ahead.	A Local Plan is a statutory land-use planning document that sets out how the Council should be developed over the next 15 years, in line with the requirements of national policy and legislation. A lesser timeframe for the local plan is not allowed
Tim	Chilvers		A 20-year plan period is supported and considered appropriate. The 2021 NPPF encourages councils to be more forward-looking and include strategic policies which look beyond a traditional 15-year plan period, to recognise the speed at which larger scale developments with appropriate infrastructure take to deliver. This approach has been recognised by planning inspectors at examination across the country which in turn has informed the recent change to the NPPF. As part of this issues and options consultation, the Council has recognised the failings of its 2017 plan strategy around the slow delivery of garden suburbs and strategic allocations. It is therefore necessary to plan over a longer period and also to include a larger number of small and medium-sized sites spread across the District to ensure that sufficient supply is available to meet local	Support for a 20 year plan noted

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 10. Should the plan period be longer than 15 years, should the period be 20 years, so that infrastructure can be planned in over a longer period?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Elliott	George		Paragraph 22 of the NPPF outlines that: "Strategic policies should look ahead over a minimum 15 year period from adoption, to anticipate and respond to long-term requirements and opportunities, such as those arising from major improvements in infrastructure. Where larger scale developments such as new settlements or significant extensions to existing villages and towns form part of the strategy for the area, policies should be set within a vision that looks further ahead (at least 30 years), to take into account the likely timescale for delivery." Given the above, national policy is clear that a plan period should be for a minimum of 15 years from the date of adoption and that significantly longer plan periods (at least 30 years) should be considered where large scale developments are proposed. Without knowing the Council's development strategy, it is impossible to know whether the latter would be appropriate however Taylor Wimpey would support a plan period over a longer period (for example 20 years) as this provides greater opportunities to properly plan for infrastructure improvements and lead-in times for such works, as well as providing the local community with clarity on a Council's strategy for growth over a longer period.	Support for a 20 year plan noted
Kate	Ellis			
Kevin	Ashman	Estates and Agency Strategic Land	The appropriate plan period is not just an issue related to meeting housing need. There are a range of issues to balance, including uncertainties around the future direction of the economy, changes to how we shop, and technological changes, set against the need to coordinate infrastructure delivery.	A Local Plan is a statutory land-use planning document that sets out how the Council should be developed over the next 15 years, in line with the requirements of national policy and legislation. A lesser timeframe for the local plan is not allowed, though a longer one is
Jake	Nugent	Endurance Estates Ltd	Yes, the Plan period should be longer than 15 years. Our response to Question 8 states that the Plan should cover the period 2022 to 2043, a 21-year period. The reason given for this is because the plan will unlikely be adopted in 2022 as the timescales are too optimistic, therefore any delays result in a 15 year period not being met and this should be factored into consideration. In addition to this, the Local Plan's housing trajectory should be a consistent one, not a stepped trajectory that proposes to back-end the delivery of new housing in the later years of the Plan period. The Plan needs to take account of current under-delivery and it needs to take it into account in the short-term, to ensure that current under-supply is not exacerbated through deferral.	Support for a longer period of the plan noted. The housing trajectory has not been established yet so no further comment can be made at this time.
John	Buchanan		The plan should be staged, with 15 years a firm period and 20 or even 25 year consequences included as well so longer term infrastructure plans can have something to reference them to.	Comment noted, a longer plan period can assist in bringing infrastructure projects forward.
Tim	Bradford	leadenhall		
Jacky	Bannerman	Woodham Walter Parish Council	The plan should be over more than 15 years to afford the opportunity of the infrastructure to catch up with what there is at present let alone what will be the case in the future. Setting the Settlement Pattern will require the provision of up-to-date data that is currently not the case. It will also require assessments as to how any proposed development will impact on existing settlements. It is clear from the published data on the Call for Sites that this has not been done and the data to facilitate the assessment is incorrect.	Comment noted. The Rural Facilities Study is an up to date piece of work and comments from this consultation on individual settlements will be fed into it to ensure that it is accurate.
Mark	Tentori	Mazdev Limited	A longer plan period would enable a more holistic approach to planning for the District, and the opportunity to deliver a variety of different housing types and necessary infrastructure in a better, more planned, fashion than previous Local Plans.	Support noted for a longer plan period
Peter	Ingram		I think a shorter period, reviewed more frequently would be advisable.	A Local Plan is a statutory land-use planning document that sets out how the Council should be developed over the next 15 years, in line with the requirements of national policy and legislation. A lesser timeframe for the local plan is not allowed, though a longer one is
Jane	Pilgrim		We have no idea what will happen in 15 years time.	A Local Plan is a statutory land-use planning document that sets out how the Council should be developed over the next 15 years, in line with the requirements of national policy and legislation. A lesser timeframe for the local plan is not allowed, though a longer one is
Judith	Radcliffe		if accompanied by improved leverage with ECC and health authorities	The present LDP has an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which was approved through its examination, infrastructure is agreed with statutory providers such as the NHS and ECC and should be to mitigate the impact of development. Infrastructure is being provided under the terms of S106 legal agreements and will be assessed further as part of the LDP Review work. The matter in the majority of cases is not that infrastructure has not been provided but that its trigger points such as the number of homes completed has not been reached. This matter is monitored carefully and contributions pursued as they become liable.
Christopher	Mabbutt	Burnham Primary School		
Mary	Putt		It should also be possible to reduce this figure is the need is not found to be there. Properties seem to take a long time to sell currently is this because there isn't a need for them	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced, therefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months
Alan	Shrimplin	N/A	No, this is a long enough period, and with the changing of work patterns, car and transport types, further infrastructure, EV-Charge points, Solar power from roofs, wind farms may need to be adapted and reviewed.	Support for a 15 year plan period noted.

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 10. Should the plan period be longer than 15 years, should the period be 20 years, so that infrastructure can be planned in over a longer period?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Valerie	Coleby	Berrys	One of the key issues identified for the Local Plan review at 6.87 is 'ensuring that infrastructure meets residents, visitors ana business needs'. Hence again if the Council is to reflect how it addresses the key issues identified through the development of the plan and it policies, rather than merely paying lip service, the plan period should be extended to cover the longer 20 year period to ensure sites that are allocated to deliver infrastructure have the extent of the plan period to deliver and the security in provision that allocation brings where an element of infrastructure is required in advance.	The Council can consider 30 years and this is supported by the NPPF, it will be a matter which will need further discussion depending on what the future infrastructure provision is for the District and if it can be accommodated over a minimum of 20 years or is more time required.
Kevin	Bruce			
William	Shepherd			
victoria	newson	Childrens Nursery		
David	Banfield		Would allow review for the ageing demographic which should release more housing over time and changes global warming will bring to the area. 2 elderly residents passed on in Purleigh in owener occupied properties. One property was refurbished by a new family one property demolished and replaced with a very large new build. Another property is currently being refurbished	Comment noted, a longer plan period can assist in bringing infrastructure projects forward and would allow for a higher number of housing allocations.
Phillip	Wright	CALA Homes (North Home Counties) Ltd	We support the lifespan of the new Local Plan being extended to cover a period of at least 20 years, as we recognise that infrastructure provision for major development can often need to take place over an extended time period. MDC will need to be mindful of paragraph 22 of the NPPF (2021), which states: "Strategic policies should look ahead over a minimum 15-year period from adoption, to anticipate and respond to long-term requirements and opportunities, such as those arising from major improvements in infrastructure. Where larger scale developments such as new settlements or significant extensions to existing villages and towns form part of the strategy for the area, policies should be set within a vision that looks further ahead (at least 30 years), to take into account the likely timescale for delivery". With regard to any proposal for a new settlement, we believe MDC will need to act with great caution given the notoriously long lead-in times that are often associated with these. The Council will be aware of the recent failure of other proposed new settlements in Braintree, Colchester and Uttlesford due to their Local Plan Examination Inspectors' serious concerns about their overall viability and deliverability. MDC should not proceed with a new settlement / large urban extension strategy unless it has an extremely strong evidence base to demonstrate deliverability. It will need to be realistic about delivery timescales and should take account of the findings set out in Lichfields' 'Start to Finish: how quickly do large-scale housing sites deliver?''.	The Council can consider 30 years and this is supported by the NPPF, it will be a matter which will need further discussion depending on what the future infrastructure provision is for the District and if it can be accommodated over a minimum of 20 years or is more time required.
.	.	SN Developments		
.	.	Cooper Property Holdings Ltd		
Jane	Coleman	Maldon Town Council	Probably - infrastructure promised in previous LDP has not been delivered to date - giving more time won't necessarily deliver it.	The present LDP has an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which was approved through its examination, infrastructure is agreed with statutory providers such as the NHS and ECC and should be to mitigate the impact of development. Infrastructure is being provided under the terms of S106 legal agreements and will be assessed further as part of the LDP Review work. The matter in the majority of cases is not that infrastructure has not been provided but that its trigger points such as the number of homes completed has not been reached. This matter is monitored carefully and contributions pursued as they become liable.
Roy	Martin	Mr Roy Martin	Infrastructure needs and delivery need longer than 15 years in this country	Support for a longer period of the plan noted.
Simon	Butler-Finbow	Pigeon Investment Management	The NPPF requires local plans to cover a period of at least 15 years from adoption. Arguably, a 20-year plan period will ensure this. However, in either event, it is also necessary for the plan to be reviewed at least every 5 years (NPPF, Paragraph 33) to ensure it is up to date, accurate and is continuing to address identified needs. There is of course a risk in a longer term plan of failing to respond to current issues and changes in circumstances, therefore risking wider implications for the community of the district. Thus, whether a 15 or 20 year plan is taken forward, it will be essential for MDC to commit to undertaking a review of the plan and updating relevant strategic policies at least every 5 years so that as a minimum housing needs continue to be met.	A Local Plan is a statutory land-use planning document that sets out how the Council should be developed over the next 15 years, in line with the requirements of national policy and legislation. A lesser timeframe for the local plan is not allowed, though a longer one is. There is also a statutory duty to review local plans every 5 years this allows the Council to assess its housing and infrastructure requirements.
sara	doran		the longer the plan, the vaguer the plan. however, large projects, particularly insfrastructure projects, need a long period. It might be that a decision about bradwell will be made within 20 years that will influence decision making, for example reducing large developments until there is clarity on that development, as this will need infrastructure - roads(which might be provided from capital costs) but that could link with eg development of a new town. Having a 20 year projection also makes it more possible to reduce the size of developments over the next 10 years to allow the current huge developments to embed and to enable the infrastructure for these projects eg schools, health, sports, roads to be developed. This could also mean more opportunity for smaller, locally delivered projects - supporting the local economy and crafts.	Having a longer plan period does not equate to planning for less housing, though national planning policy does now advocate that there should be a mix of sites including 10% of sites which should be no more that 1.0 hectare, this does allow for choice in the housing market.
Colin	Horner	Villageretreat	The plan at 15 years would enable the infrastructure on roads and heath to be established. Extending the period just allows the developers to delay infrastructure further.	Support for a 15 year plan noted
Robert	Scott	Lewis & Scott Retirement Living Ltd	Yes - and the need for a consistent supply of deliverable sites that are available, suitable and achievable.	Support noted
Rob	Bard			
Tim	Hann			
Burnham	Town Council	Burnham on Crouch Town Council	15 years seems acceptable.	Support for 15 year plan noted.

Question 10

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 10. Should the plan period be longer than 15 years, should the period be 20 years, so that infrastructure can be planned in over a longer period?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Justin	Barkham	Self employed	The plan period needs to balance a number of uncertainties which may develop and should react to infrastructure delivery and technological changes. Incorporation of large sites does not enable that flexibility	National planning policy does now advocate that there should be a mix of sites including 10% of sites which should be no more that 1.0 hectare, this does allow for choice in the housing market.
Poppy	Vidler	Crown Consumer Ltd	Yes, we are in uncertain times and our needs and wants are likely to change and develop over time, what may look like a good idea today may totally not relate to our future economic and infrastructure needs tomorrow, as the lockdown has shown us it's given rise to a realisation for a need for change of thinking from what we thought our needs were to new future priorities, taking time to get our future right is crucial and unforgiveable to be shortsighted.	Support noted
Stephen	Sutton			
Tim	Madelin		Should be 20 years for infrastructure only as predicting housing needs more than 15 years away is likely to be subject large uncertainties	It is not possible to have a different time period for housing and infrastructure, they are linked together and the Inspector at the local plan examination will expect to have it demonstrated that the council can deliver both through its plan making
Joanna	Jeffery	Althorne Parish Clerk	Concentrate on getting the infrastructure in place for current needs. Think about future needs realistically nearer the time, and make sure infrastructure and facilities are in place when building starts, not when a percentage of housing has already been put in place.	The present LDP has an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which was approved through its examination, infrastructure is agreed with statutory providers such as the NHS and ECC and should be to mitigate the impact of development. Infrastructure is being provided under the terms of S106 legal agreements and will be assessed further as part of the LDP Review work. The matter in the majority of cases is not that infrastructure has not been provided but that its trigger points such as the number of homes completed has not been reached. This matter is monitored carefully and contributions pursued as they become liable. Because infrastructure is predicated on population growth putting some of it in first would actually mean empty schools waiting for growth.
Paul	Coppin		But not only in relation to housing needs, there must be a balance in economy and technological changes and the impact on infrastructure delivery.	Comment noted, a longer plan period would include all types of growth planning not just housing.
Steven	Bardwell	S P Bardwell Ltd		
David	Oxford	Lloyds Banking Group	Albeit should always be based on the suitablity of the area compared to other surrounding areas that are better suited for further development	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced, therefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months
Stephen Francis	Dewick	Curry Farm	No - things change ie Brexit It also dis-enfranchises younger people who may have missed the last 20 year plan from having an opinion noted	The Council is going to be carrying out a series of exercises with young people to ensure their voice is heard in the development of the local plan, this is considered important for the future development of the district.
George	Dixon			
Douglas	Channer	Private	The reason I am saying NO is because as in previous answers I have made you have only ever referred to 2043 . No where do I recall ever seeing the comparisons with 2038. In questions apart from now this one only 2043 has been highlighted. It appears to me therefore that the authority has already decided and the questions are loaded towards 2043 so the answers will be.	Comment noted, though the Council has not made a decision on the timeframe of the local plan yet because we not yet know the cost and timeframe of the infrastructure that is required.
Lynda	Bugg			
Paul	Burgess	None	To many imponderables over an extended time frame	Comment noted though the Council has a statutory duty to produce a local plan which is for a minimum 15 years and a longer time frame could assist in bringing forward essential needed infrastructure.
D	Cooper			
C/O Agent	C/O Agent		Yes, we believe that the plan period should be longer than 15 years to allow for a greater degree of forward thinking with regard to infrastructure and housing delivery. The Issues and Options appears to have also been based on a 20-year plan period with many of the sections referring to 2023-2043	Support for 20 year plan noted
Zoe	May	East of England Ambulance Service NHS Trust	Any extension to the time plan requires health commissioners to review the suitability and provision of health infrastructure to meet the needs of the local population. EEAST will work with commissioner and the local authority to deliver effective and efficient emergency ambulance services for the local community. Any CIL/S106 legal agreement should include all aspects of health - acute, community, mental health and emergency ambulance services	Comment noted, the Council will work with statutory providers of infrastructure as part of the Duty to Co-operate to ensure delivery over the whole plan period.
Roger	Woodcock			
Braxted and Blackwater Conservation Grou	BBCG	The Braxted and Blackwater Conservation Group (BBCG)	The appropriate plan period is not just an issue related to meeting housing need. There are a range of issues to balance, including uncertainties around the future direction of the economy, changes to how we shop, and technological changes, set against the need to coordinate infrastructure delivery	Support noted and agreed
raymond	dundas	Householder	Infrastructure need to be in place before large scale development takes place. Schools both Primary and Secondary Doctors and public transport improvements.	The present LDP has an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which was approved through its examination, infrastructure is agreed with statutory providers such as the NHS and ECC and should be to mitigate the impact of development. Infrastructure is being provided under the terms of S106 legal agreements and will be assessed further as part of the LDP Review work. The matter in the majority of cases is not that infrastructure has not been provided but that its trigger points such as the number of homes completed has not been reached. This matter is monitored carefully and contributions pursued as they become liable. The local plan review will review that IDP to ensure that infrastructure is provided over the whole new plan period

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 10. Should the plan period be longer than 15 years, should the period be 20 years, so that infrastructure can be planned in over a longer period?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
John	Watson		There is absolutely no reason why infrastructure cannot be planned for using the start date of the prior LDP... The delivery of Infrastructure and timing will depend largely upon the strategy chosen not the growth as suggested in Government guidance such as Securing developer contributions for education November 2019	The present LDP has an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which was approved through its examination, infrastructure is agreed with statutory providers such as the NHS and ECC and should be to mitigate the impact of development. Infrastructure is being provided under the terms of S106 legal agreements and will be assessed further as part of the LDP Review work. The matter in the majority of cases is not that infrastructure has not been provided but that its trigger points such as the number of homes completed has not been reached. This matter is monitored carefully and contributions pursued as they become liable. The local plan review will review that IDP to ensure that infrastructure is provided over the whole new
Josh	Plant	Gladmans	The NPPF is clear that strategic policies should look ahead over a minimum of 15 years from the point of adoption. It further states that where larger scale developments such as new settlements of significant settlement extensions are proposed, the strategic vision should look further ahead to at least 30 years. Gladman suggest planning for a longer plan period given the uncertainty over the how long plans take to be prepared and examined we would suggest that the Council plans for a period beyond this minimum in order to ensure it is achieved.	The Council can consider 30 years and this is supported by the NPPF, it will be a matter which will need further discussion depending on what the future infrastructure provision is for the District and if it can be accommodated over a minimum of 20 years or is more time required.
*	*		A 20 year Plan period is supported and considered appropriate. The 2021 NPPF encourages councils to be more forward-looking and include strategic policies which look beyond a traditional 15 year plan period, to recognise the speed at which larger scale developments with appropriate infrastructure take to deliver. This approach has been recognised by planning inspectors at examination across the country, which in turn has informed the recent change to the NPPF. As part of this issues and options consultation, the Council has recognised the failings of its 2017 plan strategy around the slow delivery of garden suburbs and strategic allocations. It is also relevant that emerging plans in neighbouring authorities are reliant on strategic scale developments which are underpinned by infrastructure projects all of the which will impact on the District. It is, therefore, necessary to plan over a longer period and to include a larger number of small and medium-sized sites spread across the District to ensure that sufficient supply is maintained and available to meet local housing needs.	Support for a 20 year plan noted. National planning policy does not advocate a mix of sites including 10% being less than 1.0 hectare in size, this will allow for choice and flexibility.
*	Willmott		A 20 year plan period is supported and considered appropriate. The 2021 NPPF encourages councils to be more forward-looking and include strategic policies which look beyond a traditional 15 year plan period, to recognise the speed at which a larger scale developments with appropriate infrastructure take to deliver. This approach has been recognised by planning inspectors at examination across the country, which in turn has informed the recent change to the NPPF. As part of this issues and options consultation the Council has recognised the failings of its 2017 plan strategy around the slow delivery of garden suburbs and strategic allocations. It is also relevant that emerging plans in neighbouring authorities are reliant on strategic scale developments which are underpinned by infrastructure projects all of the which will impact on the District. It is therefore necessary to plan over a longer period and to include a larger number of small and medium-sized sites spread across the District to ensure that sufficient supply is maintained and available to meet local housing needs.	Support for a 20 year plan noted. National planning policy does not advocate a mix of sites including 10% being less than 1.0 hectare in size, this will allow for choice and flexibility.
Ivor	Watson			
*	*		Table 1 in Section 10 of the LDPIO states that existing commitments will deliver 3,161 dwellings in the period 2023-2043. It is unclear where this number comes from, and we suggest it will be important that future iterations of the LDP make clear how this has been determined. Table 1 also accounts for shortfall 2014-2021. As the trajectory seeks to address the period from 2023, we suggest it would be prudent to also make an allowance for projected shortfall 2021-2023 to avoid a situation whereby the LDP ultimately submitted for examination inadvertently fails to provide sufficient housing to meet development needs over full plan period. Separately, irrespective of the housing requirement ultimately determined for the LDP, it should not be overlooked that this figure will provide the minimum number of new homes the LDP should seek to deliver. 2 Inspector's Report on the examination of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011-2034 (27 November 2020), paragraph 205. We note the Council's Housing Economic Land Availability Assessment 2022 (HELAA) has identified capacity to deliver 9,978 dwellings over the next 20 years through development of suitable and available sites. This suggests clear potential for Maldon to exceed current estimates of the minimum housing requirement. The exceedance of minimum requirements would result in greater social and economic benefits, enhance the prospects of attracting investment and securing infrastructure improvements, and ensure a greater proportion of affordable housing need will be met. Such potential is particularly relevant given the extent of unmet housing needs in surrounding areas (and the potential for this to increase pressure on Maldon's housing market); the extent of affordable housing need in the District; and the NPPF's objective to significantly boost housing land supply.	The answer does not relate to the question so no further comment can be made.
*	*		A 15 year plan period is supported as factors that influence a Local Development Plan can generally be managed successfully over that timeframe. Investment and certainty can be provided over 15 years which may otherwise become diluted if stretched over a longer period. The main rationale for seeking a longer timeframe would appear to be if a new settlement were being sought, in accordance with the NPPF for new settlements. Given the Objectives set out in the review material run to 2043, it would appear that this decision may have already been made. However, we would recommend that a 15 year timeframe would likely be suitable and effective for Maldon in all other spatial settings.	Support for a 15 year plan is noted. The decision has not yet been made it will depend on what infrastructure is required and how it can be funded, this will assist in setting the time frame of the plan.

Question 10

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 10. Should the plan period be longer than 15 years, should the period be 20 years, so that infrastructure can be planned in over a longer period?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
*	*		A 15 year plan period is supported as factors that influence a Local Development Plan can generally be managed successfully over that timeframe. Investment and certainty can be provided over 15years which may otherwise become diluted if stretched over a longer period. The main rationale for seeking a longer timeframe would appear to be if a new settlement were being sought, in accordance with the NPPF. Given the Objectives set out in the review material run to 2043, it would appear that this decision may have already been made.	Support for a 15 year plan is noted. The decision has not yet been made it will depend on what infrastructure is required and how it can be funded, this will assist in setting the time frame of the plan.
*	*		A 15 year plan period is supported as factors that influence a Local Development Plan can generally be managed successfully over that timeframe. Investment and certainty can be provided over 15years which may otherwise become diluted if stretched over a longer period. The main rationale for seeking a longer timeframe would appear to be if a new settlement were being sought, in accordance with the NPPF. Given the Objectives set out in the review material run to 2043, it would appear that this decision may have already been made.	Support for a 15 year plan is noted. The decision has not yet been made it will depend on what infrastructure is required and how it can be funded, this will assist in setting the time frame of the plan.
*	*		A 15 year plan period is supported as factors that influence a Local Development Plan can generally be managed successfully over that timeframe. Investment and certainty can be provided over 15 years which may otherwise become diluted if stretched over a longer period. The rationale for seeking a longer timeframe would appear to be if a new settlement were being sought, in accordance with the NPPF. Given the Objectives set out in the review material run to 2043, it would appear that this decision may have already been made.	Support for a 15 year plan is noted. The decision has not yet been made it will depend on what infrastructure is required and how it can be funded, this will assist in setting the time frame of the plan.
*	*		A 15 year plan period is supported, as factors that influence a Local Development Plan can generally be managed successfully over that timeframe. Investment and certainty can be provided over 15years which may otherwise become diluted if stretched over a longer period. The main rationale for seeking a longer timeframe would appear to be if a new settlement were being sought, in accordance with the NPPF. Given the Objectives set out in the review material run to 2043, it would appear that this decision may have already been made.	Support for a 15 year plan is noted. The decision has not yet been made it will depend on what infrastructure is required and how it can be funded, this will assist in setting the time frame of the plan.
*	*		BDW Eastern agrees that the Local Plan Period should be longer than 15 years. Paragraph 22 of the NPPF states that strategic policies should consider a minimum (our emphasis) 15 year period from adoption. In the previous Housing White Paper, the Government sought to impose a target of 30 months from preparation to adoption of Local Plans. Although there will be a further White Paper later this year, with potentially this aspiration scrapped, it demonstrates the Government's desire for a more streamlined process in the preparation of Local Plans. However, the timescales for the adoption of new Local Plans have been slow, particularly in the Eastern region with a number of emerging Local Plans being withdrawn by their respective Councils (e.g. Basildon District Council on 3 March 2022 before the Examination in Public). Therefore, in order for the Council to have a Plan in place that includes strategic policies that consider the District 15 years from the Plan's adoption, BDW Eastern considers that the proposed Plan Period of 2023-2043 is appropriate albeit allowing for an early review, subject to future housing delivery.	Support for a longer plan period noted
Ben	Binder	University of Adelaide		
Lorraine	Bailey	Wickham Bishops Parish Council		
Ali	Aldis			
David	Smye	The Maldon Society		
Stewart	Newlands	Fambridge Lake		
Stewart	Newlands	Fambridge Lake		
Paula	Stanbury			
Sonia	Whiskin	Financial Services		
Geoffrey	Charge	n/a		
Robert	Collins			
Ben	Thornett			
Matthew	Wood	Phase 2 Planning		
Tim	Aves			
Helen	James		There is already an urgent need for infrastructure before building a single additional property, due to the fact that infrastructure is already at breaking point.	The present LDP has an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which was approved through its examination, infrastructure is agreed with statutory providers such as the NHS and ECC and should be to mitigate the impact of development. Infrastructure is being provided under the terms of S106 legal agreements and will be assessed further as part of the LDP Review work. The matter in the majority of cases is not that infrastructure has not been provided but that its trigger points such as the number of homes completed has not been reached. This matter is monitored carefully and contributions pursued as they become liable.
Kathy	Day			
Peter	Wakling			
Sara	Howarth			
Eissa	Leo			
Michele	Williams			
Tara	Strydom			

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 10. Should the plan period be longer than 15 years, should the period be 20 years, so that infrastructure can be planned in over a longer period?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Jenny	Ball		Having seen so much housing development in the past few years without additional infrastructure being provided - I don't believe the length of the plan period is material here. The important factor is Maldon DC and Essex CC holding developers to account to provide additional infrastructure up front before granting planning permission in the first place.	The present LDP has an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which was approved through its examination, infrastructure is agreed with statutory providers such as the NHS and ECC and should be to mitigate the impact of development. Infrastructure is being provided under the terms of S106 legal agreements and will be assessed further as part of the LDP Review work. The matter in the majority of cases is not that infrastructure has not been provided but that its trigger points such as the number of homes completed has not been reached. This matter is monitored carefully and contributions pursued as they become liable.
Cliff	Baron			
Gill	Winsor	Tesco		
Emily	Benham	Servoca complex care and nursing		
Laura	Cannon			
Shaneen	Illanes		The planned number of houses is too high and risks destroying the natural beauty of the area.	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced, therefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months
Merryl	Quilter			
Bear	Keen			
Jessica	Cox		Yes, more time is needed to ensure infrastructure projects are planned and delivered.	Support for a longer plan period noted
Robert	Burton			
Yvonne	Wade			
Louise	Bywaters-Smith	Hospitality		
Brooke	Roberts-Morgan			
Patricia	Bunkle			
Marc	Rawinsky	M R Sovereign Services Ltd		
Roger	Tiffn			
Kathryn	Beighton	Publishing	A lot can change in a short time, as we've just seen by it needing revising again already. Stick to a shorter period and get a more accurate prediction	A Local Plan is a statutory land-use planning document that sets out how the Council should be developed over the next 15 years, in line with the requirements of national policy and legislation. A lesser timeframe for the local plan is not allowed, though a longer one is. There is also a statutory duty for the Council to review its local plan every five years, this ensures effective monitoring for the plan and the plan can adapt and be brought up to date if necessary.
Roy	Warren	Sport England		
STUART	SOWTER			
Mark	Raffray		The expected advantages and payback relating to infrastructure planning over a 20-year versus a 15-year period is insufficiently detailed to permit a fully reasoned judgement. For instance what major capital projects or transformational changes in infrastructure forward planning would accrue from a 20-year plan? If alternatively, major new settlements or radical extensions to existing villages and towns represent core LDP preferences, then the possibility exists that 20 years would be insufficient as a horizon (see NPPF guidance)	The Council can consider 30 years and this is supported by the NPPF, it will be a matter which will need further discussion depending on what the future infrastructure provision is for the District and if it can be accommodated over a minimum of 20 years or is more time required.
April	Rowley			
Bill	Withers			
joanna	jeffery			
John	Mitchell			
Peter	Layley			
Rex	Davenport			
Lesley	Mitchelmore	Danbury Parish Council		
Karen	Neath	Tolleshunt Major Parish Council		
N	DA			
Dorreen	Linton	our group consists of adults, playschool and brownies group		
John	Wileman			
Richard	Courtney	University Of East London		
sue	Rawlinson	Evolve		
Douglas	Milsted	Heybridge Basin Conservation Society	YES BUT NEEDS TO BE DELIVERABLE TO PREVENT Q.9 ABOVE	Comment noted and agreed having a flexible plan should ensure delivery of its key priorities during the lifetime of the plan.
Alan	Outlaw	Self Emplyed		
Lindsey	Squire	North Fambridge Parish Council		
K	Jeffries			
John	Lakin	?		
Samantha	Weeks			
Carlie	Mayes			
Richard	Martin	Scott Properties	A 20-year plan period with reviews every 5 years would enable more holistic planning.	Support for a 20 year plan period noted

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 10. Should the plan period be longer than 15 years, should the period be 20 years, so that infrastructure can be planned in over a longer period?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Mike	Spurgeon	Phase 2 Planning and Development		
C/O Agent Mike	Spurgeon	Phase 2 Planning & Development		
Amanda	Mickelsen			
Samuel	Newton	Anglo European School		
Mary-Ann	Munford			
Jo	Harvey			
Terry	Fleming			
Philip	Davies		Provision of Infrastructure has recently been totally inadequate, particularly GP practices, Schooling and transport . It may be written into LDP but all too often these are just words much is never delivered. At present too much housing has been built with seemingly very little or no thought for the supporting infrastructure. i.e too few GP practices to the extent that all existing GP practices are well over subscribed, and appointments difficult to get. Not enough school places in all levels, and pupils are being offered placement for from their local schools. During rush hour traffic congestion at pinch point is getting bigger and bigger due to the additional vehicles on the roads resulting from the housing developments.	The present LDP has an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which was approved through its examination, infrastructure is agreed with statutory providers such as the NHS and ECC and should be to mitigate the impact of development. Infrastructure is being provided under the terms of S106 legal agreements and will be assessed further as part of the LDP Review work. The matter in the majority of cases is not that infrastructure has not been provided but that its trigger points such as the number of homes completed has not been reached. This matter is monitored carefully and contributions pursued as they become liable.
Susan	Cumming	not applicable		
Ronald	Edge	Construction Industry		
Gordon	Mussett	Little Braxted Parish Council		
Ronnie	Tongue	state school		
Sue	Dobson	Essex Bridleways Association		
David	Webb			
Andrew	Marsh	Historic England		
Brian	Haydon			
Hazel	Notley			
Jean	Brown			
Joanne	McGinity			
Stuart	Dedman	Nil		
Kerry	McKenna			
Penny	McCauley	Tiptree dental		
Jane	Phillips	Solicitors	Infrastructure provision and considerations alongside development provision is essential. Much of the development in the District has been given the green light without adequate consideration and impetus given to the necessary accessibility impacts and infrastructure provision. For example, the developments in Southminster have increased population without consideration of the provision for more GPs and schools.	The present LDP has an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which was approved through its examination, infrastructure is agreed with statutory providers such as the NHS and ECC and should be to mitigate the impact of development. Infrastructure is being provided under the terms of S106 legal agreements and will be assessed further as part of the LDP Review work. The matter in the majority of cases is not that infrastructure has not been provided but that its trigger points such as the number of homes completed has not been reached. This matter is monitored carefully and contributions pursued as they become liable.
David	Rees			
Darren	Weeks			
Phil	Manning			
Peter	Clack		It is important proper consideration and consultation on the impact and mitigation provision are undertaken with a longer term impact horizon. Infrastructure provision and considerations alongside development provision is essential. Much of the development in the District has been given the green light without adequate consideration and impetus given to the necessary accessibility impacts and infrastructure provision. For example, the developments in Burnham-on-Crouch have increased population without consideration on the need to increase health services (particularly GP and local hospital provision) and schools with families being told their children cannot get places locally and need to be taken to Brightlingsea (a minimum of a 1 hour journey).	The present LDP has an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which was approved through its examination, infrastructure is agreed with statutory providers such as the NHS and ECC and should be to mitigate the impact of development. Infrastructure is being provided under the terms of S106 legal agreements and will be assessed further as part of the LDP Review work. The matter in the majority of cases is not that infrastructure has not been provided but that its trigger points such as the number of homes completed has not been reached. This matter is monitored carefully and contributions pursued as they become liable.
Doug	Lockwood	National Grid		
Sally	George			
Vara	Szajkowski			
Bob	Calver			
Tessa	Lambert	Natural England		
Dawn	Howles			
natasha	frith			
Anthony	Bates		The plan should be considered over a much shorter period of time say 5 years	A Local Plan is a statutory land-use planning document that sets out how the Council should be developed over the next 15 years, in line with the requirements of national policy and legislation. A lesser timeframe for the local plan is not allowed, though a longer one is. There is also a statutory duty for the Council to review its local plan every five years, this ensures effective monitoring for the plan and the plan can adapt and be brought up to date if necessary.
Russell	Howles	WSP		
Gillian	Hollamby			
Brian	Townsend			
Malcolm	Finch			
Peter	Taylor	Retired		

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 10. Should the plan period be longer than 15 years, should the period be 20 years, so that infrastructure can be planned in over a longer period?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Chris	Melbourne			
Robert	Hollamby			
Kate	Priest	Purleigh Community Primary School		
Gary	SPICER			
Helen	Bridge		No because infrastructure will be planned to come on line 5 years later.	A Local Plan is a statutory land-use planning document that sets out how the Council should be developed over the next 15 years, in line with the requirements of national policy and legislation. A lesser timeframe for the local plan is not allowed, though a longer one is. There is also a statutory duty for the Council to review its local plan every five years, this ensures effective monitoring for the plan and the plan can adapt and be brought up to date if necessary.
Melanie	Allen	Government	If Developers don't have to complete infrastructure until the homes are built / they won't finish them. Althorne has issues with infrastructure - B1019 is not fit for 2 vehicles to pass.	The present LDP has an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which was approved through its examination, infrastructure is agreed with statutory providers such as the NHS and ECC and should be to mitigate the impact of development. Infrastructure is being provided under the terms of S106 legal agreements and will be assessed further as part of the LDP Review work. The matter in the majority of cases is not that infrastructure has not been provided but that its trigger points such as the number of homes completed has not been reached. This matter is monitored carefully and contributions pursued as they become liable. As far as is known, there are no examples of developers not finishing developments so they do not have to provide infrastructure.
Adam	Medlycott		20 years	Support for a 20 year plan period noted
Joanne	Maloney			
Portia	Roelofs			
Lisa	Singh	Direct Call Centres Ltd	Absolutely. The lack of infrastructure in small villages such as Althorne result in pressure on the basic services such as schools and doctor surgeries. I have struggled to get a Dr's appointment this year on two occasions having to wait up to 3 weeks.	The Council cannot comment on individual settlements. Support for a longer plan period is noted.
Kevin	Head		It is generally best practice to formulate a long term vision and plan strategically over a longer period, but essential to monitor and review the plan when it is not delivering or performing or there are major changes in national policy. Whilst a set period for the plan (either 15 or 20 years) is appropriate, there should be continuous Call for Sites exercises and regular reviews of the plan in order to monitor housing supply and delivery progress. New allocations could be added into the plan at a later date if necessary.	The Council can consider 30 years and this is supported by the NPPF, it will be a matter which will need further discussion depending on what the future infrastructure provision is for the District and if it can be accommodated over a minimum of 20 years or is more time required. There is a statutory duty on the Council to review its local plan every five years.
Elizabeth	Sawyer Bayliss		Times change quickly. 20 years is too long.	The Council may have to have a 20 year plus plan to ensure that critical infrastructure can be delivered.
Michael	Partridge			
Kenneth	Northfield			
Jerry	Petts			
Frederick	McMahon			
Tracey	Merritt	Dengie Hounds and Horses	Increasing the term of the plan allows for a more delayed response to change which is not beneficial. Changes occur more frequently and a proactive approach is required to keep up to date. Often the implementation of infrastructure is often too slow and agreed too long after the need has been identified. Updating plans more regularly should keep required development on track.	A Local Plan is a statutory land-use planning document that sets out how the Council should be developed over the next 15 years, in line with the requirements of national policy and legislation. A lesser timeframe for the local plan is not allowed, though a longer one is. There is also a statutory duty for the Council to review its local plan every five years, this ensures effective monitoring for the plan and the plan can adapt and be brought up to date if necessary.
Jo	Crump	Servoca Secure Soutions		
Susan	ARCHER			
Winifred	Sutherland			
Chris	clark		Longer than 20 years you know how long it takes for roads to added and drs , schools etc	Support for 20 year plan noted
Jeremy	Richardson		Plan and build infrastructure first for target growth, then build houses around the infrastructure	The present LDP has an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which was approved through its examination, infrastructure is agreed with statutory providers such as the NHS and ECC and should be to mitigate the impact of development. Infrastructure is being provided under the terms of S106 legal agreements and will be assessed further as part of the LDP Review work. The matter in the majority of cases is not that infrastructure has not been provided but that its trigger points such as the number of homes completed has not been reached. The system does not support front loading of infrastructure excepting in exceptional evidenced circumstances. This matter is monitored carefully and contributions pursued as they become liable.
Cheryl	Carter	Education		
Susan	Mason			
Melad	Kamlow			
Dave	Draper	The Hartford Insurance Group	Outline plans should be longer … start at 25 years	The Council can consider 30 years and this is supported by the NPPF, it will be a matter which will need further discussion depending on what the future infrastructure provision is for the District and if it can be accommodated over a minimum of 20 years or is more time required.
Kevin	Cooper			
Katherine	Whitehouse			
Linda	Soul			

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 10. Should the plan period be longer than 15 years, should the period be 20 years, so that infrastructure can be planned in over a longer period?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Robert	Wilson		20 years is far .too long to predict with any level of confidence the needs for housing	Lack of support for 20 year plan noted.
Sarah-Jayne	Hunt	SJ Aesthetics LTD		
Jonathan	Hunt			
Deborah	de Boltz	Farleigh Hospice		
Tim	Murphy			
Claire	McGrane		Too much changes too quickly	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth, the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months.
Tracey	Munford	NA		
Rowan	Rampersad			
LUKE	MACFARLANE	S A RAVEN		
Anna	Wombwell	Morris Farm		
Ronald	Owen	Not applicable		
Elizabeth	Johns			
Colin	Day		I disagree with building on green open space outside the settlement boundary	This answer does not relate to the question however, the district does not have a history of industrial development and therefore it is inevitable that sites will be developed on greenfield land to accommodate the growth this will have to be either adjacent to existing settlements.
Natalie	Bradford			
Harriet	Hurst-Smith			
Tony	Vanner			
Josie	Vanner			
Tracy	Carroll		Constantly building new houses puts a great deal of pressure on infrastructure, amenities and nature. Plans should be spread out over a longer period so as to minimise these issues.	The Council can consider 30 years and this is supported by the NPPF, it will be a matter which will need further discussion depending on what the future infrastructure provision is for the District and if it can be accommodated over a minimum of 20 years or is more time required.
Ian	Roberts	N/A		
Tony	Ashton	none		
mandy	SHORT			
Kevin	Money	St. Lawrence Parish Council		
Claire	Udall	1		
Linda	Raffray			
John	Cooper			
Leah	Jewiss			
Elaine	Ketley	South Woodham Ferrers Town Council		
Ruth	Bull	The Othona Communty		
Mark	Jackson	Mark Jackson Planning		
ann	cutting			
Sharon	Cushen			
Ian	Tooley			
Sally	Tokeley			
Christina	Chan			
Tim.	Holdsworth			
Graham	Snow			
Sarah	Packard			
Martin	Cook			
Clifford	Brown			
Steve	Gallant	Crouch Valley Defence Group		
Lesley	Woodley			
Kirsty	Rowsell			
Philip	Wakeling		Not possible to plan with any certainty over 15 years	Lack of support for 20 year plan noted.
David	Brock			
Niki	Halls			
Stewart	Geden			
Anita	Thomas	Bank		
Andrew	Ashworth			
michael	smith			
Simon	Priest			
Philippa	Marshall			
Lewis	Cook	Form Architecture Ltd.		
EDWARD	GITTINS	Edward Gittins & Associates		
Steve	Williamson			
James	Cowell	E & B R Cowell		
Colin	Hawkes			
Ronald	PIPER			
John	McLarty			
John	McLarty		15 years is acceptable to deliver suitable employment and residential to mixed use housing schemes.	Support for 15 year plan noted.
Norman	Branch	N/A		

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 10. Should the plan period be longer than 15 years, should the period be 20 years, so that infrastructure can be planned in over a longer period?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
John	McLarty			
James	Clarke			
David	Stilwell			
Ann	Thomas			
michael	harris			
Geoffrey	Cox			
John	McLarty			
Barrington	Thomas			
Richard	Edwards			
Robyn	Woloszczuk			
Lesley	Speller			
Nicola	O'Dean	Balgores Motors		
Alexander	Romang			
Hayley	Holgate	ECC		
Eirlys	Parry	N/A		
Michael	Unwin	N/A		
Tony	Barber			
Nick	Mason	ECOClassics		
Melanie	Osborne	Motor Trade		
Stuart	Turner	Essex search and rescue		
Mike	Carpenter	CODE Development Planners Ltd		
ian	wilson	cm36pt		
c/o Agent	c/o Agent			
kelly	tilley			
Catherine	Bicknell	Mid and South Essex Health and Care Partnership		
N	Baseley	IBA Planning Ltd		
Sue	White		It is a live document and always open for reassessment. I think that a 20 year plan might be sensible, as it might mitigate future costs to extend the period now, but that is something for future debate.	Support for 20 year plan noted
Sarah	Yates			
Leonard	Lewis			
R	Minney			
Tim	Grant	Evolution Town Planning	A long plan period would give certainty for the delivery of development.	Support for a longer plan period noted
ANNE	OSBORN	Purleigh Community Shop		
Stephen	Hodgkinson		It is generally best practice to formulate a vision and plan strategically over a longer period, but essential to monitor and review the plan when it is not delivering or performing or there are major changes in national policy. Whilst a set period for the plan (either 15 or 20 years) is appropriate, there should be continuous Call for Sites exercises and regular reviews of the plan in order to monitor housing supply and delivery progress. New allocations could be added into the plan at a later date if necessary.	A Local Plan is a statutory land-use planning document that sets out how the Council should be developed over the next 15 years, in line with the requirements of national policy and legislation. A lesser timeframe for the local plan is not allowed, though a longer one is. There is also a statutory duty for the Council to review its local plan every five years, this ensures effective monitoring for the plan and the plan can adapt and be brought up to date if necessary. It is not practical to keep the call for sites exercise open all the time but it should be periodically reviewed as set down in national planning policy.
c/o Agent	c/o Agent	Maldon Wick Limited		
ZOE	HOSTY			
S	Swain			
Kevin	Coleman	Phase 2 Planning		
John	Lawrence			
Diane	Wallace			
Jonathan	Aldis	Good life Countryside Services		
Grace	Godwin			
Sue	Hillman			
michael	carr	NHS		
Simon	Plater	Plater+Claiborne		
Mark	Anderson			
Karen	Wellum			
Emma	Wright			
Linda	Coom		I think we need to review regularly rather than assume what will be needed in future.	A Local Plan is a statutory land-use planning document that sets out how the Council should be developed over the next 15 years, in line with the requirements of national policy and legislation. A lesser timeframe for the local plan is not allowed, though a longer one is. There is also a statutory duty for the Council to review its local plan every five years, this ensures effective monitoring for the plan and the plan can adapt and be brought up to date if necessary.
Caitlin	Soul			
Michelle	Curtis	Tollesbury Parish Council		
Mary	Hammond			
Ian	Drinkwater			

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 10. Should the plan period be longer than 15 years, should the period be 20 years, so that infrastructure can be planned in over a longer period?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
john	hand	N/A		
Emma	Smith	Bradwell on Sea Parish Council		
Tim	Dixon			
Nicola	Taylor	Elixirr		
Graham	Johnson	graham v johnson		
Chris	Yates			
Sally	Everritt	Community360		
Mark	Garrett			
Paul	Vidler			
Victoria	Long			
Victor	Staines			
Jayne	Moore	Essex County Fire and Rescue Service		
Kevin	Bennett			
Nicholas	Matthams		Any infrastructure changes should be completed before large scale housing is approved in order to reduce unnecessary further strain on already severely overstretched resources. This should not just include schools, medical facilities etc. but also the physical infrastructure, water, power, sewage & road improvements where appropriate.	The present LDP has an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which was approved through its examination, infrastructure is agreed with statutory providers such as the NHS and ECC and should be to mitigate the impact of development. Infrastructure is being provided under the terms of S106 legal agreements and will be assessed further as part of the LDP Review work. The matter in the majority of cases is not that infrastructure has not been provided but that its trigger points such as the number of homes completed has not been reached. This matter is monitored carefully and contributions pursued as they become liable.
Christian	van Stolk	RAND Europe		
Nicholas	Jepson			
Pamela	Lacey		Is there any infrastructure in place as I haven't seen any improvements	The present LDP has an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which was approved through its examination, infrastructure is agreed with statutory providers such as the NHS and ECC and should be to mitigate the impact of development. Infrastructure is being provided under the terms of S106 legal agreements and will be assessed further as part of the LDP Review work. The matter in the majority of cases is not that infrastructure has not been provided but that its trigger points such as the number of homes completed has not been reached. The sytem does not support up front provision of infrastructure except in exceptional circumstances and when it is evidenced. This matter is monitored carefully and contributions pursued as they become liable.
Chloe	Soul			
carole	kirk			
Sharon	Jackson		Prioritise the planning of infrastructure for current needs. Future needs should be looked at nearer the time. Infrastructure needs to be in place.	The present LDP has an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which was approved through its examination, infrastructure is agreed with statutory providers such as the NHS and ECC and should be to mitigate the impact of development. Infrastructure is being provided under the terms of S106 legal agreements and will be assessed further as part of the LDP Review work. The matter in the majority of cases is not that infrastructure has not been provided but that its trigger points such as the number of homes completed has not been reached. The sytem does not support up front provision of infrastructure except in exceptional circumstances and when it is evidenced. This matter is monitored carefully and contributions pursued as they become liable.
RICHARD	GROUT			
Charles	Bishop			
Paul	Jewiss	Self Employed		
Deborah	Anderson	NHS		
John	Pilgrim	Self employed	We do not know what may change in 15 to 20 years. We may almost all be working from home by then.	The Council may have to have a 20 year plus plan to ensure that critical infrastructure can be delivered.
Gloria	Gold	London Design and Engineering UTC		
Linda	Curry		Difficult to plan so far in the future. Seems pointless spending more time and resources on planning even further ahead.	A Local Plan is a statutory land-use planning document that sets out how the Council should be developed over the next 15 years, in line with the requirements of national policy and legislation. A lesser timeframe for the local plan is not allowed, though a longer one is. There is also a statutory duty for the Council to review its local plan every five years, this ensures effective monitoring for the plan and the plan can adapt and be brought up to date if necessary.
Lucy	Waterhouse			
Jon	Mayhew			
James	Goody	James Goody refurbishments		
Johanna	Dale			
Tracy	Kinnane			
Carlos	Rodriguez			
Rebecca	Tucker			
Mark	Faraway			

Question 10

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 10. Should the plan period be longer than 15 years, should the period be 20 years, so that infrastructure can be planned in over a longer period?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
T	Ketteley			
Elizabeth	Weston			
Jacky	Barber			
Ursula	Benjafield			
Paul	Mitchell			
Kristian	Tokeley	CTC Construction Ltd		
Ziyad	Thomas	Churchill Retirement Living / McCarthy Stone		
James	Campbell	HMPPS		
William	Moss			
Simon	Mackenzie Smith			
Richard	Udall			
Rosalind	Bishop			
John	Symington		Please see Section 2 of our submitted representations for details.	it is not clear what the respondant is stating.
Michael	Manning			
Jack	Inglis	Kelvedon Hall		
Peggy	Shields			
Dawn	Adams	Catesby Estates	Yes. Assuming that the start of the plan period is prior to the adoption date of the Local Plan then this is the only way to ensure that the plan looks forward at least 15 years from adoption as required by paragraph 22 of the NPPF. We consider that a 20 year plan period would be suitable.	It is not clear what the respondant is meaning, a plan period normally runs from the date of a review going forward for at least 15 years.
Wayne	Tilley	RTG Group Limited		
David	Dronfield	Braxted park	Q11 Settlement Pattern Great Baxted is appropriately identified as a small village and Little Braxted a hamlet. This is appropriate with the evidence showing that they are some of the smallest settlements by population size; and Great Braxted has very limited service provision	This answer does not relate to the question so no further comment can be made
John	Peirson			
Ron	Brown	Corporate		
Roger	HAWES			
Anne	Hull	Elmwood Equestrian Centre		
Matthew	Bloxham	Matt		
Julia	Morris			
Amanda	MacKenzie			
Jenny	Shepherd			
Jack	Ellum			
Bernard	Steeples			
Anna	mccomb	NHS Property Services Ltd		
Natalie	Kermath	Environment Agency		
Peter	Knights			
Unknown	Unknown	Ministry of Defence		
Duncan	Clark		It is more than just a matter of housing need. It is also a matter of housing supply, speed of provision of infrastructure, the effects on the District's economy of technological change and the need to protect, in the face of all that the District's historic landscape and heritage.	The Council may have to have a 20 year plus plan to ensure that critical infrastructure can be delivered.
Patricia	Smith			
Mick	Sargeant			
John	Cockerell	Hatfield Peverell Parish Council		
Catherine	Williams	C/O Savills (Agent)		
Tom	Kelly			
Linda	Gemmill			
Linda	Gemmill			
Mark	Norman	Highways England		
Thomasin	Foster			
*	*			
Alan	Massow			
*	*			
Ian	Butt			
Sarah	Sayer			
*	*			

Question 12

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 12. If you do not agree, how should they be grouped on what basis? (this refers to the Settlement Pattern)	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Jenny	Clemo	Langford & Ulting Parish Council	Disagree with classification of Langford as a medium village. The population figure in the 2011 Census is 161. Langford should therefore be classified as a small village. In addition, the part time shop which was in the church vestry and run by volunteers, is no longer operating. Similarly, disagree with classification of Ulting as a small village. The population figure in the 2011 Census is 167. Ulting has a dispersed settlement pattern and should therefore be classified as a hamlet. A majority of the village has no access to the bus route.	The Settlement Pattern is not based on population size but on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that. The shop has been removed from Langford. Ulting has a regular shopper and commuter bus service which is accessible to residents so has been awarded point for this.
Gavin	Rowsell			
Gareth	Davies	N / A		
Jackie	Gibbs			
Mike	Hayes		The largest villages, such as Latchingdon, should be categorised as Local Service Centres (or similar) and more development should be directed to these locations. The categories are too broad and do not allow for proper locational development control.	The categories are designed to be simple and easily understood by all, therefore using terms such as towns, large, medium and small villages is thought to do this. It is the description of each tier of the Settlement Pattern that assists in describing broadly each type of tier. Latchingdon as a large village as a number of services and facilities, a primary school and shops and is comprable to other similar settlements described as large villages.
David	Sismey			
Stuart	Willsher	Persimmon Homes Essex		
Anthony	Fittock		This has been oversimplified and excludes access to key everyday requirements. Latchingdon is on a strategic route and other than on route parking has only 3 places to park in. Post offices are no longer an essentially requirement or evidence of sustainability the majority of residents shopping is done at large superstores not small outlets. There is no assessment of the quality of play space or of the needs of teenagers / youth. There is also no consideration of distances from secondary schools in terms of assessing access to education within the District. Latchingdon is outside of the realistic straight line catchment area for existing schools in and outside of the district Continuing to expand a village based just upon size is not a robust or thoughtful strategy. The methodology and points ranking does not appear to be reflective in any way of need and hence does not accurately reflect differentials between settlements. The propsed acceptable travel distances would create a climate impact of approximately 1 Ton of Co2 per annum per household as a best case scenario. (daily travel to station and return ,1 visit per week to a supermarket , 2 recreational activities per week)	Parking in a settlement is not a matter which is looked at when making an assessment of a settlements sustainability. Post offices are still offer an important service in communities and therefore should be considered in any rural facilities study. An assessment of the quality of play space is being carried out as part of the evidence base work of the LDP Review. With regard to secondary school access there are only two secondary schools in the District and if regard was given to the travel to them then all settlements in the District except Burnham On Crouch and Maldon/Heybridge could be classed as unsustainable, this is not the purpose of the Settlement Pattern, it is a baseline to broadly group settlements which are alike together. The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that. The District being rural will inevitably mean that some journeys need to be undertaken by vehicle and using a 15 minute drive time to access higher order settlement would seem realistic.
Daniel	McAllister	Robert Mulholland And Company Limited		
Sarah	Sapsford		I could not find the updated settlement pattern.	The Settlement Pattern is available on the Council`s website, though it will be updated again following the analysis of the responses to the Issues and Options consultation.
Stephanie	Ireland		Heybridge Basin and Heybridge should be together as they are part of the same area.	Heybridge Basin is now a separate parish and therefore should be assessed separately in the Rural Facilities Study.

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 12. If you do not agree, how should they be grouped on what basis? (this refers to the Settlement Pattern)	COUNCIL RESPONSE
e	e	e	1. There is an error in the formula in the Rural Facilities survey. The formula in the red column CH should be =SUM(G5+I5+K5+M5… etc) not =SUM(G5:I5:K5:M5 etc). This would change Tollesbury's total weighted score from 177 to 160. Others would be similarly reduced, and the overall rank order would be slightly altered. 2. I think the weightings need further consideration, and to be evidence-based: a. For instance, do we have any evidence that a pharmacy - which serves the whole population and is essentially a health service - is less important than allotments, which are a comparatively niche interest? Why do we think that public open space (which everyone can use at any time) is less important than an indoor sports facility (which normally charges fees, is probably not environmentally friendly, and usually has relatively limited opening hours and other constraints)? b. Grocery/convenience stores are weighted at 8, and all other shops have a weighting of 5. Yet I would say a bakery is considerably more important for every-day life than, say, a florist, and those less-frequented shops should score perhaps 3. c. I don't think estate agents and insurance brokers should be counted as retailers: they should attract a lower weighting. d. I think the weight for rail services should be increased. e. I think the weight for any truly usable commuter buses to nearby towns (not those that stop before 5pm) should be increased. f. There doesn't seem to be any reflection of the myriad businesses that people run from home, such as cake decorating, bike repairs, or web design - or of any marine businesses. Yet "financial professional services" are included. Is that intentional? I realise they are harder to quantify. 3. The expressions "Large", Medium" and "Small" village can be misleading, as the criteria relate mainly to facilities, not to geographic area or population. Better terms might be "Major", "Mid" and "Minor"; or "Primary", "Secondary" and "Tertiary". This could help public understanding.	The error in the calculations has been noted and when the Settlement Pattern is republished this will be corrected. The priority of services and facilities was discussed at two all Member workshops in June of 2021. It would be almost impossible to place a wieghting on businesses being run from home because the Council could not get the finite details of those, the professional services in the Rural Facilities Study are those that have business premises such as banks, building societies. The terms towns, large, medium and small villages have been used because they are terms everyone can understand and in common language.
Kevin	Lagan		Build a new town on a rail corridor. Leave Maldon, Heybridge and Burnham alone. The damage has been done.	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth, the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months. Maldon/Heybridge and Burnham on Crouch are classed as towns with numerous services and facilities it is therefore expected that they will have to accommodate some level of growth, what that level is has yet to be determined.
Bethany	Jones	Colchester Borough Council		
magnus	Magnusson	Parker Planning Services	Yes, we agree, Maldon/Heybridge and Burnham-on-Crouch are the most sustainable settlements based on the current level of services and amenity provision and as demonstrated by the Council's own evidence base document.Consequently, Maldon/Heybridge and Burnham-on-Crouch should remain at the 'top' of any 'settlement hierarchy' that emerges through the LDP Review process. It is such locations (settlements) that should be the focus for new and integrated development within the plan-period.	No further comment
Nick	Whiteley			
Linda	Flowers	Self Employed	I feel that too many villages appear in the large villages category, the distribution of scores within this group is just too big. The Council, I feel, has done this to potentially justify allocating housing to them as a group. Villages such as Purleigh and Cold Norton rely heavily on car ownership. Most of the other Dengie villages have regular commuter and daytime bus services linking to Chelmsford City and many are on, or closer, to the rail services. The route between Cold Norton and Purleigh is a frankly dangerous country lane unsuitable for large buses, with narrow parts and blind corners. The large village category needs further assessing and needs to be fairer and smaller. The definitions large/medium/small should be changed to something more descriptive. Potentially having more than 3 categories.	The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that. Accessibility is a matter which is addressed by different modes of transport and therefore taking account of bus and train connectivity is an important part of the Rural Facilities Study. Road infrastructure will be considered in the next stage of the LDP Review with the Council working with Essex County Council to have Transport Modelling done. The Settlement Pattern is done blind, in that the Council do not know where growth is going to go when it is set so it can not be influenced by anything other than what level of services and facilities are in each settlement.
Peter	Holmes			
Colin	Pryke			
John	Hitcham		Again. One size doesn't fit all. After LDP I, each sub area has brought forward different classes of dwelling at different rates. Eg: Burnham which has overdelivered cf LDPI targets =is starting LDP II at a very different position. The requirements in LDP I are broadly similar for most sub areas. Therefore the aspirations for LDP II will be different for Burnham and the Dengie compared with LDP II.	The Council acknowledges that the requirements for the LDP Review will be broadly different from the approved Plan, given that a number of years have passed since the evidence base was produced and the Plan examined.

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 12. If you do not agree, how should they be grouped on what basis? (this refers to the Settlement Pattern)	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Richard	Kelly	Croudace Homes	Whilst South Woodham Ferrers is within the administrative boundary of Chelmsford, given its close links to the southwest boundary of Maldon, reference should be made to the role that the town plays for residents of the District. The adopted Chelmsford Local Plan (May 2020) identifies South Woodham Ferrers as a "high order settlement" considered to be "the most sustainable as they have the most functions and the best services and facilities including transport links and employment opportunities". It is therefore logical that development that will adjoin South Woodham Ferrers is a strategic matter that should be considered in a joined-up manner. This is linked to the cross-boundary strategic matter of delivering housing across the Housing Market Area ('HMA') being agreed through discussions between each authority to ensure policies are adopted that can support development on the edges of administrative areas. Such policies / strategies need to be agreed early to ensure they are delivered comprehensively in a planned and well considered	At the present time the Council cannot comment on whether individual settlements can or cannot accommodate future growth.The LDP Review process has to plan for future growth and it will have to be accommodated within the District. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and this was one of the reasons for the Issues and Options Consultation. In the coming months work will be undertaken to make the necessary decision using the evidence that is being prepared as part of the LDP Review work.
Andy	Quelch			
James	Rushton		Please see Question 13 below.	The Council has corresponded with the Parish Council and amended the information for Woodham Walter, this should ensure that the data is more accurate now.
Catherine	Champion			
Terence	Hughes	Burnham-on-Crouch constituent	Burnham-on-Crouch has the same problems that all the Dengie towns have and should not be treated separately. The Dengie Peninsula is unique as being isolated from the rest of the district. With only one rural road to connect to the Essex road system any increase in population, and therefore traffic, will affect the Dengie Peninsula more than any other area in the district.	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth, the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months.
John	Tompkins		Settlement boundaries for small settlements should be retained and secured as they are absolutely essential to retain the character of individual settlements. Once it is gone, it will never be regained. 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 would provide a measure of flexibility. It is far more beneficial than a 'free for all' and would provide a level of consistency. Capping is fine providing the site is suitable in the first instance based upon accurate survey information. If the survey information is incorrect, the process is flawed to the detriment of the villages and the environment.	These comments do not relate to this question - checked and the consultee has made the same comments under the appropriate question, which will be responded to.
Jeremy	Potter	Chelmsford City Council		
Daniel	Goodman	Rochford District council		
Chris	Harvey			
Jane	Senior			
Amanda	Clack		There is clear evidence of service and facility deterioration from 2008 to 2021. Development prioritisation should therefore be concentrated to the Towns and Larger Villages (only) where these facilities can be built up to better serve all the local community. Development concentration around the Towns and Larger Villages allows a focus for access and infrastructure as well as service and facility provision, thereby enabling the quality of rural life and enjoyment for the remaining areas to the benefit of everyone. A spread and scattering of development dilutes provision and spreads wider impact to the detriment of the rural landscape. I wish to specifically draw attention/object to ALT2 - Althorne, the increase in size and nature of this site being identified as a 'yes' in the HELAA Call for sites 2022 would severely negatively impact the landscape as well as increase traffic. The area is designated as a Special Landscape Area and Coastal Protection Belt following a Technical Study, the Landscape Character Assessment EB009a, jointly commissioned in 2005 by 5 Essex local councils. Althorne, for example, is currently classified as a "smaller village" where access to facilities is limited. Nothing has changed in the village; except we have now subsequently lost our only shop. Yet, through the Local Development Plan (LDP) now being consulted upon, the District Council are suggesting changing the categorisation of our village to a 'Medium Village' yet we have no facility provision.	The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that. The Council cannot respond on site specifics at this stage of LDP Review. Work on site allocations will be undertaken in the coming months with a Preferred Options consultation being carried out at the end of this period. The previous Rural Facilities study was not carried out very robustly, it relied on information supplied by the Parish Councils at the time and we are not even sure if they all responded, it appears that the information was never verified and no-one checked on site. This time we have tried to be much more robust, we have consulted the parish councils but we have also visited each settlement and carried out a robust desktop survey. We will also be looking and verifying any responses from this consultation and feeding that into the information we have for each settlement. Also in the present approved LDP the Settlement Pattern does not make logical sense, there are settlements which do not relate to each other, Althorne is grouped with settlements that have even less services and facilities than it and with those that have a lot more and its split in such a way that is it difficult to use in the policies. It does not say in the present LDP that Althorne is an unsustainable place, it just groups the settlements. We have tried to rectify this by carrying out a more robust assessment, we have also included travel to main town times, bus services, travel to main employment sites etc to make the assessment more complete and splitting the pattern in a more clearly logical way. Therefore we can`t compare the two pieces of work because the present piece of work contains more detail and is more accurate.

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 12. If you do not agree, how should they be grouped on what basis? (this refers to the Settlement Pattern)	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Daphne	Scott		Shoppers and commuter bus service, rail station, within 15 min drive of a town, halls, children's play, outdoor sports, recycling point, church, POS - This is the basic information provided in order to determine that Althorne can be categorised as a Medium Village. There is no POS and the so called commuter bus service is infrequent, not available at times that would be useful to anyone commuting to work, and only serves a small part of the village. The majority of people living in Althorne have to commute by car along narrow, windy roads that are already overloaded by traffic travelling from Burnham on Crouch, Southminster and other outlying villages.	
Kenny	Alexander	Thomas Gainsborough School		
David	Kennedy		the analysis of facilities, particularly doctors surgery's, is not of sufficient granularity to be meaningful. It would be more meaningful to calculate the number of GP's per 100 of the population as an example. As a further example, settlements with a bus services is also a meaningless statistic. It does not take into account frequency, routes, usage etc. This whole document needs greater granularity.	There is a limitation in terms of the resource capacity that the Council can apply to any given piece of work in the LDP Review. The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that. Bus services were examined and divided into two catergories, shoppers and commuters both of these would mean that residents could either go shopping in a higher order
Mark	Behrendt	Home Builders Federation		
Matthew	Cooper			
Terry	Inkpen	None	The points scoring system is contentious with the ranking of various facilities not agreed. The population of a settlement is not taken into account when calculating size ranking, which could lead to some anomalies. It is in fact a facilities and potential sustainability ranking if done properly. The facilities attributed to Althorne are incorrect. Althorne has a train station 1 mile from what could be considered the centre of the village with no bus service to it. There is one public house. Shopper buses run only twice a week in school term time. Regular bus services are 40 mins in each direction on weekdays and only run through the northern end of the village, not the centre. There is no Sunday service. There are no shops or post office. There is only a privately run pre school, and no infants, primary or secondary schools. Even using the proposed points system it would get 39 points which would put it into the Small Village category.	All the settlements with a train station got awarded points, the station can be walked to even though it is not in the centre of the settlement it is still a service associated with the settlement. A bus service which offers shoppers the ability to access a higher order settlement was given points in each settlement where relevant, residents would not be expected to go shopping everyday so a less frequent service is acceptable. The settlement was not awarded points for a shop or post office.
christine	collins		the data it is based on is inaccurate particular with regard to althorne, This needs to be reassessed with updated unformation Althorne does not have the facilities that are listed and so is a small village this needs to be reassessed !	The consultee has not stated which services and facilities are available in the settlement so no further comment can be made.
Stuart	Williams	Ace group	The groupings are not consistent	The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that. The consultee has stated why the groupings are inconsistent so no further comment can be made.
Reegan	Howles		Settlement patterns should more adequately assess the existing infrastructure of an area, as well as considering what has changed in an area to warrant an upgrade or downgrade in settlement type. For example, Althorne has been updated to a 'medium village' in the new pattern, despite having NO doctors surgeries, pharmacies, primary schools, proper grocery shops, other retail shops, banks, hairdressers, fire stations, libraries, petrol stations, places of worship or indoor sports facilities. Nothing significant has changed in Althorne to suggest it has now upgraded to a 'medium village' from its' previous 'small village' status. The only reason I can see for this upgrade is to suit the agendas of developers.	The previous Rural Facilities study was not carried out very robustly, it relied on information supplied by the Parish Councils at the time and we are not even sure if they all responded, it appears that the information was never verified and no-one checked on site. This time we have tried to be much more robust, we have consulted the parish councils but we have also visited each settlement and carried out a robust desktop survey. We will also be looking and verifying any responses from this consultation and feeding that into the information we have for each settlement. Also in the present approved LDP the Settlement Pattern does not make logical sense, there are settlements which do not relate to each other, Althorne is grouped with settlements that have even less services and facilities than it and with those that have a lot more and its split in such a way that is it difficult to use in the policies. It does not say in the present LDP that Althorne is an unsustainable place, it just groups the settlements. We have tried to rectify this by carrying out a more robust assessment, we have also included travel to main town times, bus services, travel to main employment sites etc to make the assessment more complete and splitting the pattern in a more clearly logical way. Therefore we can`t compare the two pieces of work because the present piece of work contains more detail and is more accurate.
jasbir	Singh			
Janice	Jackson		Althorne should be classed as a small village.	The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that. The consultee has not stated why Althorne should be a small village and therefore no further comment can be made.
Roy A	Clare	Charities		

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 12. If you do not agree, how should they be grouped on what basis? (this refers to the Settlement Pattern)	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Felicity	Gale		You have classed my village Althorne has a medium village, this is ridiculous as a result, via your 'call for sites' exercise you have classed 1750 houses as being suitable - you are destroying my village.	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth, the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months. The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that.
Lindsey	Wright			
David	Hill	Dandara Ltd		
Steven	Potter			
Vysian	Banyard	TKPC	Tolleshunt Knights and Goldhanger should be classed as small villages as they have few or no facilities and little access to them. T Knights relies on facilities in Tiptree which are largely oversubscribed, particularly GP and dental service, Tiptree, in any case, is growing rapidly without improved infrastructure and their developing Neighbourhood Plan seek to place any further development to the north of Tiptree as the traffic problems are already considerable.	The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that. Tiptree may be like other settlements across the country in that its infrastructure will come forward after some of the growth has occurred.
Diane	Carter			
Luke	Garrett	Obsidian Strategic Asset Management Ltd	Obsidian Strategic agrees with the continued identification of Tollesbury as a 'larger village' in the updated Settlement Pattern. The District Council's own evidence base, specifically the Rural Facilities Survey and Settlement Pattern (January 2022), clearly show that Tollesbury has a range of services and facilities sufficient for its own needs, and provides for some of the needs of smaller villages within its immediate sphere of influence. This is reflective of Tollesbury being the second highest scoring of the 'larger villages'. However, Obsidian Strategic queries the identification of some of the new 'larger villages', including Purleigh, Cold Norton, Great Totham South and Tolleshunt D'Arcy. These settlements have significantly fewer services and facilities, achieve a score of less than half of Tollesbury, and score only marginally higher than a number of the 'medium villages', specifically Bradwell-on-Sea and Althorne. In this context, Obsidian Strategic consider that it may be more appropriate for some of the new 'larger villages' to continue to be classified as 'medium villages'.	The Settlement Pattern will be reviewed once the responses on the Issues and Options consultation has been processed.
Robin	Fanshawe			
John	Brown			
Chris	Waumsley	Inovo Consulting	There is an over emphasis on proximity to employment allocations and insufficient recognition of the importance of the rural economy in providing employment. Diversification in the rural economy from agriculture should be supported by adequate provision of housing in the rural villages	The economy is a strand of sustainability and therefore the relationship to major employment allocations is an important aspect of assessing the relationship between settlements. It is not possible for the Council to assess all businesses in a settlement because we do not have the information on size and number of employees so could not provide the information across all the settlements.
Phil	Jacklin		Whilst I understand how the points for individual villages are allocated, it is difficult to understand how Cold Norton can be considered to be a "large village" when it is about number 13 by population. So, perhaps, population should be the criteria.	Population is not a matter which is factored in with regard to the Rural Settlements Hierarchy. The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that.
Robert	Jones	The University of Reading		
Robert	Stephens	N/A	Maldon and Heybridge should be two distinct districts	Maldon and Heybridge may be separate in terms of municipal administration and democratic representation but in regard to spatial planning they are clearly one connorbation. The services and facilities interrelate with each other, particularly with regard to shopping, employment and spatial relationship. They therefore have been classed as one place in regard to LDP Review.
Pete	Butcher		The data does not state how near alternative services and facilities are to an area. It is possible that two nearby villages (or town and village) are complementary and in combination could have far greater services and facilities. Alternatively, it is possible that a location has very few services and facilities, but is very close to another location which has most facilities. In such a situation where is the planning preference?	It is quite difficult to pinpoint interrelationships between settlements unless they are clear in the way the Maldon and Heybridge are. To a degree comment has been made in the Rural Facilities Study about linkages between settlements where it is apparent. When the Rural Facilities Study is reviewed after the comments are assessed from this consultation review of settlement linkages will be part of that process.
JO	COOMBES			
Jonney	Aldridge			
Mark	Hurley	Selfridges	Grouping is fine, but the services part of LDP isn't. Please listen to the people of Maldon, we don't have enough doctors, densists, car parks, social venues etc. to cope with current population. There needs to be a proper survey and analysis to determine what's needed both now and when new homes start to be filled, and there needs to be a proper plan executed to deliver these services.	The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that.
Neil	Burke	Bradwell Power Generation Company Limited	Bradwell B do not have any specific comments to make on this question.	N/A
Lynne	Goodbourn		Too much emphasis has been placed on building in the south of our district. The northern villages and towns must take a greater load of proposed development	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth, the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months.

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 12. If you do not agree, how should they be grouped on what basis? (this refers to the Settlement Pattern)	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Christopher	Kent		Althorne is a small village. No shop. No restaurant. No school . No Doctor. No Dentist and Bus Service that only serves the lower part of Althorne.	The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that. The bus service in Althorne can be accessed by residents.
Sophie	Pryor			
c/o Agent	c/o Agent	Clarion Housing		
Stephanie	Jones	home		
Phillipa	Griffiths			
Matthew	Taylor		Great Braxted is appropriately identified as a small village and Little Braxted a hamlet. This is appropriate with the evidence showing that they are some of the smallest settlements by population size; and Great Braxted has very limited service provision.	Support noted
Anne	Bailey		Any increase building should be near large towns where access to transport and main roads are accessible, not creating larger villages in areas of outstanding natural beauty.	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth, the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months.
Lucien	Taylor			
David	Baker		The classification of Purleigh as a large village is flawed, it is made up of three distinctly small villages, Purleigh, Mundon and Cock Clarks. It is no longer appropriate to view these as one, each has its own character and identity and undoubtably each has its own needs and requirements. None have their own shop or post office, are poorly served as far as health services are concerned, falling between Maldon and Danbury, public transport is virtually non-existant and roads are inadequate to serve the classification.	The Settlement Pattern will be reviewed once the responses on the Issues and Options consultation has been processed. Purleighs services and facilties are going to be reviewed because of a difference in information supplied, this may alter the position in the Settlement Hierarchy. Mundon and Cocks Clarks have been assessed separately from Purleigh so have not been included in with Purleighs services and facilities.
Glenna	Wilkins		Far to vague and proposals rarely seem to be carried out.	It is not clear what this consultee is saying and how this relates to the question.
Danny	Soul			
Fiona	Barkham	Private Individual	Answer to 11 / 12 Great Braxted is identified as a small village, little Braxted as a hamlet These are appropriate given they are some of the smallest settlements in the district The inclusion of a site such as GB1 is completely out of keeping with the settlements	Comments noted about the settlements. The Council cannot respond on site specifics at this stage of LDP Review. Work on site allocations will be undertaken in the coming months with a Preferred Options consultation being carried out at the end of this period.
Isabel	Adcock		The communities need to be looked at more individually - not one size fits all. During the pandemic some rose amazingly well to the challenges whilst others seemed to wait for help. The one needs encouraging and supporting the other need building up.	The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that.
alan	johnson	sky broadcasting	how on earth can you class Purleigh in the list of 'large villages' I looked at a number of different sources of information and it's one of the smallest villages on the list. Please show some evidence of how the list was populated	The Settlement Pattern will be reviewed once the responses on the Issues and Options consultation has been processed. Purleighs services and facilties are going to be reviewed because of a difference in information supplied, this may alter the position in the Settlement Hierarchy.
Victoria	Cutmore	Endurance Estates	It is noted that the hierarchy continues to recognise the sustainability of Heybridge by its identification as a town, placing it at the top of the hierarchy which is supported by Endurance Estates.	Support noted
Jane	Potter	Purleigh Parish Council	11. The Parish Council broadly agrees with the updated settlement pattern but not the specifics included in the table of settlements on page 22 of the document.	Comments noted. Purleigh is one of the settlements which is having its services and facilities rechecked and the details will be input into the Rural Facilties Study.
Brian	Haydon	Cold Norton Parish Council	N/A	N/A
Lee	Foster		There is no information on how these settlements have been categorised. I.E Althorne has been put with the Medium groupage? On what grounds and information was this decided? With under 620 properties, There is no medical facilities such a doctors, pharmacy. No education, No shop, Minimal at best transport facilities. One occupied train an hour with no capacity to increase. It is essential to drive whilst living in Althorne. Surely a 'medium village' should be able to supply modern day basic amenities	The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that. A broad description of each tier of the Settlement Pattern is set out in the Rural Facilties Study.
Vanessa	Horner		The plan is not upto date and does not reflect current services and facilities. Purleigh is a medium village spread out over a large area with approx half in village itself. You need to look at village itself and not whole of it	The Settlement Pattern will be reviewed once the responses on the Issues and Options consultation has been processed. Purleighs services and facilties are going to be reviewed because of a difference in information supplied, this may alter the position in the Settlement Hierarchy. The services and facilties are looked at within the reasonable boundary of the village itself not the wider hinterland.
Brian	Howson	Pharmaceutical company	Purleigh is not a 'large' village. I would say the central area of the village is small. The wider district of Purleigh is a large area. If there is an aim to designate Purleigh village as 'large', as a potential method for imposing housing in the village please do not. Please leave the green spaces in the villages alone - they are rich in wildlife and in most cases far enough from roads to give the insects / small mammals to flourish. Once the wildlife have gone they are gone for good. Which means our families / children / future generations will never know the enjoyment from seeing and observing them	The Settlement Pattern will be reviewed once the responses on the Issues and Options consultation has been processed. Purleighs services and facilties are going to be reviewed because of a difference in information supplied, this may alter the position in the Settlement Hierarchy. The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that.
Marion	Gunn			

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 12. If you do not agree, how should they be grouped on what basis? (this refers to the Settlement Pattern)	COUNCIL RESPONSE
BRIAN	COLLINS		I do not understand your comments, where you say that a settlement plan is not necessarily based on projected growth patterns. If not why not ?	The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that
Peter	Lampard		Purleigh should be treated as a medium sized village, not a large village.	The Settlement Pattern will be reviewed once the responses on the Issues and Options consultation has been processed. Purleighs services and facilties are going to be reviewed because of a difference in information supplied, this may alter the position in the Settlement Hierarchy
Tim	Chilvers		The settlement pattern is supported and it is considered that Maldon/Heybridge have correctly been identified at the top of settlement hierarchy. It is considered important that the pattern of spatial growth and allocations reflect the positon of settlements within the hierarchy.	Support noted
Elliott	George		In response to Question 11 (due to a lack of a response box) we comment as follows: The settlement pattern identifies Large Villages are the most sustainable after the principal towns in the District. We note that the Council has prepared a new Rural Facilities and Settlement Hierarchy (Jan 2022) and this identifies that Southminster has the largest population after the Towns but more importantly then scores each settlement against available facilities. This report gives Southminster a total score of 220 points, which is the highest score in the report by some 30 points demonstrating it is, my some margin, the most sustainable Large Village in the District, a conclusion we wholly support. The emerging Local Plan states at paragraph 11.3 that "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." Whilst, it is accepted that settlement pattern alone does not define a growth strategy, it is clearly a hugely important consideration that significantly influenced the strategy within the adopted Local Plan by focusing growth at the Towns. However, such a strategy meant that Southminster, a demonstrably a highly sustainable settlement in the District, didn't receive any growth in the adopted Local Plan, something the emerging Local Plan must address. Given the above and unconstrained nature of Southminster, it is considered that growth should identified here through the emerging Local Plan	Support noted
Kate	Ellis		I believe that the information about the settlements is factually incorrect. Living in Purleigh, I know that the classification of the village as a large village is inaccurate. It is a small to medium village with limited infrastructure to support any planned development works.	The Settlement Pattern will be reviewed once the responses on the Issues and Options consultation has been processed. Purleighs services and facilties are going to be reviewed because of a difference in information supplied, this may alter the position in the Settlement Hierarchy
Kevin	Ashman	Estates and Agency Strategic Land	EASL raises no objections with the Settlement Pattern. However, by definition, it is a snapshot from a point in time based on a level of services and facilities. It assumes the equilibrium is maintained until 2038. The Settlement Pattern should consider what existing services and facilities within a given settlement provide the catalyst for sustainable growth. This could include elements such as school capacity, public transport and economic drivers.	The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that. The Council then monitors the Settlement Pattern to see if its policies are achieving what they should be in terms of growth or protection of rural services and facilities
Jake	Nugent	Endurance Estates Ltd	No, we do not agree with the updated settlement hierarchy as it stands. We consider that Althorne should be higher up the hierarchy, as a "large village" instead of a "medium village". Paragraph 11.2 of the consultation identifies that the Settlement Pattern is a snapshot in time of the District's settlements. With this in mind, we note that the Updated Rural Facilities Survey (2021) identifies the addition of a shop and restaurant in Althorne and that there is potential for it to move up the hierarchy, but despite having a higher score than other settlements further up the hierarchy, it currently remains as a "medium village". We consider that the Survey is right to recognise this potential because it means that there is scope for the Plan to capture the most up to date position as it emerges. So, at this juncture we consider that the position of Althorne should be reconsidered and note the opportunity for MDC to do so. Althorne should be grouped within the larger villages because the scoring shows that it warrants being included as a larger village.	The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that. The services and facilities are what they are within each settlement and the Council cannot move settlements either up or down the pattern artifically, it would be for policies to set growth and then over time through implementation and monitoring a settlement may move up the pattern.
John	Buchanan			
Tim	Bradford	leadenhall		
Jacky	Bannerman	Woodham Walter Parish Council	Settlement boundaries for small settlements should be retained and secured as it is gone, it will never be regained. 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 would provide a measure of flexibility. It is far more beneficial than a 'free for all' and would provide a level of consistency. Capping is fine providing the site is suitable in the first instance based upon accurate survey information. If the survey information is incorrect, the process is	This consultee response does not relate to the question, checked and the consultee has made the same comments under the appropriate question, which will be responded to
Mark	Tentori	Mazdev Limited		
Peter	Ingram		Althorne is grouped as a medium settlement but this is based purely on dwellings not infrastructure. This is the main cause of concern.	The number of dwellings is not a matter which is taken into account in the Rural Facilities Study. The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 12. If you do not agree, how should they be grouped on what basis? (this refers to the Settlement Pattern)	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Jane	Pilgrim			
Judith	Radcliffe			
Christopher	Mabbutt	Burnham Primary School		
Mary	Putt		There is only one sizeable town in this area and that is Maldon - it is wrong to class Burnham on Crouch as a town, as it suggests that it comes with all the expected town trappings and it does not it is far more akin to a large Cornish fishing port. If you must call it a town could you not caviate the listing as large town - Maldon, small town Burnham on Crouch	Burnham on Crouch has a secondary school, large employment allocation, high street, primary school and health facilities and therefore falls within the broad description of a town. It can sustain most aspects of daily life without residents having to travel to a larger settlement
Alan	Shrimplin	N/A	Many parts of this consultation group BOC and Southminster together, and then many parts separated them, it appears they are grouped together when needed to give a certain answer and then separated for a different answer, settlement pattern/areas should be consistent over the whole consultation	Burnham on Crouch is considered to be a town and therefore does not appear in the Rural Facilities Study as the level of services and facilties is not something the Council would monitor in terms of that study. Southminster is considered to be a large village and therefore does appear in the Rural Facilties Study and its services and facilties are monitored
Valerie	Coleby	Berrys		
Kevin	Bruce		Dont understand what is meant by grouping	The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that
William	Shepherd		In my view Purleigh is not a large village and has had no new infrastructure for many years. In fact contrary to stated in your plan there is NO post office in Pureigh and only a small community shop with limited supply. Previous to 2018 there was a commercially run shop and post office Although the Parish of Purleigh is large , Purleigh is a small village and should be reclassified as such	The Settlement Pattern will be reviewed once the responses on the Issues and Options consultation has been processed. Purleighs services and facilties are going to be reviewed because of a difference in information supplied, this may alter the position in the Settlement Hierarchy. The post office has not been counted.
victoria	newson	Childrens Nursery	Settlements should be easily accessible to main roads not inadequate semi rural villages that simply cannot cope with this massive influx of people.	The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that. Roads and Transport Modelling will be considered at the next stage of the LDP Review
David	Banfield			
Phillip	Wright	CALA Homes (North Home Counties) Ltd		
.	.	SN Developments		
.	.	Cooper Property Holdings Ltd		
Jane	Coleman	Maldon Town Council	N/A	N/A
Roy	Martin	Mr Roy Martin	Position on 'Hamlets' is confusing and contradictory and appears outside area for future development (consultation for Option 4 confines to 'towns, small, medium and large villages' which according to recent 'Settlement Map' would exclude 'Hamlets'). Urgent clarification is required of this as will limit and deter land availability on otherwise suitable sites.	The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that. Hamlets would not normally be considered for growth unless they were designated for a growth uplift to a large village or town, the growth option and polices would do that not the Settlement Pattern.
Simon	Butler-Finbow	Pigeon Investment Management	It is considered correct for Burnham-on-Crouch to be identified as one of the two towns / top tier settlements in the Settlement Pattern, owing the high levels of sustainability of the town. MDC should provide a brief summary against each tier so it is clear why each settlement is in the position set out. This will also provide an opportunity for full public review and scrutiny of the Pattern which will support a more robust plan at examination. Whilst MDC states that the Settlement Pattern does not dictate where development will go, arguably it should provide a strong guide for development over the plan period as the Settlement Pattern is a statement of the sustainability, accessibility and ultimately suitability of each area for new development. In line with the NPPF's sustainability objectives, the more sustainable and accessible locations in the Settlement Pattern should be the main focus of development over the plan period.	Support noted
sara	doran		I am concerned that eg Creeksea - established as a parish more than 700 years ago and identified as separate from Burnham-on-crouch has a church, 3 sports venues, houses, leisure caravans and now a cafe is not included, and might be subsumed under hamlet or burnham. It has it's own identity and this seems to be ignored in recent planning decisions. I note a further 250 houses are due to be built in parallel to the railway and the boundary of ferry road - describing this as urban. This is not urban. this is rural, and the major change has been the addition of the endless traffic down a small lane to get to the parlour cafe (previously a farm). I actually support this development, but perhaps the access could have been considered from the burnham side of the farm- thereby including it in the burnham development rather than ruining creeksea.	Creeksea is not a separate parish and lies within but very much on the outside of the town of Burnham on Crouch so for the purposes of the Rural Facilities Study has not been considered as a separate place but would be looked at in relation to the town of Burnham. There a few places within the District that have not been assessed separately because they are in effect classed as in the open countryside, Howe Green is one such place. The railway line appears to form a barrier to development to the south of it with the golf course to the west, this leaves Creeksea with a buffers against strategic expansion of the town also there is the consideration of flood risk the nearer the river you get. At the present time I would not consider making Creeksea a separate place in the Settlement Pattern, it appears to have no defined core and is not a parish in itself.
Colin	Horner	Villageretreat	The plan is not upto date and does not reflect the current facilities and services. Purleigh is a medium village spread out over a large area with approx half the population in the village itself . You need to look at the village only not the parish.	The Settlement Pattern will be reviewed once the responses on the Issues and Options consultation has been processed. Purleighs services and facilties are going to be reviewed because of a difference in information supplied, this may alter the position in the Settlement Hierarchy. The area of the village was the area assessed not the wider hinterland

Question 12

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 12. If you do not agree, how should they be grouped on what basis? (this refers to the Settlement Pattern)	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Robert	Scott	Lewis & Scott Retirement Living Ltd	It is important to recognise that development - specifically that to address demographic and affordability needs - is capable of being delivered across the settlement pattern to address local needs. Therefore, provided that the development is proportionate and based on the level of need, the delivery of affordable specialist housing should not be precluded in smaller settlements. As shown by a number of studies, as well as first evidence within the District itself, this will lead to the deterioration of the settlement's services	This consultee response does not relate to the question, checked and the consultee has made the same comments under the appropriate question, which will be responded to
Rob	Bard		Purleigh should not be classed as a large village. The population figures suggest that the Purleigh figure includes other villages (such as Cock Clarks and Hazeleigh) that are part of the parish but are separated in the settlement pattern document in which the comparison is being made. The facilities in the village of Purleigh do not match that of a large village.	The Settlement Pattern will be reviewed once the responses on the Issues and Options consultation has been processed. Purleighs services and facilties are going to be reviewed because of a difference in information supplied, this may alter the position in the Settlement Hierarchy. Cock Clarks and Hazeleigh were assessed separately, population is not a factor in the Settlement Pattern.
Tim	Hann		A large percentage of settlements are incorrectly grouped. A number of the 'large villages' are incorrectly assigned as the criteria used is flawed. I cannot see how a village with, 1 Shop (no Post Office), 1 Public House, 1 Small Primary School, 1 Small (morning only) Nursery , 1 Church (with no resident clergy & shared services with 4 neighbouring parishes) & 1 Village Hall can be classed as a large village. This can be applied to a number of the listed large villages and is not specific to individuals	The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that.
Burnham	Town Council	Burnham on Crouch Town Council		
Justin	Barkham	Self employed	Answer to 11 / 12 Great Braxted is identified as a small village, little Braxted as a hamlet. These are appropriate given they are some of the smallest settlements in the district. The inclusion of a site such as GB1 is completely out of keeping with the settlements	Comments noted about the settlements. The Council cannot respond on site specifics at this stage of LDP Review. Work on site allocations will be undertaken in the coming months with a Preferred Options consultation being carried out at the end of this period
Poppy	Vidler	Crown Consumer Ltd	As a resident of Great Braxted the area receives hardly any service provision.	Support noted
Stephen	Sutton		Great Totham South should be treated separately to Great Totham North they are distinct places. Both should be treated as medium villages.	Great Totham South and Great Totham North have been treated separately. The consultee has not set out why they should both be medium villages so further comment can be made.
Tim	Madelin		The wrong measure of proximity to amenities has been used - it should be public transport accessibility not 'private car drive time'	Both measures have been used. Bus services have been examined and points awarded for shoppers and commuter bus services and a 15 minute drive time was used as it cannot reasonably be expected that residents in a rural district would not use their vehicles to access some services and facilities and employment
Joanna	Jeffery	Althorne Parish Clerk	The points scoring system is contentious with the ranking of various facilities not agreed. The population of a settlement is not taken into account when calculating size ranking, which could lead to some anomalies. It is in fact a facilities and potential sustainability ranking if done properly. The facilities attributed to Althorne are incorrect. Althorne has a train station 1 mile from what could be considered the centre of the village with no bus service to it. There is one public house. Shopper buses run only twice a week in school term time. Regular bus services are 40 mins in each direction on weekdays and only run through the northern end of the village, not the centre. There is no Sunday service. There are no shops or post office. There is only a privately run pre school, and no infants, primary or secondary schools. Even using the proposed points system it would get 39 points which would put it	All the settlements with a train station got awarded points, the station can be walked to even though it is not in the centre of the settlement it is still a service associated with the settlement. A bus service which offers shoppers the ability to access a higher order settlement was given points in each settlement where relevant, residents would not be expected to go shopping everyday so a less frequent service is acceptable. The settlement was not awarded points for a shop or post office.
Paul	Coppin		no comment	N/A
Steven	Bardwell	S P Bardwell Ltd	I do not agree with settlement table on page 22	The consultee has not stated why they do not agree and therefore no further comment can be made
David	Oxford	Lloyds Banking Group	Grouping should be based on the categorisation, number of existing houses, facilities and heritage lanscape and industy(farmland/Vineyards	The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that. It would not be possible to objectively award points based on landscape or heritage and therefore these criteria are not used in a Rural Facilities Study, it is always worked out on matters that can be measured.
Stephen Francis	Dewick	Curry Farm		
George	Dixon			

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 12. If you do not agree, how should they be grouped on what basis? (this refers to the Settlement Pattern)	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Douglas	Channer	Private	Medium villages These settlements have reasonable connectivity and could provide either a commuter/shopper's bus service or train service. They may provide some essential services such as shop, post office or primary school, and may provide some job opportunities for their residents, they also may provide basic services for neighbouring hamlets and smaller villages, but in the main they look to towns and large villages to provide a greater range of community facilities, including medical facilities. They, in general have a smaller range of community facilities than the towns or large villages. Small villages There are smaller villages of differing sizes, which have a limited range of services or facilities. Though connectivity of these settlements is reasonable with some access to commuter/shopper bus services and train connectivity, very few have schools, food shops, or employment opportunities although most have places of worship, village halls and a public house. Residents would have to look to higher order settlements to meet the vast majority of their everyday needs I have to speak for Althorne where I live. It is an unsustainable area as a number of planning application refusals and appeals have identified. Clearly knowing the village the text that applies to it is above under small villages. I think the point scoring is off beam and distorts other important aspects that should relate to and influence the outcome of where a village is placed. I do not understand how you can split Great Totham as shown in the tables and not Althorne. There is essentially an upper and lower Althorne . Both would then definitely be regarded as small. In my opinion I find this exercise and its outcomes extremely concerning and I consider it may be challengeable	The description of the types of settlements is broad and there will always be settlements that do not exactly fit, settlements cannot just be moved up and down the settlement pattern because they appear not to fit exactly. The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that. It may be that Althorne scores points in other regards such as having a train station or additional sports facilties. Althorne is one parish and clearly one settlement and that is why it has been assessed as one place. Great Totham is two separate places with a significant green gap in between and therefore has been assessed as two separate places.
Lynda	Bugg		Yes, it's all right to group villages together but disagree that Althorne is a medium village.	The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that
Paul	Burgess	None	Dwelling numbers and population are of greater importance then the amenity points system used which is highly subjective. Critical mass needed to make a community should be a key factor. The nature of the community ie demographics should also be used to create a viable settlement hierarchy.	Population is not a matter which is factored in with regard to the Rural Settlements Hierarchy. The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. Population does not reflect the amount of services and facilties a settlement has and many smaller settlements have more than larger ones in terms of population
D	Cooper			
C/O Agent	C/O Agent			
Zoe	May	East of England Ambulance Service NHS Trust		
Roger	Woodcock		This is an almost impossible problem to solve as it will always cause a negative reaction (understandably) in those residents impacted upon by further development. All that can be done is to minimise the misery. The list does appear to be logical.	The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that
Braxted and Blackwater Conservation Grou	BBCG	The Braxted and Blackwater Conservation Group (BBCG)	No comment	N/A
raymond	dundas	Householder		
John	Watson		This has been oversimplified and excludes access to key everyday requirements. Latchingdon is on a strategic route and other than on route parking has only 3 places to park in. Post offices are no longer an essentially requirement or evidence of sustainability , The vast majority of resident shopping is done at large superstores. There is no assessment of the quality of play space or of the needs of teenagers / youth. There is also no consideration of distances from secondary schools in terms of assessing access to education within the District. Latchingdon is outside of the realistic straight line catchment area for existing secondary schools in and outside of the district. Continuing to expand a village based just upon size is not a robust or thoughtful strategy. It is our opinion that the point system used for differential identification is flawed and does not accurately reflect the quality or appropriateness or importance of facilities listed.	Parking in a settlement is not a matter which is looked at when making an assessment of a settlements sustainability. Post offices are still offer an important service in communities and therefore should be considered in any rural facilities study. An assessment of the quality of play space is being carried out as part of the evidence base work of the LDP Review. With regard to secondary school access there are only two secondary schools in the District and if regard was given to the travel to them then all settlements in the District except Burnham On Crouch and Maldon/Heybridge could be classed as unsustainable, this is not the purpose of the Settlement Pattern, it is a baseline to broadly group settlements which are alike together. The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that.
Josh	Plant	Gladmans	Gladman support the updated Settlement Pattern and recognition of the suitability of large villages which has been established through the assessment of access to key services and facilities.	Support noted

Question 12

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 12. If you do not agree, how should they be grouped on what basis? (this refers to the Settlement Pattern)	COUNCIL RESPONSE
*	*		4.19 The settlement pattern is helpful, however, in respect of Southminster its grouping with other large villages does not sufficiently reflect its size or the scale of the services and facilities available, including the railway station. It is considered that an additional tier of settlements should be included which could be called Growth Villages or Service Villages to recognise the sustainability credentials of the largest settlements, especially in the parts of the District where there is the greatest need to deliver market and affordable housing. Accordingly, the status of Southminster should be elevated within the settlement hierarchy.	Comments noted but do not agree with the proposal put forward. It is important to keep the Settlement Pattern as simple as possible as it is the golden thread that runs through the plan. Southminister is a large village and there has to be a village at the top of the each tier it does not make it different in terms of its broad similarity with the other large villages it also does not mean that it will get more growth. The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that. By creating another higher tier in the Settlement Pattern it is like pre-determining where growth is going to go and the Council has not made that decision yet.
*	Willmott		The settlement pattern is helpful. Stow Maries has been identified as a Hamlet which reflects its scale by comparison to the larger villages within the District. However, in terms of sustainability it does benefit from its close proximity to Cold Norton to the north-east and the Town of South Woodham Ferrers to the south-west. It is also close to the railway stations at South Woodham Ferrers and North Fambridge. This relationship and close proximity of services and facilities mean that it is a sustainable rural location for further growth and should also be considered in line with the policy recommendations set out in paragraph 78 of the NPPF.	Stow Maries whilst being close to Cold Norton is quite a distance in terms of being able to walk, with South Woodham Ferrers being even further away with no safe pavement acccess. It has very few services and facilities, its designation as a hamlet would therefore be appropriate.
Ivor	Watson			
*	*		Policy S8 of the Approved Maldon Local Development Plan (ALP) (2017) sets out the District's settlement hierarchy. It identifies Maldon (Maldon Town), Heybridge and Burnham as the District's main settlements, on their current size, level of service provision, local character as well as identified opportunities and constraints. There has not been any significant change in the nature of Heybridge to suggest it no longer should be at the top of the District's settlement hierarchy. The population of Heybridge Parish was 8,175 as at Census day 2011, making it one of the larger communities in the District. It benefits from a range of services, facilities and employment opportunities. The Approved Local Plan refers to it as one of the important drivers to the local economy, with Maldon and Burnham -on- Crouch being the other two. The settlement hierarchy refer to Maldon (Town) / Heybridge. We agree there is logic in combining these two settlements for the purposes of the settlement hierarchy. There would be strong similarities between taking such an approach for Maldon Town and Heybridge, and that found sound through the Rochford Core Strategy (2011) and Rochford Allocations Plan (2014) in relation to the settlements of Rochford and Ashingdon. Like Maldon Town and Heybridge, there is a strong functional relationship between Rochford and Ashingdon. The two settlements are immediately adjacent to one another. There are a number of services, facilities and employment opportunities within Ashingdon, but more – including a designated town centre – in Rochford. Residents in the two settlements have convenient access to services and facilities in the other. As in the case of Maldon Town and Heybridge, Rochford and Ashingdon have their own distinct identities, and their own unique qualities and characteristics. Having regard to the strong functional relationship between Rochford and Ashingdon it was considered a sound approach to combine the settlements for the purposes of the settlement hierarchy, with Rochford / Ashingdon identified as a tier 1 settlement and the main focus of growth. There are clear parallels here between an approach found sound towards Rochford / Ashingdon and that which would be sound for Maldon Town / Heybridge. Accordingly, in considering the sustainability of Heybridge to accommodate growth, it is pertinent to consider the services, facilities and employment opportunities available in Maldon Town, in addition to Heybridge itself. Maldon Town is by far the largest settlement in the District. It has the greatest concentration of services and facilities, and its residents are less reliant on services and employment opportunities from outside of the District – it is best placed to capture the economic and social benefits of growth. Notably, in the ALP, Maldon Town and Heybridge were identified as being at the top of the settlement hierarchy,	Support noted
*	*			
*	*			
*	*		3.22 Yes, the settlement pattern represents a sensible approach to the existing pattern of development in the district.	Support noted
*	*			
*	*			

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 12. If you do not agree, how should they be grouped on what basis? (this refers to the Settlement Pattern)	COUNCIL RESPONSE
*	*		As stated above, North Fambridge has been upgraded in the latest Settlement Pattern from a 'small village' (defined as a settlement containing few or no services and facilities with limited or no access to public transport) to a 'medium village' (defined as having a limited range of services, serving a local catchment and a lower level access to public transport). Larger villages are defined as having opportunities for employment, retail and education and better access to public transport. BDW Eastern support this redesignation and are pleased that MDC recognises the importance of the village for the overall spatial development of the District. Therefore, the emerging Local Plan should consider allocating land for additional development within North Fambridge to support this upgrade. However, should the Sustainability Assessment identify that North Fambridge would be an appropriate location, as we contest, to accommodate further growth, a further re- classification should be considered, as to whether North Fambridge should be classified higher up the Settlement Pattern. The accompanying spreadsheet to the Settlement Pattern update includes information on the services and facilities in the Village. At present the Village of North Fambridge has a nursery and a Public House. As such it does include some facilities that can be reached by sustainable modes. The Site's proximity to the River Crouch also provides excellent leisure opportunities, which include the North Fambridge Yacht Club and a Village Hall, but these are likely to largely be reliant upon visitor/tourist/day trip trade. The provision of housing on the two Parcels can help provide a larger permanent population to support these existing facilities. There is also potential for the two Parcels to provide more facilities and services (e.g. a local shop), education facilities as part of a new Local Centre and/or a new heart to the Village to not only benefit future residents at the Parcels but also the existing North Fambridge community. Indeed the Parcels at North Fambridge provide the perfect opportunity to encourage the development of further services and facilities to serve and support the village's population as a whole, contributing to the justification at the very least to upgrade the settlement from a 'small' to a 'medium' Village, and subject to the appropriate level of growth identified through a Sustainability Appraisal, and further technical assessments/masterplanning (to be provided by BDW Eastern in due course), a further upgrade within the settlement hierarchy. The Council's settlement pattern assessment concludes that there are no capacity issues with GP/health and school facilities. Although not located in the Village itself, there are sustainable transport links (by bus and train) to the facilities and services in South Woodham Ferrers. The location of the two Parcels, in proximity to the railway station, which has regular services to these larger settlements, could provide excellent links	Comments noted about North Fambridge. At the present time the Council cannot comment on whether individual settlements can or cannot accommodate future growth.The LDP Review process has to plan for future growth and it will have to be accommodated within the District. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and this was one of the reasons for the Issues and Options Consultation. In the coming months work will be undertaken to make the necessary decision using the evidence prepared as part of the LDP Review work.
Ben	Binder	University of Adelaide		
Lorraine	Bailey	Wickham Bishops Parish Council		
Ali	Aldis			
David	Smye	The Maldon Society		
Stewart	Newlands	Fambridge Lake		
Stewart	Newlands	Fambridge Lake		
Paula	Stanbury			
Sonia	Whiskin	Financial Services		
Geoffrey	Charge	n/a		
Robert	Collins			
Ben	Thornett			
Matthew	Wood	Phase 2 Planning		
Tim	Aves			
Helen	James			
Kathy	Day			
Peter	Wakling			
Sara	Howarth			
Eissa	Leo			
Michele	Williams		It would be useful to show population aswell as area covered to assess how densly populated each village is as this has impacts on infrastructure needs	When the census comes out in the summer of 2022, population and household statistics will be updated for each settlement, we will be able to see how they have grown and changed since 2011. This information will form part of the evidence base of the LDP Review
Tara	Strydom			
Jenny	Ball			
Cliff	Baron			
Gill	Winsor	Tesco		
Emily	Benham	Servoca complex care and nursing		
Laura	Cannon		You shouldn't be building more houses in a quiet village!!!!	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth, the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months.
Shaneen	Illanes			
Merryl	Quilter			
Bear	Keen			

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 12. If you do not agree, how should they be grouped on what basis? (this refers to the Settlement Pattern)	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Jessica	Cox		Settlements should be grouped by population and accessibility (not transport infrastructure or location)	The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that. Accessibility is a matter which is addressed by different modes of transport and therefore taking account of bus and train connectivity is an important part of the Rural Facilities Study.
Robert	Burton			
Yvonne	Wade		I would not consider Tillingham to be a large village - population has increased over the years due to new housing, however facilities and public transport have not improved. When considering the grouping, road infrastructure should be a major factor - many of these villages are situated on very minor roads.	The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that. Road infrastructure is a matter which is considered at the next stage of the LDP Review.
Louise	Bywaters-Smith	Hospitality		
Brooke	Roberts-Morgan			
Patricia	Bunkle			
Marc	Rawinsky	M R Sovereign Services Ltd		
Roger	Tiffn		there should be indicative plans to show the extent of the proposals	This will be available at the next stage of the LDP Review when polices, policy maps and site allocations will be available for comment.
Kathryn	Beighton	Publishing	Generally agree, but Mundon has a pub and village hall, same as Woodham Walter, so should it not be in the same Medium Village section?	The public house and village hall in Mundon has already been noted as has the two pubs and two village halls in Woodham Walter. Woodham Walter also has a nursery, a recycling centre and a primary school so it would be expected that Woodham Walter would be higher up the Settlement Pattern than Mundon.
Roy	Warren	Sport England		
STUART	SOWTER		Althorne has been classed as a medium village? there appears to be no thought/transparency as to how this has been calculated.	The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that. Road infrastructure is a matter which is considered at the next stage of the LDP Review.
Mark	Raffray			
April	Rowley			
Bill	Withers			
joanna	jeffery			
John	Mitchell		I think Southminster should be classed as a town along with Maldon and Burnham. It has a direct rail link to London and is much bigger than any of the other large villages. It is a serious contender to accommodate sustainable growth over the next 15 years rather than the Council falling back on Maldon yet again.	Two of the key criteria for a town are having a secondary school and a large employment site(s) neither of which Southminster has, if a secondary school was to be located in Southminster then one of the policy objectives of the LDP Review could be that it would move up the Settlement Pattern and become a town.
Peter	Layley			
Rex	Davenport			
Lesley	Mitchelmore	Danbury Parish Council		
Karen	Neath	Tolleshunt Major Parish Council		
N	DA			
Dorreen	Linton	our group consists of adults, playschool and brownies group		
John	Wileman			
Richard	Courtney	University Of East London		
sue	Rawlinson	Evolve		
Douglas	Milsted	Heybridge Basin Conservation Society		
Alan	Outlaw	Self Emplyed		
Lindsey	Squire	North Fambridge Parish Council		
K	Jeffries		They should be grouped nearer to rail links to avoid congestion coming in and out already on the roads	Access to rail and travel times to railway stations gets points in the Rural Facilities Study because rail travel is considered a sustainable mode of transport and can reduce journeys by vehicle.
John	Lakin	?	Shouldn't need anymore housing ew are full look up north and help create this Northern Powerhouse.	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth, the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months.

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 12. If you do not agree, how should they be grouped on what basis? (this refers to the Settlement Pattern)	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Samantha	Weeks		Grouping should factor in the availability of resources, transport links, shops, amenities etc. Some villages sited as large seem based on dwellings and parish boundary, not the complete picture of what is available in that parish. Purleigh village has been designated a large village, scoring 70 points. But has a very patchy bus service, poor road structure and only a volunteer run tiny convenience shop which would not be open without village stakeholder involvement - it is not an economically viable village asset. More weighting should be given to existing transport and road infrastructure and those villages with sustainability.	The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that. Accessibility is a matter which is addressed by different modes of transport and therefore taking account of bus and train connectivity is an important part of the Rural Facilities Study. Road infrastructure will be considered in the next stage of the LDP. The work on the Rural Facilities Study did not base settlement sustainability on the number of dwellings or parish boundaries. Purleigh has been noted as having a shoppers bus service which means you can use it when its available to go shopping in a higher order settlement. A retail shop which sells basic needs is given points irrespective of
Carlie	Mayes			
Richard	Martin	Scott Properties		
Mike	Spurgeon	Phase 2 Planning and Development	The role of Cold Norton The identification of Cold Norton as a Larger Village in the settlement hierarchy is supported. This accurately reflects its role as one of most sustainable settlements outside of the main towns in the District where there is both an existing range of facilities and the potential to accommodate growth of a scale and nature that is proportionate to the role and function of the village. We note that in respect of the seven strategic options put forward for in the consultation document, Cold Norton would feature to some degree or other in Options 2, 3 and 4. While Option 2 or 4 would see an increase in housing provision in the larger villages, the strategy is expressed most clearly in Option 3. The balanced approach to growth that this promotes would reasonably be expected to result in new housing provision in all of the settlements identified as Larger Villages in the proposed settlement hierarchy, including Cold Norton. Opportunities for growth in Cold Norton It is acknowledged that the Issues and Options document is not seeking comments on specific sites or the promotion of specific land interests. However, we do note that the consultation material explains that achieving any of the proposed strategic options is dependent on suitable sites being made available by landowners. In respect of Cold Norton, we would simply note that the Council's current Call for Sites mapping does identify a number of 'green' land parcels, which indicates that there are potentially suitable sites for residential development. There is clearly scope for these sites to provide land for the expansion of the village in a manner which is proportionate to the size and scale of the settlement. These sites are not only suitable, but are also available and largely unconstrained, meaning that they are capable of coming forward for development. These are ultimately able to make a contribution towards the future growth of housing and to meeting the need for new dwellings in the District regardless of which of the seven options is eventually taken forward. It is considered that the Larger Villages such as Cold Norton should feature as part of a balanced approach to accommodating the development needs of the District. Development has previously been constrained with the settlement boundaries in the Maldon Local Plan drawn tightly around the limits of existing development. This is evident in Figure 1 (below), where the settlement boundaries (shown in the form of a solid black line), do not include any land other than that already built up and in use as housing or commercial premises. As a result of this, policies relating to development in the countryside have been applied to any proposals for development relating to land beyond the defined limits of the settlement. The growth potential of the village has therefore been highly constrained as a result and there is little evidence of recent development. Within the village there are a range of	Comments noted, though no comments can be made at this stage on individual settlements.
C/O Agent Mike	Spurgeon	Phase 2 Planning & Development		
Amanda	Mickelsen			
Samuel	Newton	Anglo European School	Purleigh should be a medium village as it does not have a post office	The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that. The Council have not awarded Purleigh points for a Post Office.
Mary-Ann	Munford			
Jo	Harvey			
Terry	Fleming		Agreed seems fair assessment, please note though Burnham very much a small town surrounded by satellites of Creeksea ,Stony Hills etc where the characterisation of these can be lost forever with large scale development	Comments noted, the settlement pattern is about services and facilities and does not take into account character which is part of individual planning application assessments.
Philip	Davies		It is stated that the settlement pattern is based on sustainability. However, the criteria for what is considered sustainable/un-sustainable has not been stated, The Updated Rural Facilities Study on the MDC website is incorrect for Althorne. I belive that when these are corrected Althorne should be categorised as a Small Village when compared to other Small villages.	The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that. The consultee has not stated why Althorne has been categorised incorrectly so no further comment can be made.
Susan	Cumming	not applicable		
Ronald	Edge	Construction Industry		
Gordon	Mussett	Little Braxted Parish Council		
Ronnie	Tongue	state school		

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 12. If you do not agree, how should they be grouped on what basis? (this refers to the Settlement Pattern)	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Sue	Dobson	Essex Bridleways Association		
David	Webb			
Andrew	Marsh	Historic England		
Brian	Haydon			
Hazel	Notley			
Jean	Brown			
Joanne	McGinity			
Stuart	Dedman	Nil		
Kerry	McKenna		Purleigh has less population than St Lawrence but St Lawrence is classed as a medium village and Purleigh as a large village. This cannot be correct. Bradwell has a butchers, bakery and grocery store, petrol station but is classed as a medium village. Purleigh only has a grocery store and classed as a large village. This cannot be correct.	The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that. The services and facilities in Purliegh are going to be looked at again because there is some difference in information supplied this may alter its position in the Settlement Pattern.
Penny	McCauley	Tiptree dental	They should be grouped by infrastructure and amenities not by size of existing settlements	The Settlement Pattern is not based on population size but on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that.
Jane	Phillips	Solicitors	Development prioritisation should be concentrated to the Towns and Larger Villages (only) where these facilities can be built up to better serve all the local community. Development concentration around the Larger Villages allows a focus for access and infrastructure as well as service and facility provision, thereby enabling the quality of rural life and enjoyment for the remaining areas to the benefit of everyone. A spread and scattering of development dilutes provision and spreads wider impact to the detriment of the rural landscape. I wish to specifically draw attention/object to ALT2 - Althorne, the increase in size and nature of this site being identified as a 'yes' in the HELAA Call for sites 2022 would severely negatively impact the landscape as well as increase traffic. The area is designated as a Special Landscape Area and Coastal Protection Belt following a Technical Study, the Landscape Character Assessment EB009a, jointly	The Council cannot respond on site specifics at this stage of LDP Review. Work on site allocations will be undertaken in the coming months with a Preferred Options consultation being carried out at the end of this period. The rest of the consultee response relates to the option for growth question which will be responded to separately.
David	Rees			
Darren	Weeks		I do not agree that Purleigh should be classified as a large village. There is a Post Office mentioned in the Site Information assessment, this is factually incorrect - there is no post office in the village and hasn't been for several years. Energy supply is limited. Electricity is frequently an issue (power cuts are very common) and the village has no mainline gas supply. There are several references to a 'Townscape' in the Site Information Asessment, giving the impression of an semi-urban environment, which is not the case. The village comprises of a small development of mid 20th century houses surrounded by farms and rural countryside.	Purleigh has not been given points for a post office. The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that. Townscape refers to the urban environment in any sense so the impact on townscape would also include the impact on the built environment of a village as well as a town.
Phil	Manning			
Peter	Clack		There is clear evidence of service and facility deterioration from 2008 to 2021. Development prioritisation should therefore be concentrated to the Towns and Larger Villages (only) where these facilities can be built up to better serve all the local community. Althorne, with just 650 houses, no shop and no doctors surgery, post office or any other facility , cannot be classed as a Medium Village. It is a small village, and should remain as such, with provision being available in Burnham-on-Crouch, Southminster, Maldon or South Woodham Ferres. Development should be concentrated around the Towns and Larger Villages allowing a focus for access and infrastructure as well as service and facility provision, thereby enabling the quality of rural life and enjoyment for the remaining areas to the benefit of everyone. A spread and scattering of development dilutes provision and spreads wider impact to the detriment of the rural landscape. We wish to specifically draw attention/object to ALT2 - Althorne, the increase in size and nature of this site being identified as a 'yes' in the HELAA Call for sites 2022 would severely negatively impact the landscape as well as increase traffic. The area is designated as a Special Landscape Area and Coastal Protection Belt following a Technical Study, the Landscape Character Assessment EB009a, jointly commissioned in 2005 by 5 Essex local councils.	The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that. The Council cannot respond on site specifics at this stage of LDP Review. Work on site allocations will be undertaken in the coming months with a Preferred Options consultation being carried out at the end of this period. The previous Rural Facilities study was not carried out very robustly, it relied on information supplied by the Parish Councils at the time and we are not even sure if they all responded, it appears that the information was never verified and no-one checked on site. This time we have tried to be much more robust, we have consulted the parish councils but we have also visited each settlement and carried out a robust desktop survey. We will also be looking and verifying any responses from this consultation and feeding that into the information we have for each settlement. Also in the present approved LDP the Settlement Pattern does not make logical sense, there are settlements which do not relate to each other, Althorne is grouped with settlements that have even less services and facilities than it and with those that have a lot more and its split in such a way that is it difficult to use in the policies. It does not say in the present LDP that Althorne is an unsustainable place, it just groups the settlements. We have tried to rectify this by carrying out a more robust assessment, we have also included travel to main town times, bus services, travel to main employment sites etc to make the assessment more complete and splitting the pattern in a more clearly logical way. Therefore we can`t compare the two pieces of work because the present piece of work contains more detail and is more accurate.
Doug	Lockwood	National Grid		
Sally	George			

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 12. If you do not agree, how should they be grouped on what basis? (this refers to the Settlement Pattern)	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Vara	Szajkowski			
Bob	Calver			
Tessa	Lambert	Natural England		
Dawn	Howles			
natasha	frith			
Anthony	Bates			
Russell	Howles	WSP		
Gillian	Hollamby			
Brian	Townsend			
Malcolm	Finch		I do not understand how Purleigh can be classified as a large village. I have always described it as small! There is no Post Office, one small shop run by volunteers, a playing field and village hall, but no other civic amenities.	The Settlement Pattern will be reviewed once the responses on the Issues and Options consultation has been processed. Purleigh has not been given points for a post office. Purleighs services and facilties are going to be reviewed because of a difference in information supplied, this may alter the position in the Settlement Hierarchy.
Peter	Taylor	Retired		
Chris	Melbourne		Althorne has been classified as a small village and we are now a medium village to suit your purposes of redevelopment! At our parish council meeting we were informed of this fact, the only difference is our one shop has now closed!!!! MDC has issued no justification or evidence as to how this has been achieved.	The shop has been taken out of Althornes list of services and facilities. The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that. The Rural Facilities Study is carried out blind, which means its done without the Council knowing where future growth is going to go.
Robert	Hollamby			
Kate	Priest	Purleigh Community Primary School	I do not agree that Purleigh should be classed as a large village. It is not. There is NO post office in the village (mentioned in the Site Information Assessment) and there hasn't been for several years. There are also no indoor sports facilities and public transport is extremely limited in Purleigh. Energy supply is limited in Purleigh - no mainline gas and frequent issues with electricity, such as power cuts. Purleigh village is a small development with farms and rural countryside.	The Settlement Pattern will be reviewed once the responses on the Issues and Options consultation has been processed. Purleigh has not been given points for a post office. Purleighs services and facilties are going to be reviewed because of a difference in information supplied, this may alter the position in the Settlement Hierarchy.
Gary	SPICER			
Helen	Bridge			
Melanie	Allen	Government	Althorne is not a Medium Town - no shop, no restaurant, no school, no doctors, no dentist Other areas use the points system differently. It should be a Uniform way of grouping. Not how each Area interprets his to complete the document. eg 3 points of a shop or 1 point per shop…	The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that. The priority of services and facilties was worked on at a Member workshop in June 2021, there is no national guidance on what points should be in place for each service or facility because each area has different views on what priorities are.
Adam	Medlycott			
Joanne	Maloney			
Portia	Roelofs			
Lisa	Singh	Direct Call Centres Ltd		
Kevin	Head		Generally agree in the context of paragraphs 11.1 - 11.3	Support noted
Elizabeth	Sawyer Bayliss			
Michael	Partridge			
Kenneth	Northfield			
Jerry	Petts		Depends what the grouping is being used for ..	The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that.
Frederick	McMahon			
Tracey	Merritt	Dengie Hounds and Horses		
Jo	Crump	Servoca Secure Soutions		
Susan	ARCHER			
Winifred	Sutherland			
Chris	clark		I dispute that Purleigh is not a large village we are a MEDIUM village not large. It sounds to me as if the pen pusher who classified the villages has not been to them.	The Settlement Pattern will be reviewed once the responses on the Issues and Options consultation has been processed. Purleighs services and facilties are going to be reviewed because of a difference in information supplied, this may alter the position in the Settlement Hierarchy. All the settlements recieved in site visit in the summer of 2021.
Jeremy	Richardson			
Cheryl	Carter	Education		
Susan	Mason			
Melad	Kamlow		Small villages with very little infrastructure are bracketed as medium and large villages. This is concerning as it will lead to over development and extensive damage to these historic villages.	The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that.

Question 12

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 12. If you do not agree, how should they be grouped on what basis? (this refers to the Settlement Pattern)	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Dave	Draper	The Hartford Insurance Group	The 'large' villages are not large enough to be considered on their own and should therefore be clustered together especially given the lack of infrastructure to support growth	The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that.
Kevin	Cooper			
Katherine	Whitehouse			
Linda	Soul			
Robert	Wilson			
Sarah-Jayne	Hunt	SJ Aesthetics LTD	Purleigh is not a LARGE VILLAGE and does not have the infrastructure to support additional housing.	The Settlement Pattern will be reviewed once the responses on the Issues and Options consultation has been processed. Purleighs services and facilties are going to be reviewed because of a difference in information supplied, this may alter the position in the Settlement Hierarchy.
Jonathan	Hunt		PURLEIGH IS NOT A LARGE VILLAGE AND DOES NOT HAVE THE INFRASTRUCTURE TO SUPPORT ADDITIONAL HOUSING.	The Settlement Pattern will be reviewed once the responses on the Issues and Options consultation has been processed. Purleighs services and facilties are going to be reviewed because of a difference in information supplied, this may alter the position in the Settlement Hierarchy.
Deborah	de Boltz	Farleigh Hospice	Purleigh should not be classified as a 'large' village - this is completely wrong - it only has community led shop, one pub and one church!	The Settlement Pattern will be reviewed once the responses on the Issues and Options consultation has been processed. Purleighs services and facilties are going to be reviewed because of a difference in information supplied, this may alter the position in the Settlement Hierarchy.
Tim	Murphy			
Claire	McGrane		I can't find an explanation for how you decide village grouping to provide further opinion.	The information on the Rural Facilities Study is available on the Councils website,
Tracey	Munford	NA		
Rowan	Rampersad			
LUKE	MACFARLANE	S A RAVEN	Existing population should be a factor in deciding which are large villages – There should be more emphasis on the potential to maintain and enhance communities – villages with schools should be given a higher ranking as this is crucial to community spirit – Too much emphasis on employment allocations, need to recognise most rural employment is often local and not in factories or office blocks.	Population is not a matter which is factored in with regard to the Rural Settlements Hierarchy. The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that. Schools are given a high number of points with employment being one of the main strands of sustainability it therefore should feature in any Rural Facilities Study including access to
Anna	Wombwell	Morris Farm		
Ronald	Owen	Not applicable		
Elizabeth	Johns		Purleigh is not a large village, there are no mainline amenities, a very small community lead shop and a small local primary school servicing many other small villages, it is very disproportionate to include Purleigh as a large village. Whilst the village may be spread over what seems to be a large area we are very rural with one main road through the village which is often blocked due to high volumes of school traffic. No access to a main trainline. There are no street lights, no doctor's surgery, pharmacy, dentist, no off road parking for the majority of the village, we are serviced by one bus per day. We often have powercuts and water main issues, the basic infrastructure; water, sewage, drainage is insufficient to host anymore housing. We are not on a main gas, all houses are	The Settlement Pattern will be reviewed once the responses on the Issues and Options consultation has been processed. Purleighs services and facilties are going to be reviewed because of a difference in information supplied, this may alter the position in the Settlement Hierarchy.
Colin	Day		I disagree with building on green open space outside the settlement boundary	This consultee response does not relate to the question, checked and the consultee has made the same comments under the appropriate question, which will be responded to
Natalie	Bradford			
Harriet	Hurst-Smith		Purleigh is not a large village. It should not be classed as one either. If you compare us to say Southminster or Burnham which are classed as large village we are not in the same league. Our village shop is run mainly by volunteers, that is not a grocery shop for profit.	The Settlement Pattern will be reviewed once the responses on the Issues and Options consultation has been processed. Purleighs services and facilties are going to be reviewed because of a difference in information supplied, this may alter the position in the Settlement Hierarchy. A shop is classed as a shop irrespective of who runs it, it still serves the community
Tony	Vanner			
Josie	Vanner			
Tracy	Carroll			
Ian	Roberts	N/A		
Tony	Ashton	none		
mandy	SHORT			
Kevin	Money	St. Lawrence Parish Council		
Claire	Udall	1		
Linda	Raffray			
John	Cooper			

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 12. If you do not agree, how should they be grouped on what basis? (this refers to the Settlement Pattern)	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Leah	Jewiss		I strongly dispute that Purleigh should be classified as a large village. Adding an additional 150 houses (which I believe would double the current number of houses) would dramatically and drastically change the look, feel and shape of this village, which definitely is not large! Purleigh Parish as a whole, encompassing various different villages, spans a large area, but Purleigh village itself is most definitely not large, and should not be defined as such for the purposes of this LDP. Purleigh village is not large by acreage, nor by population, facilities or amenities. I also strongly oppose the building on top of green land and open spaces in Purleigh village, outside the settlement boundary. Purleigh village has a very small, tight knit community. The small community shop is staffed by volunteers from the village and the playground was funded by a community group holding fundraising events and applying for grants. Any sort of large scale development and influx of extra people (maybe even 500+ extra people) would have an extremely detrimental effect on our community and village life. The LDP, I believe, would have a damaging effect on house prices in the village as the village will become less desirable to those seeking out a quiet, small village environment.	The Settlement Pattern will be reviewed once the responses on the Issues and Options consultation has been processed. Purleighs services and facilties are going to be reviewed because of a difference in information supplied, this may alter the position in the Settlement Hierarchy. The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth, the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months.
Elaine	Ketley	South Woodham Ferrers Town Council	We do not agree that there are any large suitable sites at Stow Maries or Althorne in areas 5 and 7 since these may have a serious affect on the existing transport and medical facilities in the Crouch Valley corridor. SWFTC believes that the current call for sites distribution, especially sites deemed suitable for development (coloured green on the interactive map), is too weighted within the southern area of Maldon District Councils' boundaries. SWFTC believes that the balance of suitable sites as currently shown will place too much burden on the road and rail transportation infrastructures, which would require significant investment at County and Government levels to support the number of homes proposed. For the last 10 years, and indications suggest for the next 5-8 years, Chelmsford City Council and Essex County Council have concentrated their transportation infrastructure expenditure to the North of Chelmsford with committed budgets for new roads and new railway stations. SWFTC believes that more calling of and selecting sites nearer these strategic transportation development infrastructure areas would present a better option to both potential new residents and existing residents within the	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth, the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months. The Council cannot respond on site specifics at this stage of LDP Review. Work on site allocations will be undertaken in the coming months with a Preferred Options consultation being carried out at the end of this period.
Ruth	Bull	The Othona Communty		
Mark	Jackson	Mark Jackson Planning		
ann	cutting			
Sharon	Cushen		If Purleigh where I reside is classified as a "large" village then we have a major issue/flaw in the process - Purleigh is "medium" at most.	The Settlement Pattern will be reviewed once the responses on the Issues and Options consultation has been processed. Purleighs services and facilties are going to be reviewed because of a difference in information supplied, this may alter the position in the Settlement Hierarchy.
Ian	Tooley			
Sally	Tokeley		Purleigh is not correctly classified as a large village. The points allocated equal those equivalent to a medium village. Post Office mentioned in the Site Information assessment, this is incorrect	The Settlement Pattern will be reviewed once the responses on the Issues and Options consultation has been processed. Purleighs services and facilties are going to be reviewed because of a difference in information supplied, this may alter the position in the Settlement Hierarchy. A post office has not been taken into account in the assessment.
Christina	Chan		The calculation for Purleigh is wrong. The points have been added up wrong in the updated spreadsheet. Additionally there has been inclusion of an"indoor sports facility" which does not exist. This would make Purleigh score significantly less than 70 points and thus it should be classified as a Medium Village NOT a Large Village.	The Settlement Pattern will be reviewed once the responses on the Issues and Options consultation has been processed. Purleighs services and facilties are going to be reviewed because of a difference in information supplied, this may alter the position in the Settlement Hierarchy.
Tim.	Holdsworth			
Graham	Snow			
Sarah	Packard			
Martin	Cook			
Clifford	Brown			
Steve	Gallant	Crouch Valley Defence Group		
Lesley	Woodley			
Kirsty	Rowsell			
Philip	Wakeling			
David	Brock			
Niki	Halls			
Stewart	Geden			
Anita	Thomas	Bank		
Andrew	Ashworth			
michael	smith			

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 12. If you do not agree, how should they be grouped on what basis? (this refers to the Settlement Pattern)	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Simon	Priest		Purleigh is not a large village. It's size alone indicates this as well as poor transport, low population and limited amenities	The Settlement Pattern will be reviewed once the responses on the Issues and Options consultation has been processed. Purleighs services and facilties are going to be reviewed because of a difference in information supplied, this may alter the position in the Settlement Hierarchy.
Philippa	Marshall			
Lewis	Cook	Form Architecture Ltd.		
EDWARD	GITTINS	Edward Gittins & Associates	We consider the Settlement Pattern forms a sound basis for assessing the future distribution and location of growth. The fact that it is not a classification listing settlements in alphabetical order but based on an evaluation of defined sustainability factors makes it even more robust. This ranking of settlements also provides an insight into the relative sustainability of each settlement compared to other settlements in the same or different categories. We therefore offer strong support for the Settlement Pattern in its current draft form.	Support noted
Steve	Williamson			
James	Cowell	E & B R Cowell	n/a	N/A
Colin	Hawkes			
Ronald	PIPER		Purleigh is no a large village. The population is among the smallest in the list in the Settlement Pattern [SP] January 2022 at 1327.50 The village should be designated as a SMALL village and not a large or medium village. At 1.3 of the SP it states that each settlement has been the subject of "a site" visit. This I challenge. Produce to me the evidence of a visit by producing a copy of the filed report	The Settlement Pattern will be reviewed once the responses on the Issues and Options consultation has been processed. Purleighs services and facilties are going to be reviewed because of a difference in information supplied, this may alter the position in the Settlement Hierarchy. The Settlement Pattern is not based on population and the settlement was visited in the summer of 2021.
John	McLarty		There should be more emphasis on the small to medium sized settlements such as Great Braxted.	This consultee response does not relate to the question, checked and the consultee has made the same comments under the appropriate question, which will be responded to
John	McLarty		It is considered that there is an opportunity to allow certain settlements such as Ulting and in particular closely linked to Ernest Does existing facility to grow and create a larger parish settlement. There is an opportunity to classify as villages and not differentiate between small and medium villages.	The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that. There is a difference between the medium and small villages and it is felt that it is appropriate to differentiate between the two.
Norman	Branch	N/A	I totally disagree with the decision to class Purleigh as a large or even medium village. The facts and statistics provided by you clearly support a finding that Purleigh is a SMALL village and as such should be reclassified. It is not correct that Purleigh has two public houses. It does not have a sports centre or anything like it. We have no Post Office or access to a doctor. The village school is full to capacity and is largely made up of parents who commute their children in and out of the village from other districts thus creating traffic pollution and congestion.	The Settlement Pattern will be reviewed once the responses on the Issues and Options consultation has been processed. Purleighs services and facilties are going to be reviewed because of a difference in information supplied, this may alter the position in the Settlement Hierarchy. Only one public house has been noted in the assessment. The capacity of the school is not a factor which is taken into account in the Rural Facilities Study it is only the actual facility that is counted
John	McLarty		There should be more emphasis on the small to medium sized settlements such as Bradwell-on-Sea.	This consultee response does not relate to the question, checked and the consultee has made the same comments under the appropriate question, which will be responded to
James	Clarke			
David	Stilwell			
Ann	Thomas			
michael	harris			
Geoffrey	Cox			
John	McLarty		There should be more emphasis on the small to medium sized settlements such as Latchingdon.	This consultee response does not relate to the question, checked and the consultee has made the same comments under the appropriate question, which will be responded to
Barrington	Thomas			
Richard	Edwards			
Robyn	Woloszczuk			
Lesley	Speller			
Nicola	O'Dean	Balgores Motors		
Alexander	Romang			
Hayley	Holgate	ECC		
Eirlys	Parry	N/A		
Michael	Unwin	N/A		
Tony	Barber			
Nick	Mason	ECOClassics	The settlement grading as a large village for Purleigh is wrong - the village should be classified as a medium village . Based on your spreadsheet the points have been added up wrongly in the updated spreadsheet. Additionally there has been inclusion of an "indoor sports facility" which does not exist. Adding up your numbers is 61 points and deducting the 5 points for the indoor sports facility makes it 56 points comparable to all the other medium village scores. Purleigh is a medium sized village!!!!	The error on the spreadsheet will be corrected when the Settlement Pattern is published again. The Settlement Pattern will be reviewed once the responses on the Issues and Options consultation has been processed. Purleighs services and facilties are going to be reviewed because of a difference in information supplied, this may alter the position in the Settlement Hierarchy. The post office has not been counted
Melanie	Osborne	Motor Trade	Purleigh has been classed as a large town but adding up all points for services the village is clearly in the small/medium catagory.	The Settlement Pattern will be reviewed once the responses on the Issues and Options consultation has been processed. Purleighs services and facilties are going to be reviewed because of a difference in information supplied, this may alter the position in the Settlement Hierarchy. The post office has not been counted
Stuart	Turner	Essex search and rescue		

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 12. If you do not agree, how should they be grouped on what basis? (this refers to the Settlement Pattern)	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Mike	Carpenter	CODE Development Planners Ltd	Largely agree with the Settlement Pattern. In our view, the experience of failing to deliver sufficient homes on very large-scale strategic development sites concentrated in the main towns of Maldon/Heybridge and Burham-on-Crouch demonstrates the need to direct new development towards the Large Villages identified in the updated Settlement Pattern. The evidence also suggests the appropriateness of concentrating larger but proportionate scales and forms of development in those Large Villages with the most extensive range of existing services and facilities , such as Southminster and Mayland at minimum. Additional assessment and evidence will assist in identifying the suitability, accessibility and viability of individual sites within these settlements and the ability of sites to deliver increased benefits to the local community.	Support noted
ian	wilson	cm36pt		
c/o Agent	c/o Agent			
kelly	tilley		Purleigh should not be classed as a large village as it doesn't have the amenities or infrastructure to be classed as such.	The Settlement Pattern will be reviewed once the responses on the Issues and Options consultation has been processed. Purleighs services and facilties are going to be reviewed because of a difference in information supplied, this may alter the position in the Settlement Hierarchy. The post office has not been counted
Catherine	Bicknell	Mid and South Essex Health and Care Partnership		
N	Baseley	IBA Planning Ltd		
Sue	White			
Sarah	Yates			
Leonard	Lewis		Settlement in Althorne (ALT2) within HELAA scheme in very sensitive area and paying no attention to integrity of its position within the Crouch Valley or its environmental impact on surrounding area. Also HELAA ' preferred ' site status given to site in Creeksea in another very sensitive area close to the River Crouch with the same lack of integrity. I must say its very difficult and frustrating getting around this ISSUES and OPTIONS web site in a speedy manner	The Council cannot respond on site specifics at this stage of LDP Review. Work on site allocations will be undertaken in the coming months with a Preferred Options consultation being carried out at the end of this period.
R	Minney			
Tim	Grant	Evolution Town Planning		
ANNE	OSBORN	Purleigh Community Shop	Purleigh is a small community. Roads are narrow i.e Mill Hill, Lodge Lane, Howe Green. Not all properties are on main drainage. Those properties built on a flood plain are frequently flooded, including Purleigh Community Shop. Frequent power cuts. Traffic during school commuting is over subscribed and parking and driving is dangerous	The Settlement Pattern will be reviewed once the responses on the Issues and Options consultation has been processed. Purleighs services and facilties are going to be reviewed because of a difference in information supplied, this may alter the position in the Settlement Hierarchy
Stephen	Hodgkinson		Generally agree in the context of paragraphs 11.1 - 11.3	Support noted
c/o Agent	c/o Agent	Maldon Wick Limited		
ZOE	HOSTY		Purleigh is NOT a large village. I disagree with this statement.	The Settlement Pattern will be reviewed once the responses on the Issues and Options consultation has been processed. Purleighs services and facilties are going to be reviewed because of a difference in information supplied, this may alter the position in the Settlement Hierarchy. The post office has not been counted
S	Swain			
Kevin	Coleman	Phase 2 Planning		
John	Lawrence		n/a	N/A
Diane	Wallace			
Jonathan	Aldis	Good life Countryside Services		
Grace	Godwin			
Sue	Hillman		For the size of Cold Norton and the number of houses it already has, the facilities listed are barely adequate and therefore growing the housing in the village to the extent being proposed is not sustainable	The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that
michael	carr	NHS	I agree Little Braxted is listed as a hamlet; it is situated on quite a small country road and already suffers from excess traffic, especially large and heavy vehicles and the ever increasing problem of speeding vehicles - it really does not have any provision for expansion.	Support noted
Simon	Plater	Plater+Claiborne		
Mark	Anderson			
Karen	Wellum			
Emma	Wright			
Linda	Coom			
Caitlin	Soul			
Michelle	Curtis	Tollesbury Parish Council		
Mary	Hammond			
Ian	Drinkwater		Allocation of points to categorise village needs to be accurate and up to date with respect to services and facilities.	It is not clear what this consultee is saying and how this relates to the question.
john	hand	N/A		
Emma	Smith	Bradwell on Sea Parish Council		
Tim	Dixon		Rather than small/medium/large villages perhaps the settlement grouping should be based on their proximity to existing infrastructure?	The categories are designed to be simple and easily understood by all, therefore using terms such as towns, large, medium and small villages is thought to do this.
Nicola	Taylor	Elixirr		

Question 12

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 12. If you do not agree, how should they be grouped on what basis? (this refers to the Settlement Pattern)	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Graham	Johnson	graham v johnson		
Chris	Yates			
Sally	Everritt	Community360		
Mark	Garrett			
Paul	Vidler		Great Braxted is a small village and Little Braxted a hamlet. This is appropriate and Great Braxted has very limited service provision.	Support noted
Victoria	Long			
Victor	Staines			
Jayne	Moore	Essex County Fire and Rescue Service		
Kevin	Bennett			
Nicholas	Matthams		Shopper buses should run all year round and at least weekly to count on this system, currently some are fortnightly (all year round) and others are term time only meaning there are 6 consecutive weeks where they do not run. The latter should not be classed as a service for these purposes due to its inconsistency.	A shopper bus service would be expected to be infrequent as residents would not necessarily go shopping either everyday or every week. The fact that a settlement has a shoppers bus service achieves it a level of points in the Settlement Pattern.
Christian	van Stolk	RAND Europe	Great Braxted and Little Braxted re among the smallest settlements in the District. They have a unique place and character in the District. There is also very limited service provision in these locations.	Support noted
Nicholas	Jepson		Little Braxted should be seen as a hamlet. Great Braxted and Little Braxted have very little service provision.	Little Braxted is classed as a hamlet.
Pamela	Lacey			
Chloe	Soul			
carole	kirk		cold norton should not be classed as a large village	The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that.
Sharon	Jackson		The points scoring system is contentious with the ranking of various facilities not agreed. The population of a settlement is not taken into account when calculating size ranking, which could lead to some anomalies. It is in fact a facilities and potential sustainability ranking if done properly. The facilities attributed to Althorne are incorrect. Althorne has a train station 1 mile from what could be considered the centre of the village with no bus service to it. There is one public house. Shopper buses run only twice a week in school term time. Regular bus services are 40 mins in each direction on weekdays and only run through thenorthern end of the village, not the centre. There is no Sunday service. There are no shops or post office. There is only a privately run pre school, and no infants, primary or secondary schools. Even using the proposed points system it would get 39 points which would put it into the Small Village category. I would also like to add here, as there does not seem to be a question to actually comment on development of 1750 houses in Althorne. This would not be viable for the following reasons: The village currently comprises 620 houses. This amount of proposed houses would increase the village four fold. Not sure how this can actually be proposed to grow a small village by four times its existing size of houses in one fell swoop. Especially, as mentioned above, with no sufficient facilities; The impact on the estuary and wildlife migrating birds etc would be catastrophic. That amount of housing development jus across from this wildlife would be detrimental to that and the environment; That amount of housing would invariably have children and teenagers as residents. There is just a green here for children. No schools. There is nothing whatsoever here for teenagers; The traffic on Lower Burnham Road in rush hour, both morning and night is already overloaded being the only road in and out of this area. All traffic from all villages come that way. Adding, potentially at least, 2000 cars, though probably nearer 3,000 with a 2 car household, on that road would detrimentally impact the area, both environmentally and significantly increase the load of vehicles on that road; Local health services are already overloaded. I know that my doctors surgery can be up to a month to	All the settlements with a train station got awarded points, the station can be walked to even though it is not in the centre of the settlement it is still a service associated with the settlement. A bus service which offers shoppers the ability to access a higher order settlement was given points in each settlement where relevant, residents would not be expected to go shopping everyday so a less frequent service is acceptable. The settlement was not awarded points for a shop or post office. The Council cannot respond on site specifics at this stage of LDP Review. Work on site allocations will be undertaken in the coming months with a Preferred Options consultation being carried out at the end of this period.
RICHARD	GROUT			
Charles	Bishop			
Paul	Jewiss	Self Employed	Purleigh is not a large village. You have added up your numbers wrong, there isn't a Post Office, or a purpose indoor built sports facility. I also disagree with building on green open space outside the settlement boundary. I feel that you have made the process of commenting unnecessarily difficult and hard to navigate. You also have a timer countdown until 5.00pm 14th March when you can fill out the questionnaire but this is also wrong as the time now is 16.40 on 13th March and it states there is 13 hours and 50 minutes left! I do hope that other people can still access this until the allotted time.	The Settlement Pattern will be reviewed once the responses on the Issues and Options consultation has been processed. Purleighs services and facilties are going to be reviewed because of a difference in information supplied, this may alter the position in the Settlement Hierarchy. The consultation did close at the correct time.
Deborah	Anderson	NHS		
John	Pilgrim	Self employed		
Gloria	Gold	London Design and Engineering UTC		
Linda	Curry			
Lucy	Waterhouse			
Jon	Mayhew		Purleigh is a small to medium village at most and should not be regarded as a large village whatsoever.	The Settlement Pattern will be reviewed once the responses on the Issues and Options consultation has been processed. Purleighs services and facilties are going to be reviewed because of a difference in information supplied, this may alter the position in the Settlement Hierarchy.

Question 12

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 12. If you do not agree, how should they be grouped on what basis? (this refers to the Settlement Pattern)	COUNCIL RESPONSE
James	Goody	James Goody refurbishments	I live in Great Braxted and agree with the definition of my village as being "small". Little Braxted is called a "hamlet " and again I agree. Growth in these areas will always be hampered by little or no public transport or facilities. Also the lack of pavements and safe walkways prevent access unless using personal vehicles	Support noted
Johanna	Dale			
Tracy	Kinnane			
Carlos	Rodriguez		Great Baxted is appropriately identified as a small village and Little Braxted a hamlet. This is appropriate with the evidence showing that they are some of the smallest settlements by population size; and Great Braxted has very limited service provision.	Support noted
Rebecca	Tucker		Definitely a medium village due to size and transport and amenities.	Comment noted though it is not clear which settlement is being referred to.
Mark	Faraway		Althorne is a small village with around 600 homes. New villages are what is needed to keep up with housing needs	At the present time the Council cannot comment on whether individual settlements can or cannot accommodate future growth.The LDP Review process has to plan for future growth and it will have to be accommodated within the District. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and this was one of the reasons for the Issues and Options Consultation. In the coming months work will be undertaken to make the necessary decision using the evidence prepared as part of the LDP Review work.
T	Ketteley			
Elizabeth	Weston			
Jacky	Barber			
Ursula	Benjafield		Althorne has only 620 houses and few facilities and should be classified as a small village	The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that
Paul	Mitchell			
Kristian	Tokeley	CTC Construction Ltd	I do not agree that Purleigh should be classified as a large village. There is a Post Office mentioned in the Site Information assessment, this is factually incorrect - there is no post office in the village and hasn't been for several years. Energy supply is limited. Electricity is frequently an issue (power cuts are very common) and the village has no mainline gas supply. There is very minimal Foul drainage to a small part of the village and zero storm drainage. Overwhelmed ditches are struggling yearly. There are several references to a 'Townscape' in the Site Information Asessment, giving the impression of an semi-urban environment, which is not the case. The village comprises of a small development of mid 20th century houses surrounded by farms and	The Settlement Pattern will be reviewed once the responses on the Issues and Options consultation has been processed. Purleighs services and facilties are going to be reviewed because of a difference in information supplied, this may alter the position in the Settlement Hierarchy. The post office has not been counted. Townscape refers to the urban environment and that includes villages.
Ziyad	Thomas	Churchill Retirement Living / McCarthy Stone		
James	Campbell	HMPPS	Purleigh does not fit the criteria of a large village, it is a medium sized village at most, possibly even should be considered a small village.	The Settlement Pattern will be reviewed once the responses on the Issues and Options consultation has been processed. Purleighs services and facilties are going to be reviewed because of a difference in information supplied, this may alter the position in the Settlement Hierarchy. The post office has not been counted
William	Moss			
Simon	Mackenzie Smith		Great Braxted should remain a small village and Little Braxted hamlet. Both have very limited transport and other services and no retail offering	Support noted
Richard	Udall			
Rosalind	Bishop			
John	Symington		We agree that Maldon should be identified as top tier settlement in the District's settlement hierarchy. Please see Section 4 of our submitted representations for details.	Support noted
Michael	Manning			
Jack	Inglis	Kelvedon Hall	Great Braxted and Little Braxted are amongst the smalles of heritage villages and have limited service provision.	Support noted
Peggy	Shields			
Dawn	Adams	Catesby Estates	Our client supports the updated Settlement Pattern and the grouping of settlements into the 4 categories of Towns, Large Villages, Medium Villages and Small Villages. We also support the ranking of the villages in the table at section 11.0 of the consultation document. This appears to be based on the sustainability of the settlements with respect to their score in the Rural Facilities Survey and Settlement Pattern (January 2022), such that the most sustainable of the Large Villages is listed at the top of the list and the least sustainable at the bottom. We consider this to be an important metric on which to judge the capacity of villages to accommodate development as a comparison of the villages' sustainability scores against their population clearly shows that some villages with a high population have relatively few services (e.g. Great Totham – pop. 2,993 – services score. 75) whereas others with a smaller population have a higher number of services (e.g. Latchingdon – pop. 1,408 – services score 126). This clearly indicates that some of the Large Villages will have more capacity to sustainably accommodate growth than others.	Support noted
Wayne	Tilley	RTG Group Limited		
David	Dronfield	Braxted park		
John	Peirson			
Ron	Brown	Corporate	With existing development	Not sure what is meant by the comment so no further comment can be made
Roger	HAWES			

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 12. If you do not agree, how should they be grouped on what basis? (this refers to the Settlement Pattern)	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Anne	Hull	Elmwood Equestrian Centre	Prefer pepper potting	This consultee response does not relate to the question, checked and the consultee has not made the same comments under the appropriate question, noted the comments under the right question and they will be responded to
Matthew	Bloxham	Matt		
Julia	Morris			
Amanda	MacKenzie			
Jenny	Shepherd			
Jack	Ellum			
Bernard	Steeples			
Anna	mccomb	NHS Property Services Ltd		
Natalie	Kermath	Environment Agency		
Peter	Knights			
Unknown	Unknown	Ministry of Defence		
Duncan	Clark		Great Braxted is a very small village by population size. It therefore has been afforded very limited service provision over the years.	Support noted
Patricia	Smith			
Mick	Sargeant		The table in 2.3 has some settlements out of numerical order. The Settlement Plan is incomplete and does not wholly relate to the list. It should be included after Parish Boundaries Fig1. I understand the L, M, Small categories have come solely from the points total and the points are a "Maldon" not National system which is not explained, nor the points cut-offs between settlements indicated. It is rather crude being all or nothing. For example, transport links can be very frequent or practically non existent. Proximity to employment land is the same and some like the Beckingham Business Park warehousing provide very few jobs and some settlements only have a single not multiple options.	The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that. Proximity to employment land is an important consideration and we used a 15 minute drive time as being reasonable for a rural area. Noted that that further explanation is required on the points cut off and that it is a Maldon District Assessment
John	Cockerell	Hatfield Peverell Parish Council		
Catherine	Williams	C/O Savills (Agent)		
Tom	Kelly			
Linda	Gemmill			
Linda	Gemmill			
Mark	Norman	Highways England		
Thomasin	Foster			
*	*			
Alan	Massow		This section sets out the settlement hierarchy for the district. Maldon/Heybridge and Burnham on Crouch are defined as towns at the top of the hierarchy as to be expected. Of the settlements closest to Braintree District, Wickham Bishops is defined as a large village and Ulting is a small village. The proposed hierarchy is supported as it appropriately identified those towns and villages which are most sustainable	Support noted
*	*		3.1 Policy S8 of the Approved Maldon Local Development Plan (2017) sets out the District's settlement hierarchy. It identifies Maldon (Maldon Town), Heybridge and Burnham as the District's main settlements, on their current size, level of service provision, local character as well as identified opportunities and constraints. 3.2 There has not been any significant change in the nature of Maldon Town or other settlements in the area since this time to suggest it no longer should be at the top of the District's settlement hierarchy. 3.3 Maldon is evidently the principal settlement within the District, and a focus of its services, facilities and employment opportunities. The built-up area of the town had a population of 21,462 as at Census day 2011 – over a third of the District's total population. 3.4 The District's main retail centres are focused in and around Maldon Town, and the Council's Maldon District Retail Study 2015 notes that Maldon Town is the only centre within the District that had a Venuescore ranking (based on the strength of retail provision). The Maldon District Retail Study 2015 also identified that Maldon Town had the greatest market share of retail expenditure and described it as the "dominant retail destination" in the District. 3.5 The largest concentration of employment space in the District is located at Maldon Town (as recognised in the Maldon District Employment Land Review 2015). All five major employees in the District (250+ employees) are located in / around Maldon Town1; and of a total District workplace population of 23,037, over 40% (9,975) are in Maldon Town2. 3.6 The Census 2011 suggests residents of Maldon Town are significantly less likely to rely on unsustainable forms of transport, reporting that 17.7% of households within the town had no car or van; compared to 12.6% across the District as a whole. It also found that, on average, residents of Maldon Town in employment travelled shorter distances (average of 18 km) for work than average District resident (22km). This emphasises the opportunities for sustainable lifestyles that living within this sustainable settlement can offer.	
Ian	Butt			
Sarah	Sayer			

Question 12

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 12. If you do not agree, how should they be grouped on what basis? (this refers to the Settlement Pattern)	COUNCIL RESPONSE
*	*			

Question 13

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 13. 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?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Jenny	Clemo	Langford & Ulting Parish Council	Langford: Part time shop in church vestry run by volunteers has closed permanently. 73/73A bus is very infrequent and it would be difficult to arrange a reasonable shopping trip to Maldon or Chelmsford. In addition, with the limited frequency the buses rarely fit in with doctor, hospital etc appointments. Without a car it is difficult to perform everyday living requirements. The cafe/Mill House hotel are mainly used by visitors to the area. Ulting: The 73/73A but passes those houses in Ulting on the B1019. The rest of Ulting is a fair distance from the bus route and therefore does not have a shopper/commuter service. Langford and Ulting: Allocated industrial area provides little/none employment opportunity for residents.	The shop has been removed from the points for Langford. The bus service is regular, every two hours and could be used for both shopping and commuters. With regard to the Mill House, who uses a service or facility is not a matter which the Council can take into account it would be impossible for us to quantify this across all the settlements. There is an allocated employment site in Langford so this has been counted, who is employed there is not a matter which is taken into account because it would not be possible to quantify this across the whole District.
Gavin	Rowsell		It would be helpful if the link worked, or at least you could easily find the information on the Council's website... so who knows!	The Council has undertaken a learning exercise from the experience of this consultation and will, if necessary be making changes to future consultations. However, digital consultation is the way the Government is moving in regard to engaging with the planning system. The Council will always offer ways for those without digital acccess to engage with any consultation as we did with the Issues and Options Consultation where residents could telephone in with their comments.
Gareth	Davies	N / A	Why have you not provided a link to this Table? I have searched the Council's website and it is not readily findable. This is crucial information for this Consultation.	The table was available on the Councils website. The Council has undertaken a learning exercise from the experience of this consultation and will, if necessary be making changes to future consultations. However, digital consultation is the way the Government is moving in regard to engaging with the planning system. The Council will always offer ways for those without digital acccess to engage with any consultation as we did with the Issues and Options Consultation where residents could telephone in with their comments.
Jackie	Gibbs			
Mike	Hayes		N/A	N/A
David	Sismey			
Stuart	Willsher	Persimmon Homes Essex	Persimmon Homes has reviewed the 'Updated Rural Facilities Study 2021' and agrees with its findings.	Support noted
Anthony	Fittock		I do not consider the point system as an appropriate mechanism for ranking it is oudated and has no bearing to future sustainability,needs or capacity Example ... Latchingdon has 8 allotment spaces all full for many years Access to sports facilities are limited by safe access to them dues to absence of pavements etc This leads to them either not being accessibly or requiring car travel that prejudices climate mitigation. The Muga area is 3 units of basic questionable frames.The Sports faciity is a bowling alley Comapring it to other LDP's it leaves a lot to be desired if the intent is to advise on sustainability	The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that. It is not a qualitive survey of facilities, for sport this exercise is being done separately as part of the evidence base of the LDP review and assist in the formation of the Sport, Leisure and Open Space policy. The Council had not noted the MUGA in the assessment of the settlement and have now added this to the
Daniel	McAllister	Robert Mulholland And Company Limited		
Sarah	Sapsford		Could not find updated settlement pattern	This is available on the Councils website.
Stephanie	Ireland			
e	e	e	If this is referring to the spreadsheet at https://www.maldon.gov.uk/download/downloads/id/18808/2021_update_rural_facilities_survey.xlsx then my notes for Tollesbury are: • The petrol station is not a grocer's or convenience store • The preloved shop has closed down • The estate agent is not a retailer • The bus services to Maldon and to Colchester don't meet the stated criteria as they don't run up to 6pm, and as acknowledged, the last buses leave Colchester and Maldon before 5pm, so they should not get full points	If petrol station shops sell the basic necessities such as bread and milk then they have been classed as a shop in the Rural Facilities Study. This has been noted in Tollesbury. A shop is still counted in the study until its use in planning terms changes because it could open up again as a shop. Estate agents are classed as shops for the purposes of the study they normally form part of the High Street parade of shops and it is important for monitoring that we capture all types of uses in the High Street. There is the 91 to Witham and the 50/50a to Colchester both of which could be used as a commuter bus service running every day.
Kevin	Lagan			
Bethany	Jones	Colchester Borough Council		
magnus	Magnusson	Parker Planning Services	The Maldon District Rural Facilities Survey and Settlement Pattern evidence base document (January 2022) did not include Maldon/Heybridge and Burnham on Crouch as these settlements were already defined as 'Towns' and therefore they are considered to have the highest number of services and facilities of all the settlements (see para. 3.2 of the evidence base document): Rural_Facilities_and_Settlement_Hierarchy_Jan_2022.pdf Our client would concur that as there has been no substantial loss of services and facilities in these settlements since 2008, there is no need to reconsider the designation of these settlements as 'Towns' in the settlement hierarchy. These settlements remain the most sustainable and therefore should remain the focus for growth within the LDP Review plan? period.	Support noted
Nick	Whiteley			

Question 13

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 13. 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?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Linda	Flowers	Self Employed	Purleigh does not have an indoor purpose built sports facility therefore minus 5 points and demotion? The Purleigh landscape designation makes no sense and references places far from Purleigh. It fails to note the special nature of Purleigh Meadows which is a highly sensitive area (SN21). This sensitive area is noted as suitable for development on HELAA as PUR2 with a potential development of 120 houses. The comments section is flaccid. A description of the Purleigh Conservation Area can be found in ECC report dated 2007 on MDC site. This report states that the Conservation area must resist erosion of its rural setting by pressures from development. However PUR3 on the HELAA adjoins the centre of the Conservation area and the grade 11 Old Rectory which adjoins the grade 1 listed church. Purleigh is an ancient rural settlement with numerous listed buildings dotted around its entirety. PUR1 on the HELAA demonstrates the anomalous parish boundaries as it is in Cold Norton. Further land in Latchingdon spans Purleigh and Latchingdon although it is far from Purleigh. These issues could make local planning harder.	The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that. The services and facilities in Purliegh are going to be looked at again because there is some difference in information supplied this may alter its position in the Settlement Pattern. The Council cannot respond on site specifics at this stage of LDP Review. Work on site allocations will be undertaken in the coming months with a Preferred Options consultation being carried out at the end of this period. Purleigh parish boundary does push into Cold Norton but this will not make any difference in regard to site allocations because they should only be considered in or adjacent to existing settlements unless a new settlement is being created.
Peter	Holmes			
Colin	Pryke			
John	Hitcham		Sorry .. I can't find ''the table on the Council's website which sets out all the services and facilities for each settlement''. So I can't comment. Is it called something else?	The information is available on the Councils website
Richard	Kelly	Croudace Homes	See response to Q12 – whilst South Woodham Ferrers in within the administrative boundary of Chelmsford, given its close links to the southwest boundary of Maldon, reference should be made to the town. The adopted Chelmsford Local Plan (May 2020) identifies South Woodham Ferrers is recognised as a "high order settlement" considered to be "the most sustainable as they have the most functions and the best services and facilities including transport links and employment opportunities". It is therefore logical that development that will adjoin South Woodham Ferrers is a strategic matter that should be considered in a joined-up manner. This is linked to the cross-boundary strategic matter of delivering housing across being agreed through discussions between the relevant authorities to ensure policies are adopted that can support development on the edges of administrative areas. Such policies / strategies need to be agreed early to ensure they are delivered comprehensively in a planned and well considered manner that respects	The Rural Facilities Study does take into account South Woodham Ferrers in terms of distance to the town for those settlements in the South of the District. The Council as part of the Duty to Co-operate has been and will be in discussions with Chelmsford City Council concerning the options for growth.
Andy	Quelch			
James	Rushton		I live in the 'medium' village of Woodham Walter. The data on which the range of services available within the village is poor and inaccurate. If that standard of data collection is typical across the whole analysis, it is not fit for purpose and should certainly not be used for decisions relating to the LDP going forward. This response is also relevant to Q11 and Q12. This is why I cannot agree with the updated Settlement Pattern and the grouping of settlements within that	The Council has corresponded with the Parish Council and amended the information for Woodham Walter, this should ensure that the data is more accurate now.
Catherine	Champion			
Terence	Hughes	Burnham-on-Crouch constituent		

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 13. 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?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
John	Tompkins		The data is totally inaccurate for Woodham Walter despite purportedly having been visited in 2021. Policy Team have been notified. Please see document which Woodham Walter Parish Council has already submitted which details the alterations that are required. 2021 Update Rural Facilities Survey (URFS). 1. Grocery & convenience store The URFS lists one but the shop/post office was closed in 2013. Therefore, the points total is incorrect. This is considered to be a significant factor in the analysis of the 'Call for Sites'. 2. Pubs, Café, Restaurant, Fast Food The URFS lists 2 pubs, but Woodham Walter has 3 public houses as well as bars/restaurants and venue at the 2 golf clubs: • The Bell • The Queen Victoria • The Cats • The Warren Golf Club • Bunsay Downs Golf Club 3. Village Hall/Church Hall. The URFS lists one, but Woodham Walter has two: • The Village Hall • Women's Club 4. Nursery/Pre School The URFS lists none but Woodham Walter has one, Tadpoles Nursery that has been based in Woodham Walter for over 26 years. 5. SSSI The URFS lists none but Woodham Walter does have an SSSI, Woodham Walter Common. 6. Local Wildlife Sites The URFS lists none but Woodham Walter has the following: • River Chelmer (Ma01). • Warren Golf Club Woods (Ma02). • Barnfield Wood (Ma03). • West Bowers Wood (Ma04). • Thrift Wood (Ma07) (Small Section). • Warren Pit (Ma08) (In the current LPA Appendices, Ma08 is incorrectly listed as Goldsands Road Pits and Lakes. It should be Warren Pit. This has previously been reported to MDC.) • The Wilderness (Ma11) • Manor Road Complex (Ma14) • Wood Corner Grove (Ma21) 7. Ancient Woodland The URFS lists none but Woodham Walter does have Ancient Woodland Thrift Wood (small section). 8. Flood Risk The URFS lists none but Woodham Walter does have areas which are at Medium and High Risk of Flooding. 9. Conservation Area Woodham Walter has 2 Conservation Areas: • The main central village core (Settlement Area 1 in the VDS). • Chelmer & Blackwater Navigation. 10. Gas No mains gas supply is available in the Village. 11. Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, January 2022 (HELAA) 11.1. Appendix A – List of Sites. WW2 Land to the east of Rectory Road, Woodham Walter. The assessment fails to recognise that the site is within the Essex Coast Recreational Disturbance Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy (RAMS) zone of influence for the Crouch and Roach Estuaries Special Protection Area (SPA) and Ramsar site; Essex Estuaries Special Area of Conservation (SAC); Blackwater Estuary SPA and Ramsar Site and the Dingy SPA and Ramsar site. The assessment also	The Council has received separate correspondence from Woodham Walter Parish Council and acted on the information in terms of the points for the settlement. The shop has been removed. The Cats is too far out of the settlement to be considered it cannot be accessed safely by residents. The golf clubs are also too far out of the settlement. The nursery has now been included and the halls. The SSSIs are too far out of the settlement to be included, only services and facilities within and adjacent to the settlement are included in the Rural Facilities Study. Conservation Areas are not services or facilities so they are not included. The Council cannot respond on site specifics at this stage of LDP Review. Work on site allocations will be undertaken in the coming months with a Preferred Options consultation being carried out at the end of this period, though in response to the comment concerning RAMs areas, nearly all the District is covered by RAMs and it is not a service or facility.
Jeremy	Potter	Chelmsford City Council		
Daniel	Goodman	Rochford District council		
Chris	Harvey			
Jane	Senior			
Amanda	Clack		Yes - see Q12 above Options for Growth should focus on Options 1, 2, 3, 5 and 6 There is clear evidence of service and facility deterioration from 2008 to 2021. Development prioritisation should therefore be concentrated to the Larger Villages (only) where these facilities can be built up to better serve all the local community. Development concentration around the Larger Villages allows a focus for access and infrastructure as well as service and facility provision, thereby enabling the quality of rural life and enjoyment for the remaining areas to the benefit of everyone. A spread and scattering of development dilutes provision and spreads wider impact to the detriment of the rural landscape. For example, Althorne is currently classified as a "smaller village" where access to facilities is limited. Nothing has changed in the village; except we have now subsequently lost our only shop. Yet, through the Local Development Plan (LDP) now being consulted upon, the District Council are suggesting changing the categorisation of our village to a 'Medium Village' yet we have no facility	This consultee response does not relate to the question, checked and the consultee has made the same comments under the appropriate question, which will be responded to
Daphne	Scott		This information in respect of Althorne is incorrect. There is no shop and the 'restaurant' referred to is attached to the Vineyard and was operating without planning permission and is expected to close. The bus service is virtually non existent. It is necessary to travel out of the village for all medical and dental services (and none of the local NHS dentists are taking on new patients).	The matter of the shop will need further investigation, a facility is not taken out of the Rural Facilities Study until either planning permission is granted for another use or it is clear that the use has ceased permanently. The restaurant will also have to be investigated. It is possible for both to reopen. There is a bus service in Althorne 31 31A 31B 31C 31D 31X Chelmsford-Burnham on Crouch leaves Althorne Post Office at 06.39 Mon to Fri, last bus arrives back in Althorne from Chelmsford at 23.07 which is able to be accessed for both shoppers and commuters. It would be expected that for rural villages residents would have to travel to access higher order settlements.
Kenny	Alexander	Thomas Gainsborough School		
David	Kennedy		needs to include the likes of Burnham on Crouch and Maldon in order to be comprehensive and meaningful	It is not necessary to assess the towns in the district, the level of services and facilities are such that they offer a large range of services and facilities, the key matters that designate a town as a town such as a secondary school, large employment allocations, high street and other higher order comparison retail facilities
Mark	Behrendt	Home Builders Federation		
Matthew	Cooper		No	N/A

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 13. 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?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Terry	Inkpen	None	Looking at the facilities claimed for Althorne on the Master sheet:- There is no key to the Annotations i.e. (1) etc, however There is No cash point/ATM. There is no Grocery Store, the shop does not appear to be trading and is a front for a another unrelated business. There is no Post office. There is no working Phone Box There is no Restaurant, and the Cafe at Winterdale is currently closed but expected to reopen. There is a public Open Space/Recreation Ground Please see the answers to Question 13	The matter of the shop will need further investigation, a facility is not taken out of the Rural Facilities Study until either planning permission is granted for another use or it is clear that the use has ceased permanently. The restaurant will also have to be investigated. It is possible for both to reopen. Phone boxes and cash points are not counted in the Rural Facilities Study. The public open space has been noted.
christine	collins		Again the information contained in this assessment is out of date and inaccurate, Althorne had more shops and pubs 60 years ago than it does now ! Our recreation ground on which we have tried to update the facilities and equipment is used by people from southminster and Latchingdon already	The matter of the shop will need further investigation, a facility is not taken out of the Rural Facilities Study until either planning permission is granted for another use or it is clear that the use has ceased permanently. The restaurant will also have to be investigated. It is possible for both to reopen. it is not relevant to the Rural Facilities Study who uses the services and facilities.
Stuart	Williams	Ace group	You have villages with no shops or any other infrastructure in the same group as villages with schools, shops, pubs and train stations it seems like they change the sizing of the village to suite the requirements of the sites needed by the developers it doesn't add up.	The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that.
Reegan	Howles		-	N/A
jasbir	Singh			
Janice	Jackson			
Roy A	Clare	Charities	In addition to those assets on the spreadsheet, Tollesbury has a first class butcher (also sells fish) and a regular mobile veg van. The village community includes specialists in a wide range of trades - builders, engineers, marine engineers, shipwrights, plasterers, painters etc	The fish shop has already been included in the assessment. Mobile facilities have not been included as they cover a multitude of places and these can change from week to week. The employment area of the settlement has already been included in the assessment
Felicity	Gale		This spreadsheet does not open for Althorne	Comment noted, there was no separate spreadsheet for Althorne
Lindsey	Wright			
David	Hill	Dandara Ltd	The idea of a settlement hierarchy and how services and settlements are scored is considered to be a subjective in nature, depending on what the focus for development is. The weighting given to certain criteria will clearly change the end result significantly. However, it is clear that the weighting in the facilities document appears sensible and as such conclusions and positioning are logical given the current mix of settlements across Maldon. That said, it is clear that Southminster is much larger and significantly more sustainable that the other villages in that level of the Settlement Pattern, therefore, it is our view that it could potentially be treated differently. Maldon and Heybridge do not contain a station, which is a key attribute for sustainable, low carbon development and could therefore be viewed as a key positive in the development of a strategy going forward. The weighting given to the presence of a station is something that could be considered further and that could further elevate Southminster up the settlement pattern. During the recent examination of the Welwyn Hatfield Local Plan, the Inspector has specifically made mention1 of the importance of train stations as a basis for the allocation of development, especially in relation to "large villages" and how they are expected to accommodate growth. Southminster, given its position in the settlement pattern and its attributes and location, provides a key opportunity to accommodate development in this regard.	The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that. Therefore having a railway station is the same for Southminster as it would be for North Fambridge for example and it should recieve the same points as a facility.
Steven	Potter		The rating system is flawed to a large extent; it doesn't take into account, for example, adequate sewage disposal systems or inadequate power supplies. It is an arbitrary way of calculating village assets. Purleigh for example, using the assets listed in the District Council's calculations, (which line 4 on page 23 of the Issues and Options Document states are all of them) only achieves 59 points, not the 70 claimed in the document, so therefore Purleigh should be reclassified as a medium village.	The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that. The services and facilities in Purliegh are going to be looked at again because there is some difference in information supplied this may alter its position in the Settlement Pattern. The post office has not been counted. Electricity and water supply are not matters addressed in the Rural Facilities Study. At this stage of the LDP Review the main utility infrastructure providers do not get involved in the detail of the process, they will only participate once a growth option is chosen and the potential number of settlements and sites has been reduced from the
Vysian	Banyard	TKPC	The Parish Council questions how this scoring was carried out, especially for Tolleshunt Knights.	As the consultee has not set out what they believe is wrong there can be no comment about this.
Diane	Carter		There are errors with regard to Burnham (e.g. We have three pharmacies in Burnham. We do not have a NatWest bank and Barclays only opens three days a week for fours hours) so this needs to be checked thoroughly for accuracy by someone who actually knows the area well.	Burnham on Crouch should not be on the spreadsheet it is a town and is therefore not part of the assessment.
Luke	Garrett	Obsidian Strategic Asset Management Ltd	Do not wish to comment.	N/A
Robin	Fanshawe			
John	Brown			
Chris	Waumsley	Inovo Consulting	There is an over emphasis on proximity to employment allocations. Access to employment opportunities on allocated sites will become less significant as working from home becomes more prevalent and with an ageing population a higher proportion of residents are not at work. There appear to be some anomalies in the services identified, for example the services accredited to Purley do not recognise it's church. It is also within 3 miles of an allocated employment area by the most direct route	The church in Purleigh has been counted. Employment is an important strand in regard to sustainability and it should therefore be counted in any Rural Facilities Study. The route travel times were all calculated using AA route finder. This ensures that all drive times were calculated in the same way across all the settlements.
Phil	Jacklin			

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 13. 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?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Robert	Jones	The University of Reading		
Robert	Stephens	N/A	Tollesbury Comments - Petrol station shop is not retail & is closed Sat pm and all day Sunday. Estate agent is not a retail store The book store is a charity and primarily a café, not open pm or Sundays is in the wrong group. Art shop only opens limited hours on Saturday The prelove shop has closed. Points total for recycling should be 2. Incorrect total for GP. Village halls are not listed Bus service is not a commuter service or a shoppers service. Local wildlife sites still needs to be verified There is an identified flood risk	If petrol station shops sell the basic necessities such as bread and milk then they have been classed as a shop in the Rural Facilities Study, they don`t have to be open 7 days a week. This has been noted in Tollesbury. A shop is still counted in the study until its use in planning terms changes because it could open up again as a shop, once again it doesn`t matter how often a shop is open it could open in the future full time. Estate agents are classed as shops for the purposes of the study they normally form part of the High Street parade of shops and it is important for monitoring that we capture all types of uses in the High Street. Tollesbury has two halls in the assessment. There is the 91 to Witham and the 50/50a to Colchester both of which could be used as a commuter bus service running every day. Local wildlife sites have not been included in the assessment neither has flood risk, these are two matter which will come into the next phase of the LDP Review and will be looked at in the options for growth and site selection.
Pete	Butcher		The actual data is unquestionably correct. However, problems may arise when this data is interpreted for planning and sustainability purposes. Example: The data shows that a village has a primary school, however, the school may well be significantly oversubscribed in most class years. So any further development in that area would mean children in the new area would have to travel (probably by car) to the next nearest school where they have space available. This could also be true for doctors surgeries etc. Any report on infrastructure and sustainability must take account of current utilisation levels	The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that. They do not take into account the capacity of each facility because that is the part of the policy implementation and they could change from week to week
JO	COOMBES			
Jonney	Aldridge		Access to woodland	It is not clear what the response means in the context of woodland and the question asked so no further coment can be made.
Mark	Hurley	Selfridges	I couldn't see Maldon in the file! Maldon High Street is becoming a bunch of Coffeee Shops and CHarity Shops. Banks seem to be leaving and independent shops closing.	It is not necessary to assess the towns in the district, the level of services and facilities are such that they offer a large range of services and facilities, the key matters that designate a town as a town such as a secondary school, large employment allocations, high street and other higher order comparison retail facilities
Neil	Burke	Bradwell Power Generation Company Limited	Bradwell B do not have any specific comments to make on this question.	N/A
Lynne	Goodbourn			
Christopher	Kent		As Q12	This has been answered in question 12 for this consultee
Sophie	Pryor			
c/o Agent	c/o Agent	Clarion Housing		
Stephanie	Jones	home		
Phillipa	Griffiths			
Matthew	Taylor			
Anne	Bailey		Althorne is completly wrong. We do NOT have a shop or a resaurant. We have one Public house the three horseshoes. The bus service only helps those at the bottom of summer Hill. Station Road is privately owned. We are a through village with narrow roads.	The matter of the shop will need further investigation, a facility is not taken out of the Rural Facilities Study until either planning permission is granted for another use or it is clear that the use has ceased permanently. The restaurant will also have to be investigated. It is possible for both to reopen. The settlement has a bus service which residents can access if they wish to do so.
Lucien	Taylor		I believe that the identification of services in Althorne is incorrect. We do not have a village shop (it's status is unclear) and only part of the village has a bus service. It should be classified as a small village.	The matter of the shop will need further investigation, a facility is not taken out of the Rural Facilities Study until either planning permission is granted for another use or it is clear that the use has ceased permanently. The restaurant will also have to be investigated. It is possible for both to reopen. The settlement has a bus service which residents can access if they wish to do so.
David	Baker		See answer to Question 12, Purleigh needs to have each of its three small villages assessed separately.	The Settlement Pattern will be reviewed once the responses on the Issues and Options consultation has been processed. Purleighs services and facilties are going to be reviewed because of a difference in information supplied, this may alter the position in the Settlement Hierarchy. Mundon and Cocks Clarks have been assessed separately from Purleigh so have not been included in with Purleighs services and facilities
Glenna	Wilkins		Road improvements are vital to account for vast increase of traffic to avoid gridlock morning and evening.	The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that. Transport modelling is part of the work being undertaken for the next phase of the LDP Review
Danny	Soul		The spreadsheet should be corrected as it lists Purleigh as having: 2x Village Hall/Church Hall 1x Outdoor Sports Field/Social club 1x Indoor Sport (Purpose built badminton, squash, etc) Whereas in reality there is only: 1x Village Hall 1x Outdoor Sports Field/Social Club (The Cricket Pavilion) This would halve the number of points allocated for the above (10 instead of 20) and mark Purleigh as	The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that. The services and facilities in Purliegh are going to be looked at again because there is some difference in information supplied this may alter its position in the Settlement Pattern. The post office has not been counted.
Fiona	Barkham	Private Individual	No comment	N/A

Question 13

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 13. 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?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Isabel	Adcock		Don't treat all the same. The communities strength is in their individuality	The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that. Therefore each settlement is given an assessment so that the Council knows what services and facilities are in them individually
alan	johnson	sky broadcasting		
Victoria	Cutmore	Endurance Estates		
Jane	Potter	Purleigh Parish Council	The rating system is fundamentally flawed as it doesn't take into account key services and facilities (and consequently the sustainability of the amount of development allocated to each village), e.g. adequate sewage disposal systems and adequate power supplies. It is an arbitrary way of calculating village assets. Using the assets listed in the Maldon District Rural Facilities Survey and Settlement Pattern calculations (January 2022) which line 4 on page 23 of the Issues and Options document states are all of them, Purleigh should not be classified as a large village, as it only scores 59 points, not the 70 claimed in the document. It is imperative therefore that Purleigh should be re-classified as a medium village. There are also numerous inaccuracies in the descriptions for each of the three sites put forward in Purleigh parish for future development under the call for sites, following the publication of the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA), as follows: 1. PUR 1: 1.60 hectares, Latchingdon Road, Purleigh. Proposed No. of housing units 42. The site description claims there is a Post Office opposite the site within 'Country Produce'. There is not. 2. PUR 2: 8.80 hectares, Land west of Westerings, Purleigh (Purleigh Meadows.) Proposed No. of housing units 120. The site description claims the site lies between Lodge Lane to the north, B1010 and Pump Lane to the east and Mill Hill to the south. It doesn't. The site is entirely landlocked by the properties which front onto those roads and would therefore constitute back-land development. In addition, there is no Post Office within Purleigh Community Shop nor does the site lie in the middle of the existing urban environment. It is a profoundly rural environment. 3. PUR 3: 1.40 hectares, Church Hill, Purleigh (the Glebe field behind Fairfields.) Proposed No. of housing units 30. The site description claims there is a nursing home to the south. There is not. There are twelve flats (at Fairfields) managed by Purleigh Old People's Housing Association for older residents to live in independently. No element of health care is provided. Purleigh Community shop is located opposite Fairfields not another shop. It is highly unlikely that the high surface water flood risk can be mitigated against, as there have been serious and frequent incidences of flooding. The site description also states that there is a Post Office in close proximity. There is not.	The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that. The services and facilities in Purliegh are going to be looked at again because there is some difference in information supplied this may alter its position in the Settlement Pattern. The post office has not been counted. The Council cannot respond on site specifics at this stage of LDP Review. Work on site allocations will be undertaken in the coming months with a Preferred Options consultation being carried out at the end of this period.
Brian	Haydon	Cold Norton Parish Council	No	N/A
Lee	Foster		Althorne has 1 pub/restaurant as noted. No such place as Winterfield restaurant yet has the same points score as settlements with 2 Pubs. The shop does NOT meet minimal standard's to be classed as a shop the shelves are always 90% empty. This score should reflect what a shop offers not the fact it is a shop Althorne score seems questionable at best for it to then be put forward for a major development of increasing its size by 200%	The matter of the shop will need further investigation, a facility is not taken out of the Rural Facilities Study until either planning permission is granted for another use or it is clear that the use has ceased permanently. It is possible for it to reopen. It is not relevant to the Rural Facilities Study how large or small a facility is or its quality, it is just an assessment of what is there.
Vanessa	Horner		Yes. The shop is community and not business and only supports essential and should not count as shop. Population should be half as stated is the parish and not village which is 600 . The Bell pub is a gastro restaurant and not a village pub. GP issues they are all full and some residents have to go South Woodham and there is no dental or GP for new residents. Only one village hall not two the other is a cricket pavilion. No indoor sports facility. We only have one open space which is the playing/sports field which cannot be counted twice and it is just a grass field with children's play area. Distance to railway station and towns are wrong and don't reflect reality as the roads are small and clogged and you don't achieve speeds to achieve these times. Bus is shoppers only. Travel time to designated times are for Maldon and South Woodham due to traffic are unrealistic due to traffic conditions. Are roads are narrow and not all have pavements. Flood risk is high in valley surrounding village. Current green belt land including the proposed for development acts as a soak for much of the village. No gas in Purleigh. No lights either. The area is visible for miles due to high hillsides and is highly sensitive to development. It will affect the overall beauty of the region	The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that. The services and facilities in Purliegh are going to be looked at again because there is some difference in information supplied this may alter its position in the Settlement Pattern. All travel times were mapped using AA route finder so that there was a consistant approach across all settlements. Maldon District does not have any designated greenbelt land. Flood risk and utility capacity are not included in the Rural Facilities Study.
Brian	Howson	Pharmaceutical company		
Marion	Gunn		No	N/A
BRIAN	COLLINS			
Peter	Lampard		I do not think what Purleigh has will support any further development.	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth, the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months.
Tim	Chilvers		4.22 The services and facilities spreadsheet is a useful tool and clearly demonstrates that Heybridge and Maldon are the two most sustainable settlements within the District.	Support noted
Elliott	George			

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 13. 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?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Kate	Ellis		There are factual errors and misinterpretation in the facilities by whoever has assessed the village for example, the Grocery shop is a community run shop and has limited stock and is open for limited hours. Indoor sport facilities mentioned. This is a very small building and is not big enough for the examples of sports outlined, e.g. badminton, squash Bus route outlined but need to consider frequency of buses etc. Score allocated does not add up to the total of 70 as outlined suggesting that the programming/algorithm used is incorrect. Score would be even lower if amended considering the above comments.	The excel spreadsheet will be amended prior to any further publication. The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that. The services and facilities in Purliegh are going to be looked at again because there is some difference in information supplied this may alter its position in the Settlement Pattern. The post office has not been counted.
Kevin	Ashman	Estates and Agency Strategic Land	The barometer for assessing the sustainability of a settlement is very analogue. For example, a settlement hierarchy is assessed on its proximity to a grocery store or Post Office. It does not acknowledge that most Post Office related services can be undertaken online – or indeed that approximately 59% now undertake grocery shops via the Internet. More modern-facing barometers could include Internet speed with a settlement (mobile and fixed data) ; proximity to public transport interchanges, and childcare facilities	Post offices are still a service provided in some settlements and therefore they should be counted in any Rural Facilities Study the distance to them though is not counted. Childrens nurseries are counted as is public transport. Broadband speed is not counted in the study, we did look to see if we could include it but could not get reliable enough data to cover all the settlements and speeds vary across individual settlements
Jake	Nugent	Endurance Estates Ltd	The table appears to correctly identify the services and facilities in Althorne but we point to the Updated Facilities Survey, as per our responses to questions 11 and 12 above, which identifies that Althorne has the potential to be included as a larger village instead of a medium village due to the additional presence of the restaurant and shop. In addition, it also scores higher than other settlements classified as large villages, therefore should be appropriately regrouped to ensure consistency	The matter of the shop will need further investigation, a facility is not taken out of the Rural Facilities Study until either planning permission is granted for another use or it is clear that the use has ceased permanently. The restaurant will also have to be investigated. It is possible for both to reopen. The settlement has a bus service which residents can access if they wish to do so.
John	Buchanan			
Tim	Bradford	leadenhall		
Jacky	Bannerman	Woodham Walter Parish Council	Please see document which Woodham Walter Parish Council has already submitted which details the alterations that are required. 2021 Update Rural Facilities Survey (URFS). 1. Grocery & convenience store The URFS lists one but the shop/post office was closed in 2013. Therefore, the points total is incorrect. This is considered to be a significant factor in the analysis of the 'Call for Sites'. 2 Pubs, Café, Restaurant, Fast Food The URFS lists 2 pubs, but Woodham Walter has 3 public houses as well as bars/restaurants and venue at the 2 golf clubs: • The Bell • The Queen Victoria • The Cats• The Warren Golf Club • Bunsay Downs Golf Club 3. Village Hall/Church Hall The URFS lists one, but Woodham Walter has two: • The Village Hall • Women's Club 4. Nursery/Pre School The URFS lists none but Woodham Walter has one, Tadpoles Nursery that has been based in Woodham Walter for over 26 years. 5. SSSI The URFS lists none but Woodham Walter does have an SSSI, Woodham Walter Common. 6. Local Wildlife Sites The URFS lists none but Woodham Walter has the following: • River Chelmer (Ma01). • Warren Golf Club Woods (Ma02). • West Bowers Wood (Ma04). • Thrift Wood (Ma07) (Small Section). • Warren Pit (Ma08) (In the current LPA Appendices, Ma08 is incorrectly listed as Goldsands Road Pits and Lakes. It should be Warren Pit. This has previously been reported to MDC.) • The Wilderness (Ma11) • Manor Road Complex (Ma14) • Wood Corner Grove (Ma21) 7. Ancient Woodland The URFS lists none but Woodham Walter does have Ancient Woodland Thrift Wood (small section). 8. Flood Risk The URFS lists none but Woodham Walter does have areas which are at Medium and High Risk of Flooding. 9. Conservation Area Woodham Walter has 2 Conservation Areas: • The main central village core (Settlement Area 1 in the VDS). • Chelmer & Blackwater Navigation. 10. Gas No mains gas supply is available in the Village. 11. Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, January 2022 (HELAA) 11.1. Appendix A – List of Sites. WW2 Land to the east of Rectory Road, Woodham Walter. The assessment fails to recognise that the site is within the Essex Coast Recreational Disturbance Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy (RAMS) zone of influence for the Crouch and Roach Estuaries Special Protection Area (SPA) and Ramsar site; Essex Estuaries Special Area of Conservation (SAC); Blackwater Estuary SPA and Ramsar Site and the Dingy SPA and Ramsar site. The assessment also fails to recognise that the site is considered to be a Habitat Site under The Conservation of Habitat and Species Regulations 2017.	The Council has received separate correspondence from Woodham Walter Parish Council and acted on the information in terms of the points for the settlement. The shop has been removed. The Cats is too far out of the settlement to be considered it cannot be accessed safely by residents. The golf clubs are also too far out of the settlement. The nursery has now been included and the halls. The SSSIs are too far out of the settlement to be included, only services and facilities within and adjacent to the settlement are included in the Rural Facilities Study. Conservation Areas are not services or facilities so they are not included. The Council cannot respond on site specifics at this stage of LDP Review. Work on site allocations will be undertaken in the coming months with a Preferred Options consultation being carried out at the end of this period, though in response to the comment concerning RAMs areas, nearly all the District is covered by RAMs and it is not a service or facility.
Mark	Tentori	Mazdev Limited		
Peter	Ingram		There is very little in the way of facilities in Althorne. People that came to live here knew and accepted that but now the rural way of life is disappearing.	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth, the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months.
Jane	Pilgrim			
Judith	Radcliffe			
Christopher	Mabbutt	Burnham Primary School	Quality education provision must not be an afterthought. Realistic and suitable provision is required in the LDP and this should be ascertained with proper consultation with the local education providers. In particular analysis should be undertaken to determine 'outstanding schools' in the borough and also current student capacity	Comment noted, the Council will work with ECC education authority to determine the future educational provision for the district.
Mary	Putt		Burnham on Crouch is incorrectly listed as: Banks 8 - there is one bank that opens 3 days a week Bakery 2 - there is only 1 Butchers 2 - there are none Post office 2 - there is only 1 Petrol station and pharmacies you list a 0 and we have 1 petrol station and 2 pharmacies. Not a particularly good assessment of an area - and you want us to trust you with planning for the future!	It is not necessary to assess the towns in the district, the level of services and facilities are such that they offer a large range of services and facilities, the key matters that designate a town as a town such as a secondary school, large employment allocations, high street and other higher order comparison retail facilities.

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 13. 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?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Alan	Shrimplin	N/A	Why are the facility for the 2 main Towns in the MDC district not listed, this must be included in any information so that correct assessment of these 2 areas can be made as well.	It is not necessary to assess the towns in the district, the level of services and facilities are such that they offer a large range of services and facilities, the key matters that designate a town as a town such as a secondary school, large employment allocations, high street and other higher order comparison retail facilities.
Valerie	Coleby	Berrys		
Kevin	Bruce		Tillingham The Fire Station has been omitted. There is only 1 place of worship. Dots and Melons farming and DIY equipment is omitted Bradwell Bradwell Primary School is omitted. The village is oddly desidnateded - Bradwell has always been a dispersed village but is one community. The Waterside is only mentioned at the end and Mill End is ignored I have noted at least one reference to 'The Dengie' - there is no such place. We are the Dengie Hundred or the Dengie Peninsula or just the Dengie Area. There are no such designations as 'The	Tillingham - The fire station was omitted and has now been added into the points total. The study has two churches for the settlement one of which has not been converted yet, this will be checked further and if necessary the points removed if it is closed permanently. Bradwell - The primary school has been noted already. Bradwell is split into two distinct places for the purposes of the study, they have distinct characteristics and are separated by a green gap which is visually apparent both on a map and on the ground. Mill End is part of Bradwell on Sea.
William	Shepherd		There is no Post Office in Purleigh. There is a water course to the north of the PUR 2 site which has a restricted outflow and has caused flooding in the lower part of Lodge Lane on frequent occasions. Again on PUR 2 the ground is quite steeply rising in the north south direction and at the south end there are areas subject flooding. In the past there has been a pond in this area	The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that. The services and facilities in Purliegh are going to be looked at again because there is some difference in information supplied this may alter its position in the Settlement Pattern. The post office has not been counted. The Council cannot respond on site specifics at this stage of LDP Review. Work on site allocations will be undertaken in the coming months with a Preferred Options consultation being carried out at the end of this period.
victoria	newson	Childrens Nursery		
David	Banfield			
Phillip	Wright	CALA Homes (North Home Counties) Ltd	We note that the spreadsheet identifies that Southminster's population has increased from 4,272 (2011 Census) to 4,529 (estimate with growth since 2014). This being the highest amongst the 10 largest villages within the District, with Maylandsea being the next largest settlement with an estimated population of 3,886. Furthermore, we note that whilst the spreadsheet identifies Southminster's population as being 4,529, the table after paragraph 2.3 in the Maldon District Rural Facilities Survey and Settlement Pattern (January 2022) identifies that the actual population figure for Southminster is higher (4,601.96) based upon July 2021 estimates. This demonstrates the importance of the settlement of Southminster to Maldon District. In terms of Grocery Convenience Store provision, Southminster, Tollesbury and Latchingdon all score 24 points based upon the fact that they each possess three such stores. It goes on to identify that Southminster contains seven other retail stores (including a butchers and a launderette), whereas Tollesbury contains six such stores. Both settlements score 30 points. We believe that Southminster's increased depth of retail provision should be reflected within the scorings. In terms of eating facilities (restaurants, cafes and take aways), we note that Southminster scores 33 points, Maylandsea 18 points, and Tollesbury 12 points. These being the only village settlements to reach double figures. Again, this demonstrates the much greater depth of provision already present in Southminster compared to elsewhere. We note that reference is made in the schedule to the fact that the William Fisher Medical Centre in Southminster already serves over 6,000 patients and has no known GP capacity issues. Whereas, with regard to Tollesbury Surgery, which serves over 4,000 patients, in a recent planning application response the NHS commented that the GP Surgery there did not have capacity for the additional growth resulting from the proposed development. We see this as further evidence of Southminster's ability to provide key facilities and services to the wider population. Similarly, in terms of village / community hall provision, it is evident that with its 4 halls, it scores twice as well (20 points to 10 points) as Maylandsea and Tollesbury which each only possess two such halls. In terms of primary school provision, the schedules findings are considered particularly pertinent: Primary School Location School Roll School Capacity Spare Pupil Capacity Latchingdon 121 175 54 Maylandsea 257 270 13 Tollesbury 214 225 11 Southminster 200 315 115 It is apparent from the above that significant spare primary school capacity is currently available at Southminster. Whereas, both Maylandsea and Tollesbury possess primary schools that are presently very close to their current	The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that. Capacity in services and facilities is not a matter that a Rural Facilities Study takes into account because it could change from week to week, it is only the fact that the service or facility is in place that is counted.
.	.	SN Developments	SN Developments is promoting a site in Burnham on Crouch, and so comments are limited to the services and facilities within that settlement. Burnham on Crouch is classified as a Town Centre and within the top tier of the settlement hierarchy. It contains a wide range of services and facilities, including a secondary school and primary schools, convenience stores, a post office and banks, public houses and restaurants, indoor and outdoor recreation facilities, a library and other community services, a railway station and bus services, and employment opportunities.	It is not necessary to assess the towns in the district, the level of services and facilities are such that they offer a large range of services and facilities, the key matters that designate a town as a town such as a secondary school, large employment allocations, high street and other higher order comparison retail facilities.

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 13. 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?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
.	.	Cooper Property Holdings Ltd	Cooper Property Holdings Ltd is promoting a site in Bradwell on Sea, and so comments are limited to the services and facilities within that settlement. The services and facilities listed for Bradwell on Sea appear to be correct, and it is appropriate for it to be classified as a medium village in the settlement hierarchy. There is a primary school, community shop, village hall, play areas and public houses in Bradwell on Sea, and there are bus services available to the larger settlements. The primary school has spare capacity. The community shop is open daily and sells bread, vegetables, and groceries. The availability of services and facilities within a settlement is important in terms of reducing travel distances and providing community cohesion. However, it should be noted that access to supermarkets is becoming less important, since most of the larger supermarkets offer home delivery services so residents no longer need to travel for their weekly grocery shopping. The main supermarkets in Maldon and Heybridge (e.g. Morrisons, Tesco and Asda) all offer home deliveries that can be accessed by residents of Bradwell on Sea.	Support noted
Jane	Coleman	Maldon Town Council	None	N/A
Roy	Martin	Mr Roy Martin	Option 4 - development spread proportionately across all forms of settlement including Hamlets (see my letter of 11 March 2022) will satisfy organic growth in the provision of services and facilities for each settlement.	This consultee response does not relate to the question, checked and the consultee has made the same comments under the appropriate question, which will be responded to
Simon	Butler-Finbow	Pigeon Investment Management	Although MDC has referred to their website, the plan does not provide a link to the relevant page and so it is not immediately easy for anyone viewing the draft plan to obtain this information. It is far more appropriate for the net Regulation 18 version of the LDPR to include details regarding each tier in the Settlement Pattern, so it is clear why each settlement is within that tier. This can also be used as a basis for the growth options taken forward, and to help explain the approach that MDC choses for LDPR, which at this time, is currently unknown.	The Issues and Options Consultation Document was not a policy document and it main purpose was to set out the issues and options for the District in terms of the LDP Review, the details were set out in the accompanying evidence as far as the Council has gathered it at the moment. The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that.
sara	doran		I think that there should be clarity about smaller settlements or hamlets eg creeksea, and that they are not brought surreptitiously into the envelope of larger nearbytowns (eg burnham), when they are distinct places. Creeksea has it's own parish council, a church, golf club, sailing club, equestrian centre, 2 cafes, a wedding venue and housing....it is NOT burnham and I was concerned to see land in the plans earmarked for a further possible 250 houses adjacent to ferry road and north of the railway line considered appropriate because the field is in an urban environment. It is not urban, it is creeksea. It is rural. that field is used for riding, walking and enjoying nature. Creeksea should not be considered urban it has been a village in it's own right for at least 800years. Little braxted is also described as being a long way from the green man pub. The majority of the households in little braxted are in the upper part of the village, with only a handful of properties near the church. This is a challenge as the broadband as boosted at the lower end of the village, but not at the upper end where most residents live. I am concerned that there is a very large industrial park planned at great braxted. This has some merits in terms of access to the A12, but I am concerned how this development would access the A12 with the new widening plans. It is essential that the nature of the small villages is not ruined by an increase in industrial traffic, and there must be an outright ban for lorries passing through the villages of little braxted and great braxted unless required for access eg bin lorries. I think that the industrial development proposed in great braxted is close to witham and kelvedon and so is likely to provide work opportunities due to this proximity - but these are areas outside the district. I am also concerned that the industrial complex may not manage to be fully built, and whilst commercial development is a positive thing, I would absolutely NOT be agree with change of planning to develop houses part way through the delivery of a commercial development. There should be no pressure to convert this commercial land to residential land. It is unconnected by any public transport, it has no local shops, it is served by one main road, but with connections to a web of c roads that would not be able to support the expansion of a residential development. It should have a cycle way connecting to local towns. There should be a clear ask from the planning process that commercial vehicles linked to the development use eco fuel eg biodiesel, electric etc.	Creeksea is not a separate parish and lies within but very much on the outside of the town of Burnham on Crouch so for the purposes of the Rural Facilities Study has not been considered as a separate place but would be looked at in relation to the town of Burnham. There a few places within the District that have not been assessed separately because they are in effect classed as in the open countryside, Howe Green is one such place. The railway line appears to form a barrier to development to the south of it with the golf course to the west, this leaves Creeksea with a buffers against strategic expansion of the town also there is the consideration of flood risk the nearer the river you get. At the present time I would not consider making Creeksea a separate place in the Settlement Pattern, it appears to have no defined core and is not a parish in itself. The Council cannot respond on site specifics at this stage of LDP Review. Work on site allocations will be undertaken in the coming months with a Preferred Options consultation being carried out at the end of this period. The use of fuel types in vehicles would not be a matter that the planning system can control in terms that any condition placed on a planning application must be able to be monitored effectively.
Colin	Horner	Villageretreat	Yes , the shop is community not a business and only supports essential, it should not count as a shop. Population should be half as that stated in the parish not the village which is roughly 600. The Bell pub is a gastro restaurant and not a village pub. There are GP issues, all GPs are full, some residents have to go out the area to South Woodham Ferrers or Bickenarcre. There is no dental or GP availability for new residents. There is one village hall, the other is a cricket pavilion. No indoor sports facility. WE only have 1 public open space which is the playing/sports field, you can't count this twice and its just a grass field with childrens play area. Distance to railway and towns don,t reflect reality as the roads are small, clogged and you can not achieve the speeds you would need to do these times. Travel time to designated towns of Maldon and South Woodham are unrealistic at any time due to traffic and road conditions. Flood risk is high is valley area due to high slopes surrounding village and residential areas. Current greenbelt land including that proposed for development acts as a soak for much of the water coming off the land. There is no mains gas in Purleigh whatsoever. The area is visible for miles to to high hillsides and is highly sensitive to development as it will affect the overall	The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that. The services and facilities in Purliegh are going to be looked at again because there is some difference in information supplied this may alter its position in the Settlement Pattern. The post office has not been counted. Electricity and water supply are not matters addressed in the Rural Facilities Study. At this stage of the LDP Review the main utility infrastructure providers do not get involved in the detail of the process, they will only participate once a growth option is chosen and the potential number of settlements and sites has been reduced from the whole district. Travel times were worked out using AA Route finder to ensure a consistant approach across the whole district.

Question 13

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 13. 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?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Robert	Scott	Lewis & Scott Retirement Living Ltd	No - we agree with the methodology, but as stated previously, smaller settlements should not be precluded from development on the basis of having fewer amenities (a ratio should be applied to analyse relative provision). Unless smaller settlements are considered for investment, their long-term sustainability will be in question.	The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that
Rob	Bard		The total for Purleigh village is incorrect - should be 61 not 70. There are points allocated for a purpose built indoor sports facility - which is not appropriate. The spreadsheet is incorrect with the formula for the total incorrectly formatted and includes the count of the amenities not just the total points for the amenities	The excel spreadsheet will be updated prior to any further publication.
Tim	Hann		Although it clearly outlines the availability of 'shoppers bus' it does not highlight the frequency of these buses. "D2 calls at Cold Norton it runs Southminster to Maldon, earliest bus is 9.23 with the last bus calling at 18.18. D5 must be booked two hours beforehand and starts at 7.17, last bus at 19.19. No 6 bus runs on alternate Fridays to Chelmsford and is a shoppers bus service. No 3 bus service runs on alternative Fridays and is a shoppers bus service. No 99 must be booked two hours before use and starts at 9.17."	The assessment does set out what the bus services are from Cold Norton
Burnham	Town Council	Burnham on Crouch Town Council	No pharmacies are shown in Burnham and yet there are three. NatWest Bank is no longer there. Barclays Bank is only open three days per week. Therefore, on this basis, there may be many other errors or out of date statements in the document. A visit by the planners to BOC would be advisable. It is difficult to make accurate statements if one is unfamiliar with an area.	It is not necessary to assess the towns in the district, the level of services and facilities are such that they offer a large range of services and facilities, the key matters that designate a town as a town such as a secondary school, large employment allocations, high street and other higher order comparison retail facilities
Justin	Barkham	Self employed		
Poppy	Vidler	Crown Consumer Ltd	It's very poorly served.	This comment refers to Great Braxted and the comment is noted
Stephen	Sutton		Definition of commuter bus service is unrealistic if you work in London	Where residents are going to work would not be a matter the Rural Facilities Study can account for in terms of points because we would be unable to find out the information effectively.
Tim	Madelin		see above - need recalculating with this amendment	This was the answer to the previous question from this consultee - "The wrong measure of proximity to amenities has been used - it should be public transport accessibility not 'private car drive time'" the response is as follows - Both measures have been used. Bus services have been examined and points awarded for shoppers and commuter bus services and a 15 minute drive time was used as it cannot reasonably be expected that residents in a rural district would not use their vehicles to access some services and facilities and employment.
Joanna	Jeffery	Althorne Parish Clerk	Looking at the facilities claimed for Althorne on the Master sheet:- There is no key to the Annotations i.e. (1) etc, however . There is No cash point/ATM. There is no Grocery Store, the shop does not appear to be trading and is a front for a another unrelated business. There is no Post office. There is no working Phone Box There is no Restaurant, and the Cafe at Winterdale is currently closed but expected to reopen. There is a public Open Space/Recreation Ground Please see the answers to Question 12	The matter of the shop will need further investigation, a facility is not taken out of the Rural Facilities Study until either planning permission is granted for another use or it is clear that the use has ceased permanently. The restaurant will also have to be investigated. It is possible for both to reopen. The settlement has a bus service which residents can access if they wish to do so. Cash points and phone boxes are not counted. The public open space has been counted.
Paul	Coppin		no comment	N/A
Steven	Bardwell	S P Bardwell Ltd	This system is fundamentally flawed.	The consultee has not stated why the system is flawed so no further comment can be made
David	Oxford	Lloyds Banking Group		
Stephen Francis	Dewick	Curry Farm		
George	Dixon		The services listed in this table are due to be detrimentally impacted by the large developments already going up in Maldon (Near Morrison's) and Latchingdon.	Comment noted, though in the main growth positively impacts on services and facilties particularly though that need economies of scale to function and prosper.
Douglas	Channer	Private	Regarding Althorne I think the shop needs checking. How that facility was used and may be used now. Also I have no idea where Winterfield Restaurant is in Althorne and do not recall seeing a planning application for a restaurant with that name come forward in Althorne. Perhaps I missed something . Purleigh has a shop , a community shop which has a good stock and supplies essentials. I could not see any reference to that on your spreadsheet. I am not sure driving round is perhaps a good way to do a complete assessment . One would hope that Parish Councils may have been asked for their comments as well ahead of the production of the	The shop and restaurant in Althorne will be rechecked and if they are permanently closed then the points will be removed. The community shop in Purleigh has been counted. Parish Councils were consulted but not all of them responded.
Lynda	Bugg			
Paul	Burgess	None	Arguably the weighting system i.e. 8 points max does not quantify the social benefits of different types of amenity.	The priority of services and facilities was determined by two all Member workshops in June 2021.
D	Cooper			

Question 13

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 13. 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?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
C/O Agent	C/O Agent		• The 'Other retail shops' sections only list 6 stores – an estate agent, fish shop, book store, art, preloved shop and bakery. The section fails to list the butchers store, two clothing shops, doll shop, electronics retail and repair shop or bicycle shop and should be updated to include this. There are also two bakeries located within Tollesbury not one. • The Hairdressers/salon/beauty/private health sections lists two of these facilities as being within Tollesbury, however it is not stated which these are. In any case there are more than 2 facilities which offer these services, and these are: the Emma Brooks wedding shops, which includes make-up services, the Inspired by Beauty with Shae nail salon, the Styled by Samantha hairdresser and the Tollesbury Turkish Barber Shop. • The Dentist section does not list the Finn D Dental Clinic. • Whilst the NHS have advised that the GP surgery does not have capacity for the additional growth, this was in response to a planning application and does not set out the maximum or minimum number of additional patients that the practice could accommodate. This section of the Facilities Study should therefore advise of the capacity of the GP practice and also set out options for expansion. • The cycle routes section does not make reference to the cycle routes available through the Nature	Dentist noted. Hair and beauty and the wedding shop noted and points amended. Capacity of facilities is not a matter which the Rural Facilities Study gives points for it is the fact that a service or facility is in place that counts. Asentence has been added onto the comments section concerning the cycle routes.
Zoe	May	East of England Ambulance Service NHS Trust		
Roger	Woodcock			
Braxted and Blackwater Conservation Grou	BBCG	The Braxted and Blackwater Conservation Group (BBCG)	No comment.	N/A
raymond	dundas	Householder	It appears to paint a rosier picture than actually exists	Comment noted, though the settlement pattern is what is available in terms of services and facilties in the district, it is factual.
John	Watson		We do not consider the point system as an appropriate mechanism for ranking it is outdated and has no bearing to future sustainability, needs or capacity Example ... Latchingdon has 8 allotment spaces all full for many years Access to sports facilities and other services are limited by safe access to them due to absence of pavements etc This leads to them either not being accessibly or requiring car travel that prejudices climate mitigation	The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that.
Josh	Plant	Gladmans		
*	*		4.20 The services and facilities spreadsheet is a useful tool and clearly in terms of the provision of facilities, Southminster scores highest out of all the settlements included by a considerable margin. Furthermore, it has limited environmental constraints, is not subject to any significant flood risk; and, is well served by utilities infrastructure. Again this supports the case for it position within the settlement hierarchy to be elevated	Support noted
*	Willmott		4.18 The settlement pattern is helpful. Stow Maries has been identified as a Hamlet which reflects its scale by comparison to the larger villages within the District. However, in terms of sustainability it does benefit from its close proximity to Cold Norton to the north-east and the Town of South Woodham Ferrers to the south-west. It is also close to the railway stations at South Woodham Ferrers and North Fambridge. This relationship and close proximity of services and facilities mean that it is a sustainable rural location for further growth and should also be considered in line with the policy recommendations set out in paragraph 78 of the NPPF	Stow Maries whilst being close to Cold Norton is quite a distance in terms of being able to walk, with South Woodham Ferrers being even further away with no safe pavement acccess. It has very few services and facilities, its designation as a hamlet would therefore be appropriate.
Ivor	Watson			
*	*			
*	*		4.23. The services and facilities spreadsheet is a useful tool. We have just two comments: 1. It is very welcome that the council have recognised the additional benefits of having multiple services or facilities. This is a more refined approach compared to other assessments we have commented upon and is very welcome as it better distinguishes between the most and least served parts of the district. We strongly recommend that this is continued and not 'simplified' during the process; 2. We are, however, unclear about the basis for the scoring for each type of facility. While the scores may be valid and may stem from other work, it is not clear how the scores have been established and whether this is an officer judgement or whether it has been (for example) based on public comments	The priority of services and facilities was determined by two all Member workshops in June 2021. Scoring was then applied to that based on the priority list of services and facilities. It is carried out blind in that no-one knows what the outcome will be when the list of priorities is set.
*	*		The services and facilities spreadsheet is a useful tool. We have just two comments: i. It is very welcome that the council have recognised the additional benefits of having multiple services or facilities. This is a more refined approach compared to other assessments we have commented upon and is very welcome as it better distinguishes between the most and least served parts of the district. We strongly recommend that this is continued and not 'simplified' during the process; ii. We are, however, unclear about the basis for the scoring for each type of facility. While the scores may be valid and may stem from other work, it is not clear how the scores have been established and whether this is an officer judgement or whether it has been (for example) based on public comments	The priority of services and facilities was determined by two all Member workshops in June 2021. Scoring was then applied to that based on the priority list of services and facilities by officers. It is carried out blind in that no-one knows what the outcome will be when the list of priorities is set.

Question 13

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 13. 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?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
*	*		The services and facilities spreadsheet is a useful tool. However, we are unclear about the basis for the scoring for each type of facility. While the scores may be valid and may stem from other work, it is not clear how the scores have been established and whether this is an officer judgement or whether it has been (for example) based on public comments on which facilities or services they find most and least valuable	The priority of services and facilities was determined by two all Member workshops in June 2021. Scoring was then applied to that based on the priority list of services and facilities. It is carried out blind in that no-one knows what the outcome will be when the list of priorities is set.
*	*		The services and facilities spreadsheet is a useful tool. We have just two comments: 1. It is very welcome that the council has recognised the additional benefits of having multiple services or facilities. This is a more refined approach compared to other assessments we have commented upon and is very welcome as it better distinguishes between the best and least served parts of the district. We strongly recommend that this is continued and not 'simplified' during the process; 2. We are, however, unclear about the basis for the scoring for each type of facility. While the scores may be valid and may stem from other work, it is not clear how the scores have been established and whether this is an officer judgement or whether it has been (for example) based on public comments	The priority of services and facilities was determined by two all Member workshops in June 2021. Scoring was then applied to that based on the priority list of services and facilities. It is carried out blind in that no-one knows what the outcome will be when the list of priorities is set.
*	*		The services and facilities spreadsheet is a useful tool. We have just two comments: 1. It is very welcome that the council has recognised the additional benefits of having multiple services or facilities. This is a more refined approach compared to other assessments we have commented upon and is very welcome as it better distinguishes between the best and least served parts of the district. We strongly recommend that this is continued and not 'simplified' during the process; 2. We are, however, unclear about the basis for the scoring for each type of facility. While the scores may be valid and may stem from other work, it is not clear how the scores have been established and whether this is an officer judgement or whether it has been (for example) based on public comments	The priority of services and facilities was determined by two all Member workshops in June 2021. Scoring was then applied to that based on the priority list of services and facilities. It is carried out blind in that no-one knows what the outcome will be when the list of priorities is set.
*	*			
Ben	Binder	University of Adelaide		
Lorraine	Bailey	Wickham Bishops Parish Council		
Ali	Aldis			
David	Smye	The Maldon Society	No comments	N/A
Stewart	Newlands	Fambridge Lake	North Fambridge will need critical changes to infrastructure to allow for growth particularly road access to the settlement and a village centre for shopping and commercial activities. Civic amenities will need reviewing. Network Rail could be consulted on possible relocation of some of the Southminster line stations if growth and low impact public transport are to be joined up	If North Fambridge is chosen as a location for future growth the level of infrastructure required would be a priority conversation with providers including Network Rail.
Stewart	Newlands	Fambridge Lake	North Fambridge will need critical changes to infrastructure to allow for growth particularly road access to the settlement and a village centre for shopping and commercial activities. Civic amenities will need reviewing. Network Rail could be consulted on possible relocation of some of the Southminster line stations if growth and low impact public transport are to be joined up	If North Fambridge is chosen as a location for future growth the level of infrastructure required would be a priority conversation with providers including Network Rail.
Paula	Stanbury			
Sonia	Whiskin	Financial Services	Need to ensure that sufficient doctors and supermarkets to ensure good prices/competition	The capacity and future growth of GP surgeries lies with the NHS whom the Council consults and works with in order to ensure suffient infrastructure is provided for the District. Supermarkets are a private business and their locations are not in the control of the Council
Geoffrey	Charge	n/a		
Robert	Collins			
Ben	Thornett			
Matthew	Wood	Phase 2 Planning		
Tim	Aves			
Helen	James			
Kathy	Day			
Peter	Wakling			
Sara	Howarth			
Eissa	Leo			
Michele	Williams			
Tara	Strydom			
Jenny	Ball			
Cliff	Baron			
Gill	Winsor	Tesco		
Emily	Benham	Servoca complex care and nursing		
Laura	Cannon			
Shaneen	Illanes			

Question 13

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 13. 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?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Merryl	Quilter		I cant believe you are looking t building 1750 houses in Althorne. Doubling the village. On an already extremely busy road. On a village with no amenities. Therefore needing a car to get anywhere. No schools, where are they supposed to go to school. No doctors. No dentist. On beautiful land. The other side of the village suffers with flooding at the bottom. Are u going to sort this before u build more.	At the present time the Council cannot comment on whether individual settlements can or cannot accommodate future growth.The LDP Review process has to plan for future growth and it will have to be accommodated within the District. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and this was one of the reasons for the Issues and Options Consultation. In the coming months work will be undertaken to make the necessary decision using the evidence prepared as part of the LDP Review work.
Bear	Keen			
Jessica	Cox		Purleigh has been reclassified as a large village, the spreadsheet claims a total of 70 points however on adding the "points total" columns, this only equates to a total of 61 points which makes Purleigh a medium sized village by the council's parameters. How has this been allowed to be published when it hasn't been calculated correctly? Additionally, the spreadsheet claims Purleigh has a purpose built indoor sports facility, which I assume to be the cricket pavilion - this is also classed as a village hall on the spreadsheet. I don't believe it can be classed as both of those things. As far as I am aware, the pavilion is not designed with any specific indoor sports in mind therefore should not be classed as "purpose built" for indoor	The excel spreadsheet will be amended prior to any further publication. The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that.
Robert	Burton			
Yvonne	Wade			
Louise	Bywaters-Smith	Hospitality		
Brooke	Roberts-Morgan			
Patricia	Bunkle			
Marc	Rawinsky	M R Sovereign Services Ltd		
Roger	Tiffn		n/a	N/A
Kathryn	Beighton	Publishing	Unable to find this information	The information is available on the Councils website
Roy	Warren	Sport England		
STUART	SOWTER			
Mark	Raffray		The Rural Facilities Survey and Settlement Pattern (January 2022) contains errors in the points totals presented for each settlement (document pp. 13-15). This has arisen due to a systematic error in the associated Rural Facilities Study spreadsheet; relating to the summed points calculation formula (CH cells in the Excel worksheet). As a consequence the stated points scores are higher than actuals for all settlements, with some artefactual skewing for specific scored elements also apparent for certain of the individual settlements. The rationale behind the scoring and relative weighting applied to the services/facilities/connectivity elements is not fully described nor justified. However, in overall terms it appears to be broadly realistic, apart from a few exceptions where the relative weighting individual elements appear questionable. For instance, the "Connectivity to services (bus) shopper service" is scored as highly as the presence of a railway station in a settlement. This is clearly counter-intuitive. In some small-medium settlements (e.g. North Fambridge) such bus shopper services operate on a very intermittent schedule (nominally 1 service/week). Given its linkage with policy making, and with due regard to the error referenced above, consideration should be given to repeating the assessment based on a more robust survey and weighting methodology. It is encouraging to note that the Facilities Survey does include specific consideration of trends in primary healthcare facility availability in the District (e.g. GP surgeries and pharmacies). Shortfall in primary care facility availability is already an inhibitor to growth, which cannot be addressed solely by transition to virtual rather than physical resources	The excel spreadsheet will be amended prior to any further publication. The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that. Bus services and rail services are both alternative sustainable modes of transport that assist in reducing journey times so it would be appropriate to score them the same in a Rural Facilities Study. Shopper and commuter bus services have been separated out as they are operate for different purposes, with shopper bus services being more intermittant.
April	Rowley			
Bill	Withers			
joanna	jeffery			
John	Mitchell		None	N/A
Peter	Layley			
Rex	Davenport		The phrase "settlements within the District in order of the how sustainable they appear to be" doesn't make much sense to me. The use of the word "appear" suggests a subjective rather than objective view. On the Evidence Review schedule I can't find a number of key infrastructure elements being scored eg. road and public transport access, drainage and sewage treatment capacity, or car parking	The Rural Facilities Study does not score drainage or sewage treatment capacity, those two elements are looked at during site allocations at the next stage of the LDP Review. Public transport is scored with the bus services being noted and whether there is a shopper or commuter bus service in each settlement.
Lesley	Mitchelmore	Danbury Parish Council		
Karen	Neath	Tolleshunt Major Parish Council	Our village of Tolleshunt Major it receives a score of 8 for having employment land. We accept that this may be seen as a positive in terms of the economy for the district as a whole but the employment site (Beckingham Business Park) not only provides no facilities or services to the village but is detrimental to the village in term of traffic and noise. So we would question from what perspective the scoring has been done and what it is trying to show.	The economy is an important strand of sustainability and it therefore has to be a consideration in terms of the Rural Facilities Study. The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that. The impact of facilities that are already there is not a matter which can be taken into consideration in the Rural Facilities study
N	DA			

Question 13

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 13. 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?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Dorreen	Linton	our group consists of adults, playschool and brownies group		
John	Wileman			
Richard	Courtney	University Of East London		
sue	Rawlinson	Evolve	You cannot build houses until there are spaces in the schools that service the area and places at the doctors surgeries. I have a new neighbour who has to drive to Cold Norton every day to take her child to school as our local school is over subscribed. This is totally ignored when housing estates go up. It's so wrong for the environment, for the child, for the parents time and costs and for quality of work/ life balance	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth, the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months.
Douglas	Milsted	Heybridge Basin Conservation Society		
Alan	Outlaw	Self Emplyed	No further comments	N/A
Lindsey	Squire	North Fambridge Parish Council	The Rural Facilities Survey and Settlement Pattern (January 2022) contains errors in the points totals presented for each settlement (document pp. 13-15). This has arisen due to a systematic error in the associated Rural Facilities Study spreadsheet; relating to the summed points calculation formula (CH cells in the Excel worksheet). As a consequence the stated points scores are higher than actuals for all settlements, with some artefactual skewing for specific scored elements also apparent for certain of the individual settlements. The rationale behind the scoring and relative weighting applied to the services/facilities/connectivity elements is not fully described nor justified. However, in overall terms it appears to be broadly realistic, apart from a few exceptions where the relative weighting individual elements appear questionable. For instance, the "Connectivity to services (bus)shopper service" is scored as highly as the presence of a railway station in a settlement. This is clearly counter-intuitive. In some small-medium settlements (e.g. North Fambridge) such bus shopper services operate on a very intermittent schedule (nominally 1 service/week). Given its linkage with policy making, and with due regard to the error referenced above, consideration should be given to repeating the assessment based on a more robust survey and weighting methodology.	The excel spreadsheet will be amended prior to any further publication. The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that. Bus services and rail services are both alternative sustainable modes of transport that assist in reducing journey times so it would be appropriate to score them the same in a Rural Facilities Study. Shopper and commuter bus services have been separated out as they are operate for different purposes, with shopper bus services being more intermittant.
K	Jeffries		Nothing mentioned about A and E	The accident and emergency facilities are in the main towns and they have not been assessed in the Rural Facilities Study because the level of services in these settlements is such that they do not require analysis, this is why they are not mentioned
John	Lakin	?		
Samantha	Weeks		The spreadsheet is already out of date. A more up to date table should be completed. There is no convenience store in Purleigh, only a community shop, no post office. No indoor badminton/squash facilities. Bus service is unrelable and sporadic.	The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that. The services and facilities in Purliegh are going to be looked at again because there is some difference in information supplied this may alter its position in the Settlement Pattern. The community shop though is counted as a shop, who runs it is not relevant to its use
Carlie	Mayes			
Richard	Martin	Scott Properties		
Mike	Spurgeon	Phase 2 Planning and Development		
C/O Agent Mike	Spurgeon	Phase 2 Planning & Development		
Amanda	Mickelsen			
Samuel	Newton	Anglo European School	Purleigh does not have a post office	The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that. The services and facilities in Purliegh are going to be looked at again because there is some difference in information supplied this may alter its position in the Settlement Pattern. The post office has not been counted.
Mary-Ann	Munford			
Jo	Harvey		There is no shop in Althorne. It reopened and then closed shortly after! The Three Horseshoes public house is only open part-time and the Winterfeld Restaurant? Where is that?	The issue of the shop and restaurant is being investigated, the facility would not be removed until alternative planning permission has been granted to take it away permanently or it was obvious it was never going to come back as a facility.
Terry	Fleming		6 banks in Burnham??	Burnham on Crouch is not part of the Rural Facilities Study because it is a town, in the past it may have been included.

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 13. 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?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Philip	Davies		The following facilities shown on the chart is incorrect for Althorne. The General Grocery store and Post Office has been closed. Since the Post Office has closed there is no facility to withdraw cash. There has never been an outside cash dispenser. There is a Farm Shop which includes a Butchers, and Fresh Fish is available several days a week. However, the Farm Shop is on the outskirts of the village and is not within walking distance for most residents. Much of what was available at the Grocery Store is not available at the Farm Shop. The 31X Bus service only serves Lower Althorne, but the largest percentage of residents live in upper Althorne. Most elderly folk residing in Upper Althorne cannot walk up the steep Summer Hill carrying shopping. There is a railway station in Althorne but it is way out of the village and is not served by a bus, and has a small car park.	The issue of the shop and restaurant is being investigated, the facility would not be removed until alternative planning permission has been granted to take it away permanently or it was obvious it was never going to come back as a facility. Out of settlement services and facilities are not normally counted as they cannot be accessed safely. The bus service can be accessed by residents and is within the settlement so has been counted. The railway station is part of the village and can be accessed, it also has a small car park which can be used.
Susan	Cumming	not applicable		
Ronald	Edge	Construction Industry		
Gordon	Mussett	Little Braxted Parish Council		
Ronnie	Tongue	state school		
Sue	Dobson	Essex Bridleways Association		
David	Webb			
Andrew	Marsh	Historic England		
Brian	Haydon			
Hazel	Notley			
Jean	Brown			
Joanne	McGinity			
Stuart	Dedman	Nil		
Kerry	McKenna		Purleigh has been mis-classified as a large village. Purleigh does not have a cafe/restaurants. Purleigh does not have a post office. Purleigh does not have sports club, only changing rooms with toilet facility. Purleigh has a playground. The library bus visits Purleigh 3 weekly not 2 weekly	The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that. The services and facilities in Purliegh are going to be looked at again because there is some difference in information supplied this may alter its position in the Settlement Pattern.
Penny	McCauley	Tiptree dental		
Jane	Phillips	Solicitors	In respect of Althorne, the recently re-opened shop has subsequently closed. The Three Horseshoes Pub now only provides restaurant facilities for 5 days a week. The Dengie Tea Rooms (Winterdale site) is possibly also now closed.	The matter of the shop will need further investigation, a facility is not taken out of the Rural Facilities Study until either planning permission is granted for another use or it is clear that the use has ceased permanently. The restaurant will also have to be investigated. It is possible for both to reopen.
David	Rees		The section on medium sized villages makes specific comment saying that the shop in Althorne had reopened. This is only partially accurate since the shop has now closed and all signage removed. In addition a tearoom ha s closed after a short period of trading. Over the course of the present LDP the village has lost its shop, post office and sorting office. It is, therefore, not possible to purchase even basic provisions without travelling to larger settlements	The matter of the shop will need further investigation, a facility is not taken out of the Rural Facilities Study until either planning permission is granted for another use or it is clear that the use has ceased permanently. The restaurant will also have to be investigated. It is possible for both to reopen.
Darren	Weeks		The following items in the table are incorrect: - There is no dedicated indoor sports facility in Purleigh. Currently shown in the table is '1' for 'Indoor Sport (Purpose built badminton, squash, etc' - this should be '0'. There is no Church Hall in Purleigh, but there is a Village Hall - ' Currently shown in the table is '2' for 'Village Hall/Church Hall' - this should be '1'. - There is no mains gas in Purleigh. Currently shown in the table is ' 10%' - this should be '0%'. - Electricity - frequent (1 or 2 times a week) power cuts - sometimes for significant amounts of time (over 30 minutes, up to several hours). 100% good is shown in the table - this should be reduced. - Water - frequent (average once a month) water service down for up to several hours - often burst water mains. 100% good is shown in the table - this should be reduced.	The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that. The services and facilities in Purliegh are going to be looked at again because there is some difference in information supplied this may alter its position in the Settlement Pattern. The post office has not been counted. Electricity and water supply are not matters addressed in the Rural Facilities Study. At this stage of the LDP Review the main utility infrastructure providers do not get involved in the detail of the process, they will only participate once a growth option is chosen and the potential number of settlements and sites has been reduced from the
Phil	Manning			
Peter	Clack		Yes - see Q12 above Options for Growth should focus on Options 1, 2, 3, 5 or 6 only There is clear evidence of service and facility deterioration from 2008 to 2021. Development prioritisation should therefore be concentrated to the Towns and Larger Villages (only) where these facilities can be built up to better serve all the local community. Plus those places to the North of the District which can be serviced via the A12. Development concentration around the Larger Villages allows a focus for access and infrastructure as well as service and facility provision, thereby enabling the quality of rural life and enjoyment for the remaining areas to the benefit of everyone. A spread and scattering of development dilutes provision and spreads wider impact to the detriment	This consultee response does not relate to the question, checked and the consultee has made the same comments under the appropriate question, which will be responded to
Doug	Lockwood	National Grid	Commitment to new doctors surgery, train station and public transport inc. road network	The LDP has an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which was approved through its examination, infrastructure is agreed with statutory providers such as the NHS and ECC and should be to mitigate the impact of development. Infrastructure is being provided under the terms of S106 legal agreements and will be assessed further as part of the LDP Review work
Sally	George		Cannot be bothered to read it	N/A

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 13. 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?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Vara	Szajkowski		We need to ensure we keep our libraries. They are critical to small communities and they need to be staff by librarians - not local volunteers.	Agreed, it is therefore important to ensure that they are captured in the Rural Facilites Study and that rural services and facilities have strong protection around changing their use and their loss.
Bob	Calver		Burnham on Crouch has three pharmacies. The spreadsheet says none. Such a glaring error undermines the credibility of the spreadsheet. National Westminster Bank has also closed. This information is unreliable.	Burnham on Crouch should not be on the spreadsheet it is a town and is therefore not part of the assessment.
Tessa	Lambert	Natural England	Could the information on the services/facilities available for each settlement incorporate the outcomes of Green Infrastructure mapping?	They could but the evidence in the LDP has to be proportional and the level of work involved is unlikely to alter the settlement pattern and does not add to the information. Green Infrastructure is going to be mapped and is covered by a separate policy in the LDP review, the Council is working to update that information and make sure it is accurate.
Dawn	Howles			
natasha	frith			
Anthony	Bates		Althorne has little or no infrastructure	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth, the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months.
Russell	Howles	WSP	Althorne - there are Youth facilities, including a skate park and a local youth club. Althorne - there is far more than one just one area of open space. Althorne is known for its rural feel and has a fantastic park, a fantastic harbour, a beautiful sea wall, which extends along the length of the Crouch, beaches, orchards and a local area of woodland.	The skate park has not been counted so that has not been added into the assessment. A youth club would only be included if it occurred in a stand alone facility which we believe it does not in Althorne. The public open space for each settlement has only been added where it is believed it is public open space and can be used for some form of recreation.
Gillian	Hollamby			
Brian	Townsend			
Malcolm	Finch		There appear to be a number of reasons for re-classifying the size of Purleigh village. No Post Office, no indoor sports facilities, no mains gas, poor water and electricity services (frequent power outages and issues with water supply)	The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that. The services and facilities in Purliegh are going to be looked at again because there is some difference in information supplied this may alter its position in the Settlement Pattern. The post office has not been counted. Electricity and water supply are not matters addressed in the Rural Facilities Study. At this stage of the LDP Review the main utility infrastructure providers do not get involved in the detail of the process, they will only participate once a growth option is chosen and the potential number of settlements and sites has been reduced from the
Peter	Taylor	Retired		
Chris	Melbourne			
Robert	Hollamby			
Kate	Priest	Purleigh Community Primary School	The following items in the table are incorrect; * There is no mainline gas in Purleigh. * There is no church hall, just a village hall in Purleigh, so this should score 1 not 2. * There is no dedicated indoor sports facility in Purleigh, so this should be 0 not 1. * Electricity in Purleigh is not 100% good, there are frequent power cuts. * Water in Purleigh is not 100% good. There are frequent pipes burst and water mains burst / problems.	The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that. The services and facilities in Purliegh are going to be looked at again because there is some difference in information supplied this may alter its position in the Settlement Pattern. The post office has not been counted. Electricity and water supply are not matters addressed in the Rural Facilities Study. At this stage of the LDP Review the main utility infrastructure providers do not get involved in the detail of the process, they will only participate once a growth option is chosen and the potential number of settlements and sites has been reduced from the
Gary	SPICER			
Helen	Bridge			
Melanie	Allen	Government	Althorne - no shop, no Doctor, no Dentist, no school, no post office, no cash-point. Land is not Sustainable, Sewage issues, flooding, area of outstanding natural beauty Newts in ponds. Planning permissions refused due to sustainability / you can't refuse those applications and then put in one for 1750 houses Housing will not be affordable. The previous application for homes by these landowners was shown to be privately owned but rented - that's not Affordable and refused.	At the present time the Council cannot comment on whether individual settlements can or cannot accommodate future growth or on site specifics. The LDP Review process has to plan for future growth and it will have to be accommodated within the District. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and this was one of the reasons for the Issues and Options Consultation. In the coming months work will be undertaken to make the necessary decision using the evidence prepared as part of the LDP Review work.
Adam	Medlycott		No shop and restaurant in Althorne	The matter of the shop will need further investigation, a facility is not taken out of the Rural Facilities Study until either planning permission is granted for another use or it is clear that the use has ceased permanently. The restaurant will also have to be investigated. It is possible for both to reopen.
Joanne	Maloney		Great Totham comes out particularly badly in terms of shops/pubs etc per capita population	Population is not considered in the Rural Facilties Study because a smaller village in terms of population could have more services and facilties.
Portia	Roelofs			
Lisa	Singh	Direct Call Centres Ltd		

Question 13

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 13. 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?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Kevin	Head		Unlike all other settlements in the spreadsheet, services and facilities in Mayland/Maylandsea are not named. The following should be listed in their respective section: Grocery convenience store - (2) Nisa Local, Londis petrol station shop Other retail shops - (5) Golden Platter Bakery, All Occasions, Cobra Tattoo Shop, Zen Garden Massage Spa, General Freshway's Off-License Pubs/café/restaurant/fast food - (7) The Chip Inn, Imperial Kitchen, Hardy's, Village Cuisine, Zara Mayland, Blackwater Bar & Bistro, The Rickshaw Hairdressers/salon/beauty/private health - (2) Gorgeous, Cut & Dried Village hall/church hall - (2) St Luke's Chapel, Lawling Park Hall As listed above, there are 5 'other retail shops' instead of 4 as listed, and 7 'pub/café/restaurant/food' facilities instead of the 6 listed. The Updated Rural Facilities Study 2021 should be amended to reflect this and this would subsequently raise the overall sustainability score of the settlement, meaning it would be more suited to supporting housing growth than previously considered.	Mayland/Maylandsea is in the assessment. Though the details about their names have not. This has been rectified. The Zen Garden Massage Spa has not been counted, this has been rectified, we have put this under hairdressers/beauty. 2 halls have been noted.
Elizabeth	Sawyer Bayliss			
Michael	Partridge			
Kenneth	Northfield			
Jerry	Petts			
Frederick	McMahon		Need to have a portal for citizens	It is not clear why the Council would need this the consultee has not said, therefore no further comment can be noted.
Tracey	Merritt	Dengie Hounds and Horses	Old Heath Road Southminster is not 15 minutes from train station as shown in Rural Facilities study and Settlement planning document. It is only approx. 2 minutes. It is connected to the larger village of Southminster by a number of foot paths.	The 15 minutes is a maximum amount of time so if a service or facility was over the 15 minutes based on the AA route planner then the settlment would not have got points. Old Heath Road is approximately 5 minutes from the railway station in Southminster so was awarded the points.
Jo	Crump	Servoca Secure Soutions		
Susan	ARCHER			
Winifred	Sutherland			
Chris	clark		Can not get up the updated rural facilities study sheet 2021 as old PC . It only comes up on word. So i guess the council does not want us to read it. Had to get a copy from a friend by the way the spread sheet does not add up someone doing a rush job again. PURLEIGHS NUMBERS ADD UP TO 61 points to us being a MEDIUM VILLAGE like we all new not a LARGE village. By the way Purleigh has no Post Office another mistake just a very small community shop. How many more mistakes	The excel spreadsheet will be amended prior to any further publication. The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that. The services and facilities in Purliegh are going to be looked at again because there is some difference in information supplied this may alter its position in the Settlement Pattern. The post office has not been counted.
Jeremy	Richardson			
Cheryl	Carter	Education		
Susan	Mason			
Melad	Kamlow			
Dave	Draper	The Hartford Insurance Group	There is nor enough infrastructure to support the growth levels being discussed …	The LDP has an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which was approved through its examination, infrastructure is agreed with statutory providers such as the NHS and ECC and should be to mitigate the impact of development. Infrastructure is being provided under the terms of S106 legal agreements and will be assessed further as part of the LDP Review work.
Kevin	Cooper		North Fambridge Church is permanently closed. The D5 "bus service" is operated by Arrow taxis. The service if it sill exists is not well publicised and therefore is likely to be seldom used?	The matter of the church requires further investigation and if it is permanently closing then the points will be removed. No 6 bus runs on alternative Fridays to Chelmsford at 9.48am it does not require booking and can be used as a shoppers bus service.
Katherine	Whitehouse			
Linda	Soul		Firstly, Purleigh is showing on the Rural Facilities Study as a large village, as it has accumulated 70 points across the services and facilities, however the amount of points has been wrongly calculated and the total should be much less. This would therefore mean that Purleigh falls into the medium village category. Purleigh has no purpose built indoor sports facility for which it has been awarded points.	The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that. The services and facilities in Purliegh are going to be looked at again because there is some difference in information supplied this may alter its position in the Settlement Pattern. The post office has not been counted.
Robert	Wilson			
Sarah-Jayne	Hunt	SJ Aesthetics LTD	Primary school at capacity, Time to travel to train stations incorrect due to increased road traffic. Part time functioning shop run by volunteers	The capacity of schools is not a matter which is dealt with in the Rural Facilities Study it only focuses on whether there is the facility in the settlement. Time to travel to locations was set using AA route finder so that all journeys were assessed in the same way across every settlement. A part time shop is still a shop which can be accessed by residents and its not relevant who runs a service or facility.

Question 13

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 13. 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?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Jonathan	Hunt		Although there is a grocery convenience store, it is run by local residents who are volunteers. This is not a fully functioning commercial store. Purleigh school is at capacity. Travel time to nearest railway stations is optimistic, as there is only one main road in to and out of Purleigh. Also, traffic in local area has massively increased due to the housing development in Maldon.	The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that. The services and facilities in Purliegh are going to be looked at again because there is some difference in information supplied this may alter its position in the Settlement Pattern. The school has been counted as it is a facility but not its capacity because that is not relevant to the Rural Facilities Study. All drive times were mapped using AA Route Finder so it was a level playing field across all
Deborah	de Boltz	Farleigh Hospice	what a pity you have not included places of worship since in rural areas they provide community services for settlement - without this you do not have a true picture	Churches were counted in the Rural Facilities Study.
Tim	Murphy			
Claire	McGrane		It is incorrect for Althorne. Whilst only completing last year, the shop that you mentioned opening has already closed. We do not have a post office in Althorne We do not have a cashpoint in Althorne The document does not include a key for coding and lack of explanation of points system etc. make it hard to understand why some services score more points than others	The matter of the shop will need further investigation, a facility is not taken out of the Rural Facilities Study until either planning permission is granted for another use or it is clear that the use has ceased permanently. The restaurant will also have to be investigated. It is possible for both to reopen.
Tracey	Munford	NA		
Rowan	Rampersad		Distances to South Woodham Ferrers and Stow Maries is incorrect.	It is not clear what the response means so no further comment can be made
LUKE	MACFARLANE	S A RAVEN	Note the table does not recognise Purleigh has a church.	The church in Purleigh has been counted
Anna	Wombwell	Morris Farm		
Ronald	Owen	Not applicable		
Elizabeth	Johns			
Colin	Day		I disagree with building on green open space outside the settlement boundary	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth, the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months. Unfortunately Maldon as a district has very few brownfield sites and therefore future growth will have to be considered on greenfield land
Natalie	Bradford		Purleigh is incorrectly listed.	The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that. The services and facilities in Purliegh are going to be looked at again because there is some difference in information supplied this may alter its position in the Settlement Pattern
Harriet	Hurst-Smith		No	N/A
Tony	Vanner			
Josie	Vanner			
Tracy	Carroll		No	N/A
Ian	Roberts	N/A		
Tony	Ashton	none		
mandy	SHORT			
Kevin	Money	St. Lawrence Parish Council		
Claire	Udall	1		
Linda	Raffray			
John	Cooper			
Leah	Jewiss		"Indoor Sport (Purpose built badminton, squash, etc)" for Purleigh is showing as 1, but we do not have anything purpose built for indoor sport in Purleigh village. If you're thinking of the cricket pavilion, the cricket does not take place inside - this is covered in outdoor sport. Some sports are played in the pavilion such as table tennis, and village hall such as carpet bowls and dance classes, but these are not purpose built sports facilities. This category should be amended.	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth, the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months.
Elaine	Ketley	South Woodham Ferrers Town Council	N/A	N/A
Ruth	Bull	The Othona Communty		
Mark	Jackson	Mark Jackson Planning		
ann	cutting			
Sharon	Cushen		Purleigh total points is incorrect I think ? wrongly classified.	The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that. The services and facilities in Purliegh are going to be looked at again because there is some difference in information supplied this may alter its position in the Settlement Pattern
Ian	Tooley			

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 13. 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?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Sally	Tokeley		There is no Indoor Sport (Purpose built badminton, squash, etc). Defined as purpose built, there is no facility with this definition There is no Church Hall in Purleigh, only a Village Hall so this should be just a single point. There is no mains gas in Purleigh. There is no fully reliable electricity given the volume of power cuts experienced Main sewage is very limited in the village of Purleigh and the robustness of what is in place is just sufficient for today scale There is only one two way B road out of Purleigh. There have been fatal accidents recorded in recent years. All other routes out the village are single lane. This safety aspect should be captured	The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that. The services and facilities in Purliegh are going to be looked at again because there is some difference in information supplied this may alter its position in the Settlement Pattern. The post office has not been counted. Electricity and water supply are not matters addressed in the Rural Facilities Study. At this stage of the LDP Review the main utility infrastructure providers do not get involved in the detail of the process, they will only participate once a growth option is chosen and the potential number of settlements and sites has been reduced from the whole district. Transport modelling will be carried out it is not a feature of the
Christina	Chan		The points have been added up wrong in the updated spreadsheet. Additionally there has been inclusion of an"indoor sports facility" which does not exist. This would make Purleigh score significantly less than 70 points and thus it should be classified as a Medium Village NOT a Large Village.	The excel spreadsheet will be amended prior to any further publication. The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that. The services and facilities in Purliegh are going to be looked at again because there is some difference in information supplied this may alter its position in the Settlement Pattern. The post office has not been counted.
Tim.	Holdsworth			
Graham	Snow			
Sarah	Packard		There is no indoor purpose built sports facility. There is a village hall and a sports pavillion. The pavillion has changing rooms and a kitchen that can be used by people participating in outside sports (such as cricket). There is no space / facility for indoor sports.	The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that. The services and facilities in Purliegh are going to be looked at again because there is some difference in information supplied this may alter its position in the Settlement Pattern. The post office has not been counted. Electricity and water supply are not matters addressed in the Rural Facilities Study. At this stage of the LDP Review the main utility infrastructure providers do not get involved in the detail of the process, they will only participate once a growth option is chosen and the potential number of settlements and sites has been reduced from the
Martin	Cook		No	N/A
Clifford	Brown			
Steve	Gallant	Crouch Valley Defence Group		
Lesley	Woodley			
Kirsty	Rowsell			
Philip	Wakeling			
David	Brock			
Niki	Halls			
Stewart	Geden			
Anita	Thomas	Bank		
Andrew	Ashworth			
michael	smith			
Simon	Priest		Electricity is unreliable, there is no mains gas, water mains bursts are not uncommon. There are no indoor sports facilities. There are not 2 Church / village halls.	The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that. The services and facilities in Purliegh are going to be looked at again because there is some difference in information supplied this may alter its position in the Settlement Pattern. The post office has not been counted. Electricity and water supply are not matters addressed in the Rural Facilities Study. At this stage of the LDP Review the main utility infrastructure providers do not get involved in the detail of the process, they will only participate once a growth option is chosen and the potential number of settlements and sites has been reduced from the
Philippa	Marshall			
Lewis	Cook	Form Architecture Ltd.		
EDWARD	GITTINS	Edward Gittins & Associates		
Steve	Williamson			
James	Cowell	E & B R Cowell	n/a	N/A
Colin	Hawkes			

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 13. 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?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Ronald	PIPER		At 4.0 of SP deals with Rural Facilities The village of Purleigh has only very limited public transport ie; busses which are totally inadequate for commuters who need to travel from the village to a main line rail station Chelmsford some 12 miles from the village . This will create even more pollution with motor cars. We have a small village shop run by volunteers. No post office or cash machine. The Village school is totally over subscribed mainly children of parents who commute into the village, more pollution and traffic problems. There are no employment opportunities in the village so more commuters and pollution. No doctors. At 5.2 of SP sets out the basic principles or definitions of a large, medium and small village. The over whelming evidence is that Purleigh fits the definition of a small village and therefor the village of Purleigh should be re-listed as SMALL.	The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that. The services and facilities in Purliegh are going to be looked at again because there is some difference in information supplied this may alter its position in the Settlement Pattern. The post office has not been counted. Electricity and water supply are not matters addressed in the Rural Facilities Study. At this stage of the LDP Review the main utility infrastructure providers do not get involved in the detail of the process, they will only participate once a growth option is chosen and the potential number of settlements and sites has been reduced from the
John	McLarty		The services and facilities are able to demonstrate the type of provision but not the level of usage which is difficult to quantify. Rural Housing is needed to support these services and facilities.	The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that.
John	McLarty		The settlement of Ulting as shown on the Council's "General Services and Facilities Schedule" indicates a lack of facilities, given a population of approximately 171 residents plus some of the 189 employees at Ernest Does & Sons Ltd, locally there is an opportunity as part of future comprehensive development significantly improve local services and facilities.	At the present time the Council cannot comment on whether individual settlements can or cannot accommodate future growth.The LDP Review process has to plan for future growth and it will have to be accommodated within the District. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and this was one of the reasons for the Issues and Options Consultation. In the coming months work will be undertaken to make the necessary decision using the evidence prepared as part of the LDP Review work.
Norman	Branch	N/A	Please see the above answer in question 12.	The Settlement Pattern will be reviewed once the responses on the Issues and Options consultation has been processed. Purleighs services and facilties are going to be reviewed because of a difference in information supplied, this may alter the position in the Settlement Hierarchy. Only one public house has been noted in the assessment. The capacity of the school is not a factor which is taken into account in the Rural Facilities Study it is only the actual facility that is counted.
John	McLarty		The services and facilities are able to demonstrate the type of provision but not the level of usage which is difficult to quantify. Rural Housing is needed to support these services and facilities.	The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that.
James	Clarke			
David	Stilwell			
Ann	Thomas		A number of inaccuracies appear in respect of North Fambridge: There is no nurse for 1 session a week. The church is closed. There is no Post Office, it having reverted to a house. The Phone Box is no longer in service. The weekly shopper bus to South Woodham Ferrers has been discontinued and will in future go to Maldon once a week.	The church is going to be investigated further and if the church is going to close then the points will be removed. No 6 bus goes every other Friday at 9.48 to Chelmsford and does not need a dial up service so it is classed as a shoppers bus service. Nurses coming the settlement would not be counted in the Rural Services Study as the number can vary from week to week. There is no post office or phone box noted.
michael	harris			
Geoffrey	Cox			
John	McLarty		The services and facilities are able to demonstrate the type of provision but not the level of usage which is difficult to quantify. Rural Housing is needed to support these services and facilities.	The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that.
Barrington	Thomas			
Richard	Edwards		The scoring and weighting seems rather arbitary, in particular considerable weight is given to the provision of a shopping bus which in reality may only serve a limited numberof residents once a week, compared to a rail service that serves many more passengers to a regular daily time table	Bus services and rail services are both alternative sustainable modes of transport that assist in reducing journey times so it would be appropriate to score them the same in a Rural Facilities Study. Shopper and commuter bus services have been separated out as they are operate for different purposes, with shopper bus services being more intermittant.
Robyn	Woloszczuk			
Lesley	Speller			
Nicola	O'Dean	Balgores Motors		
Alexander	Romang			
Hayley	Holgate	ECC		
Eirlys	Parry	N/A		
Michael	Unwin	N/A		
Tony	Barber			

Question 13

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 13. 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?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Nick	Mason	ECOClassics	The points have been added up wrong in the updated spreadsheet. Additionally there has been inclusion of an"indoor sports facility" which does not exist. This would make Purleigh score significantly less than 70 points and thus it should be classified as a Medium Village NOT a Large Village.	The excel spreadsheet will be amended prior to any further publication. The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that. The services and facilities in Purliegh are going to be looked at again because there is some difference in information supplied this may alter its position in the Settlement Pattern
Melanie	Osborne	Motor Trade	Yes, Purleigh does not have a post office or a restaurant/cafe. The only bus route is the D1 and D2.	The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that. The services and facilities in Purliegh are going to be looked at again because there is some difference in information supplied this may alter its position in the Settlement Pattern
Stuart	Turner	Essex search and rescue		
Mike	Carpenter	CODE Development Planners Ltd	Largely accept the findings of the Updated Rural Facilities Study and the follow up Rural Facilities Survey and Settlement Pattern of January 2022. The existence, availability and accessibility of existing services and facilities are important criteria for assessing the suitability of individual settlements for further housing growth. The selected services and facilities contained in the Updated Rural Facilities Survey and Settlement Pattern document are an appropriate guide to the suitability of individual settlements. In selecting settlements and the scale of growth it will be important to measure the capacity and viability in each service and facility and to consider how new development could deliver greater stability to those existing services and facilities while, at the same time, deliver new benefits for the sustainability, well being and community life of settlements. In assessing the benefits of development to existing communities it will be appropriate to consider and in some circumstances deliver larger scale forms of development sufficient to deliver viable benefits which smaller constrained sites cannot.	Support noted
ian	wilson	cm36pt		
c/o Agent	c/o Agent			
kelly	tilley		Purleigh has been awarded too many points for the facilities that it has. It has no post office and the small shop is run by volunteers.	The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that. The services and facilities in Purliegh are going to be looked at again because there is some difference in information supplied this may alter its position in the Settlement Pattern
Catherine	Bicknell	Mid and South Essex Health and Care Partnership		
N	Baseley	IBA Planning Ltd		
Sue	White		At present it all seems to be OK, but some facilities are potentially missing, as rural communities are not good at promoting themselves.	Comment noted, any factual comments made through this consultation will be checked and input into the settlement pattern.
Sarah	Yates			
Leonard	Lewis			
R	Minney			
Tim	Grant	Evolution Town Planning		
ANNE	OSBORN	Purleigh Community Shop	Transport is negligible ie buses infrequent and no buses on a Sunday. There are no buses to any of the railway stations. Purleigh Community Shop is run by volunteers and subject to closures. No Post Office.	The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that. The services and facilities in Purliegh are going to be looked at again because there is some difference in information supplied this may alter its position in the Settlement Pattern. The community shop is classed as a shop it is not relevant who runs it
Stephen	Hodgkinson		We agree with MDC's assessment of services and facilities in Latchingdon.	Support noted
c/o Agent	c/o Agent	Maldon Wick Limited		
ZOE	HOSTY			
S	Swain			
Kevin	Coleman	Phase 2 Planning		
John	Lawrence		n/a	N/A
Diane	Wallace			
Jonathan	Aldis	Good life Countryside Services		
Grace	Godwin			
Sue	Hillman			
michael	carr	NHS		

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 13. 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?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Simon	Plater	Plater+Claiborne	For Tollesbury: Under recycling - there is a fabric collection, and a general waste collection with the other recycling mentioned (i.e. one Saturday a fortnight) Under pubs/cafe etc. we have three clubs which have bars/restaurants - the Sailing Club, the Cruising Club (which includes Harbour View) and the British Legion. Under Village Hall/Church Hall - Tollesbury has four halls available for hire - The Pavilion, the Parish Rooms, The Centre (in the. Congregational church) and the Activities Centre on Woodrolfe Road. Under public open spaces the Parish Council owns three - the Recreation ground which is included on the spreadsheet, Hasler Green and Woodrolfe Green. Under Industrial or Business Park, Beckingham Business Park (third largest in the District) should be added. Proximity to other settlements - should the distances to Chelmsford city and Colchester be shown? Both are used for shopping, cinema, restaurants etc. There are pupils in secondary schools in Colchester. Local wildlife sites - Essex Wildlife Trust and RSPB. There are two burial grounds - one at St Mary's Church and the other run by the Parish Council at the west end of the village. Tollesbury is unique in having a saltwater amenity pool, used by the village and the District. Tollesbury also has a thriving marina, and an extensive area of mud berthing.	Recycling and pubs/cafes will need to be rechecked they are different from the assessment. Halls have been updated. Public Open Space has only been counted where it is public amenity area so there is only 1 at the moment the main area in the village. Beckingham Business Park is in Tolleshunt Knights so would not be counted, there is already the main employment area counted in the assessment. General distances have not been shown the Council has taken a 15 minute drive time as a reasonable distance and used it to measure distance to a main town, railway station and allocated employment area. Burial grounds have not been counted though churches as a community facility have. The swimming pool may have been missed out of the assessment so that will be investigated.
Mark	Anderson			
Karen	Wellum			
Emma	Wright			
Linda	Coom		Unable to view on my iPad, many cells just had a symbol.	The Council has undertaken a learning exercise from the experience of this consultation and will, if necessary be making changes to future consultations. However, digital consultation is the way the Government is moving in regard to engaging with the planning system. The Council will always offer ways for those without digital acccess to engage with any consultation as we did with the Issues and Options Consultation where residents could telephone in with their comments.
Caitlin	Soul		The Rural Facilities Study 2021 spreadsheet seems to have been wrongly calculated and most of the totals should be changed. Also some of the facilities/services showing for Purleigh are incorrect, one in particular is that the village does not have a purpose built indoor sports hall.	The excel spreadsheet will be updated prior to any further publication. The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that. The services and facilities in Purliegh are going to be looked at again because there is some difference in information supplied this may alter its position in the Settlement Pattern.
Michelle	Curtis	Tollesbury Parish Council	For Tollesbury Recycling - there is a fabric collection and a general waste collection with other recycling mentioned (i.e. one Saturday a fortnight) Under Village Hall/Church Hall - Tollesbury has four halls available for hire - The Pavilion, the Parish Rooms, The Centre (in the Congregational Church) and the Activity Centre on Woodrolfe Road Industrial or Business Park, Beckingham Business Park (third largest in the District) should be added. Proximity to other settlements - should the distances to Chelmsford City and Colchester be shown? Both are used for shopping, cinema, restaurants etc. There are pupils in secondary schools in Colchester. Local wildlife sites - Essex Wildlife Trust and RSPB. There are two burial grounds - one at St Mary's Church and the other run by the Parish Council at the west end of the village. Tollesbury is unique in having a saltwater amenity pool used by the village and the district. Pubs/Restaurants should include two sailing clubs and the British Legion. No mention of a marina. Shops - no longer Pre-Loved shop but is now a Paddleboard shop. A small weekly market developing which include the Cheese & Pie Stall, The Refill Den (zero -waste - dry goods it rice. spices etc), fish	Recycling and pubs/cafes will need to be rechecked they are different from the assessment. Halls have been updated. Public Open Space has only been counted where it is public amenity area so there is only 1 at the moment the main area in the village. Beckingham Business Park is in Tolleshunt Knights so would not be counted, there is already the main employment area counted in the assessment. General distances have not been shown the Council has taken a 15 minute drive time as a reasonable distance and used it to measure distance to a main town, railway station and allocated employment area. Burial grounds have not been counted though churches as a community facility have. The swimming pool may have been missed out of the assessment so that will be investigated. Markets have not been counted.
Mary	Hammond			
Ian	Drinkwater		there is no village shop at the moment	We believe this comment relates to Althorne. The shop has closed and it will be investigated as to whether this is permanent or not, if it is then the settlement will not get points for a shop.
john	hand	N/A		
Emma	Smith	Bradwell on Sea Parish Council	Bradwell on Sea does not have an allotment site. Bradwell on Sea is in an area predominantly of Sites of Special Scientific Interest, Marine Protection and is a unique area of saltmarsh and marine conservation importance.	The issues of the allotments will have to be investigated further and if necessary the points will be removed.
Tim	Dixon		Referring to Cold Norton where I live, a bus service that runs on alternate Fridays or needs to be booked 2 hours in advance is hardly a bus service, hence why I have never used a bus in the 24 years I have lived there. Indeed I don't know anyone who has!	Checked the bus services the No 6 and the No 3 run on alternative Fridays to Chelmsford and can be used as a shoppers bus service there is no mention of them having to be pre booked.
Nicola	Taylor	Elixirr		
Graham	Johnson	graham v johnson		
Chris	Yates			
Sally	Everritt	Community360		
Mark	Garrett			
Paul	Vidler			
Victoria	Long			

Question 13

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 13. 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?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Victor	Staines		We have no sports facilities We have a community led shop with no post office	The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that. The services and facilities in Purliegh are going to be looked at again because there is some difference in information supplied this may alter its position in the Settlement Pattern
Jayne	Moore	Essex County Fire and Rescue Service		
Kevin	Bennett			
Nicholas	Matthams		Why are some village recreation grounds classed as a POS and others not? Is there a full breakdown of the awarded points for each village so villagers can verify?	There is an excel spreadsheet on the Councils website with a breakdown of points this will be updated in due course. The public open space is only shown where it is an area which can be accessed for recreational purposes, small pieces of green space have not been counted
Christian	van Stolk	RAND Europe		
Nicholas	Jepson		Notes on Little Braxted: the comment that the Green Man is a long way from the main settlement fails to reflect that this is a spread out parish/hamlet with a small number of houses and businesses near the river and church and the majority within 300m of the pub. The bus route (90) clips the top of the village next to the Wickham Bishops war memorial and would be more usable if the roads were not so dangerous to walk along with no pavement or traffic slowing 20mph zones	The service or facility has to be able to be accessed safely by residents so pubs outside settlements with no pavement to them have not been considered. A bus service has not been counted because it is outside of the settlement.
Pamela	Lacey			
Chloe	Soul			
carole	kirk			
Sharon	Jackson		Looking at the facilities claimed for Althorne on the Master sheet:- There is no key to the Annotations i.e. (1) etc, however There is No cash point/ATM. There is no Grocery Store, the shop does not appear to be trading and is a front for a another unrelated business. There is no Post office. There is no working Phone Box There is no Restaurant, and the Cafe at Winterdale is currently closed but expected to reopen. There is a public Open Space/Recreation Ground	The matter of the shop will need further investigation, a facility is not taken out of the Rural Facilities Study until either planning permission is granted for another use or it is clear that the use has ceased permanently. The restaurant will also have to be investigated. It is possible for both to reopen. The settlement has a bus service which residents can access if they wish to do so. Cash points and phone boxes are not counted. The public open space has been counted.
RICHARD	GROUT			
Charles	Bishop			
Paul	Jewiss	Self Employed		
Deborah	Anderson	NHS		
John	Pilgrim	Self employed		
Gloria	Gold	London Design and Engineering UTC		
Linda	Curry			
Lucy	Waterhouse			
Jon	Mayhew		Facilities are not accurately represented in the spreadsheet. No indoor sports hall, small community run shop rather than a general store. I do not reach the same total of 70 when adding up the points allocated even as is.	The excel spreadsheet will be updated prior to any further publication. The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that. The services and facilities in Purliegh are going to be looked at again because there is some difference in information supplied this may alter its position in the Settlement Pattern
James	Goody	James Goody refurbishments		
Johanna	Dale		As is noted on the form the church in North Fambridge is going to close. I note that villages on the Crouch Valley Line get quite a few points for their railway stations. I don't object to this but I do think that there needs to be a more nuanced understanding of the line. It is great if you want to get into London, but outside of London commuters it gets very little use because it does not effectively connect the villages with stations to other centres in the district or county. Thanks to the pandemic I now rarely have to go to work in London, but I make at least 12 return car journeys in and out of North Fambridge every week. Therefore developing along the branch line is not as sustainable in terms of transport as it first appears and any development in these villages must be supported by the introduction of improved infrastructure linking residents to places they actually want to travel, rather than just to London.	The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that. The study does not assess capacity as this could change on a weekly basis. The matter of the church will be investigated.
Tracy	Kinnane		Purleigh is not a large village , we do not have enough inforstructure to make it	The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that. The services and facilities in Purliegh are going to be looked at again because there is some difference in information supplied this may alter its position in the Settlement Pattern
Carlos	Rodriguez			
Rebecca	Tucker		Reread your spreadsheet adding and info. We read as a medium village. Our facilities are very small/limited.	Comment noted though it is not clear which settlement is being referred to
Mark	Faraway		No	N/A
T	Ketteley			

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 13. 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?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Elizabeth	Weston			
Jacky	Barber			
Ursula	Benjafield		Shop closed again. Serious GP capacity issues. Rail access is branch line with no late return from London. 31 bus service to Maldon and Chelmsford only easily available to 20% of village in north. No service Sundays and bank holidays or return home between 19.00-23.00. Only safe access to rail station by car - Fambridge Rd traffic too heavy (5000 vehicles each way each day), too fast even at 40mph and many drive much faster, too narrow for HGVs, places where they need to drive on footpath to pass, footpaths too narrow, police and MDC Community Protection Officers can't do speed checks as too dangerous, ECC Highways Rangers can't fix footpaths and hedges, Shopper bus takes most of day. doesn't run school holidays or bank holidays, No bus to Maylandsea ind/business park,	The matter of the shop will need further investigation, a facility is not taken out of the Rural Facilities Study until either planning permission is granted for another use or it is clear that the use has ceased permanently. The restaurant will also have to be investigated. It is possible for both to reopen. The settlement has a bus service which residents can access if they wish to do so. Cash points and phone boxes are not counted. The public open space has been counted.
Paul	Mitchell			
Kristian	Tokeley	CTC Construction Ltd	The following items in the table are incorrect:There is no dedicated indoor sports facility in Purleigh. Currently shown in the table is '1' for 'Indoor Sport (Purpose built badminton, squash, etc' - this should be '0'. There is no Church Hall in Purleigh, but there is a Village Hall - ' Currently shown in the table is '2' for 'Village Hall/Church Hall' - this should be '1'. There is no mains gas in Purleigh. Currently shown in the table is ' 10%' - this should be '0%'. Electricity - frequent (1 or 2 times a week) power cuts - sometimes for signi ficant amounts of time (over 30 minutes, up to several hours). 100% good is shown in the table - this should be reduced. Water - frequent (average once a month) water service down for up to several hours - often burst water mains. 100% good is shown in the table - this should be reduced.	The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that. The services and facilities in Purliegh are going to be looked at again because there is some difference in information supplied this may alter its position in the Settlement Pattern. The post office has not been counted. Electricity and water supply are not matters addressed in the Rural Facilities Study. At this stage of the LDP Review the main utility infrastructure providers do not get involved in the detail of the process, they will only participate once a growth option is chosen and the potential number of settlements and sites has been reduced from the
Ziyad	Thomas	Churchill Retirement Living / McCarthy Stone		
James	Campbell	HMPPS		
William	Moss			
Simon	Mackenzie Smith			
Richard	Udall			
Rosalind	Bishop			
John	Symington			
Michael	Manning		My comments refer to the Cold Norton Area covering CN1, CN2, CN3, CN4, CN5, CN6, CN7 and PUR1 and the notes in the spreadsheet. Generally the facilities are overstated. 1. There is no supermarket in Cold Norton. There is a Londis convenience store that cannot be described as a supermarket. 2. There are not any Post Office facilities in Cold Norton. The last facility in the forerunner of the Londis store closed several years ago. 3. In relation to the utilities, Cold Norton does not have any gas main, gas being supplied by expensive Calor Gas or similar. Furthermore, electricity supplies seem to be stretched as witnessed by several power outages. 4.Other facilities are limited to a pub, convenience store, pre-school nursery and an oversubscribed primary school. 5. There is no surgery in or near the the village. The nearest surgeries are in Maldon and South Woodham Ferrers. SWF surgeries are oversubscribed and consider Cold Norton to be outside their catchment area. Maldon surgeries are also oversubscribed and have caused patients to be allocated to Witham surgeries. 6. CN5: St Stephens Road between Fambridge Road and the western corner near the old railway line is single track and vehicles have to use the verge to pass one another. This will need widening to a full two lane road to avoid accidents due to the additional traffic. Furthermore, the proposed housing will result in higher rainwater run-off which will overload the drains in Burnham Avenue. 7. PUR1: The footpath between the proposed site and the bridge over the old railway line is narrow due to overgrowth and lack of maintenance by, presumably, the Highway Authority. This means that parents will not be able to safely walk their children to school along a road where the 40mph speed limit is ignored; they will have to add to the car traffic for the short trip to school.	The Council cannot respond on site specifics at this stage of LDP Review. Work on site allocations will be undertaken in the coming months with a Preferred Options consultation being carried out at the end of this period. The Londis is noted in the assessment already. There is no post office noted in the assessment. Utilities are not taken into consideration in the Rural Facilities Study because they are part of the next phase of the LDP Review and they will only interact with the Council once the number of settlements and sites has been reduced down through the options for growth work.
Jack	Inglis	Kelvedon Hall		
Peggy	Shields			
Dawn	Adams	Catesby Estates		
Wayne	Tilley	RTG Group Limited	I do not believe that Purleigh should be classed as a large village i can only calculate 60 points. please can I ask you to recalculate	The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that. The details will be checked as part of the response to this consultation
David	Dronfield	Braxted park		
John	Peirson			
Ron	Brown	Corporate	Not suitable	N/A
Roger	HAWES			

Question 13

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 13. 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?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Anne	Hull	Elmwood Equestrian Centre	More bridle ways please	Comment noted, though bridle ways do not relate to this question.
Matthew	Bloxham	Matt		
Julia	Morris			
Amanda	MacKenzie			
Jenny	Shepherd			
Jack	Ellum			
Bernard	Steeples			
Anna	mccomb	NHS Property Services Ltd		
Natalie	Kermath	Environment Agency		
Peter	Knights		There are also inaccuracies in the description of the sites in the Parish included in the evidence, this has given an overly inflated score placing Purleigh in the large village band width.	The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that. The services and facilities in Purliegh are going to be looked at again because there is some difference in information supplied this may alter its position in the Settlement Pattern.
Unknown	Unknown	Ministry of Defence		
Duncan	Clark			
Patricia	Smith			
Mick	Sargeant		Some graduation within the points is called for in some way within the classification. The Points total in cell CH45 should be 42 not 49 Why are the CT to CX boxes not completed Mobile reception should be added. In Goldhanger it is poor at best and nothing indoors which makes 2 part authentication very difficult C24 Never a shop, display set up for Golden Jubilee AI24 Why not 5 points AN24 Why not 5 points BE24 Is this double counting of the playing field ? BP24 suggest clarify 5 buses/day M-F BT24 8 points is disproportionate 4? BY24 5 points is disproportionate 2? Settlement narrative 5.10, there is no recycling point. The Parish council considers that Goldhanger is a Small Village at 42 points even before reductions as	The excel spreadsheet will be updated when it is next published online. A shop has not been noted for Goldhanger. Village hall points have been amended to 5 from 6 this was an error. Nursery points amended to 5. There is an outdoor sports field and a childrens play area in Goldhanger so both have been counted separately. There is a shoppers bus service to Maldon all settlements with a shoppers bus service got the same points and the same is the distance from allocated employment sites, this is so we have a level playing field when it comes to the assessment. It is a baseline assessment and not based on proportionality.
John	Cockerell	Hatfield Peverell Parish Council		
Catherine	Williams	C/O Savills (Agent)		
Tom	Kelly			
Linda	Gemmill			
Linda	Gemmill			
Mark	Norman	Highways England		
Thomasin	Foster			
*	*			
Alan	Massow			
*	*			
Ian	Butt			
Sarah	Sayer			
*	*			

Question 14

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 14. Do you agree with the approach set out above for major infrastructure projects?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Jenny	Clemo	Langford & Ulting Parish Council	Specific approach for major infrastructure projects not clear.	The Council is considering having a major infrastructure projects policy because there are a number of national strategic projects which cover the District and the Council should be able to set out in policy terms its approach to these. Some of them like Bradwell B may not happen in the life of the Plan but then again they might so instead of spreading the policy throughout the plan it will be contained in one place only to be activiated in decision making if needed.
Gavin	Rowsell		Every single application, small, medium or large should be evaluated on the same basic criteria, but it is useful to have a separate 'major infrastructure policy' to guide those decisions.	Support noted
Gareth	Davies	N / A	The potential development of Bradwell B must be covered as there is a good opportunity (if the Council is prepared) to secure needed new infrastructure in the District.	Support noted
Jackie	Gibbs			
Mike	Hayes			
David	Sismey			
Stuart	Willsher	Persimmon Homes Essex		
Anthony	Fittock		The statements is based upon potentially doubtful information. In November 21 the statement was 4.90 years in part due to a backlog in previous years. It is also fact that the 3.26 years has now been proven wrong and should have stated 3.78. That said if major developers have provided evidence that they cannot meet targets moving forwards then there is an argument for smaller developers to be used.But within a strategic plan that clearly identifies delivery timeframes of rwequired Infrastructure to support the development. Looking at the data available the failure to supply is based upon a statement at a point in time that has not been robustly explained and in part due to deficit in the early years. In terms of strategy options a recognition of current Infrastructure deficiencies might be prudent so that the most effective strategy option can be selected that prevents an expansion of the deficit and indeed reverses it would be prudent.	The major infrastructure policy would not be connected to the delivery of housing other than as a statutory accompanyment to an NSIP where the amount of housing is limited.
Daniel	McAllister	Robert Mulholland And Company Limited		
Sarah	Sapsford		I feel smaller sites spread around the district would be more sustainable, palatable and create more local jobs, have better design and enable more community engagement. Large sites as we have seen (and proposed on some villages with little or no facilities) has not worked particularly well.	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. National planning policy does now advocate that at least 10% of the sites allocated should be on smaller sites of land less than 1.0 hectare, this provides choice for the housing market.
Stephanie	Ireland		Housing should be limited now until there is data to show a need from within the existing community and a clear demonstration that those people will be able to afford what is built. Effective use of land- although brownfield sites are limited when areas do become available they should be allocated for housing or infrastructure rather than retail, particularly hospitality retail that already has outlets in the town.	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced, therefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months. The district does not have a history of industrial land use so there is limited brownfield land opportunities. When carrying out site allocations, brownfield land should be prioritised in the settlements chosen for growth.
e	e	e	Yes I think we should have a major infrastructure project policy ready for Bradwell B. I think it should be capable of use for any other major infrastructure project too, in case this District is allocated anything else.	Support noted
Kevin	Lagan		it needs delivery.	This policy would only be activated in decision making if the major infrastructure project came forward, other than that it would not be needed.
Bethany	Jones	Colchester Borough Council	Given the status of the Bradwell B Nuclear Power Station is currently unknown, it may be appropriate to include a mechanism to undertake a Plan Review in the event permission is granted; as this will likely have a significant impact across the District, beyond what can be addressed through one major infrastructure project policy. Response is subject to call in until 15 March.	Comment noted, but Maldon District is not the decision maker for Bradwell B and therefore this policy would only be activated in decision making if the major infrastructure project came forward, other than that it would not be needed. The decision to review the plan would be taken if it was felt necessary if the power station came forward.
magnus	Magnusson	Parker Planning Services		
Nick	Whiteley			
Linda	Flowers	Self Employed		
Peter	Holmes			
Colin	Pryke			

Question 14

John	Hitcham		My clear preference is OPTION 4 - Pepper pot growth throughout the Settlement Hierarchy (Spread the growth across all the sustainable settlements in the District) as it will enable multigeneration families to remain living in the same settlement, thereby building social cohesion. However this has to be dependent upon funding forward availability of required enabling infrastructure. With LDP I, one of the big flaws was the late availability of infrastructure well behind the housing build out rate. One reason for this was that there was a legacy shortfall of infrastructure in most settlements, small developments were exempt from contrubuting (which led to salami slicing of developments to avaoid making any contribution and MDC completely flunked the introduction of CIL which had been presented to PINs as an integral enabler for LDP I. Pepper Pot growth should to some degree make the provision of infrastructure kess challeging. It will also help greatly in terms of growing local jobs for local people	The respondants comments do not relate to the question, however, the present LDP has an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which was approved through its examination, infrastructure is agreed with statutory providers such as the NHS and ECC and should be to mitigate the impact of development. Infrastructure is being provided under the terms of S106 legal agreements and will be assessed further as part of the LDP Review work. The matter in the majority of cases is not that infrastructure has not been provided but that its trigger points such as the number of homes completed has not been reached. This matter is monitored carefully and contributions pursued as they become liable.
Richard	Kelly	Croudace Homes	Whilst we agree with the Council introducing a major infrastructure project policy into the Review, this should cover a wider range of potential projects which could include the improvements to the B1012 between Southminster and Burnham-on-Crouch to create better links to the wider strategic road network. Other works should also include the delivery of a pedestrian / cycle link between South Woodham Ferrers to Stow Maries and Cold Norton running along the section of disused railway.	The policy only covers NSIPs if they come forward not smaller scale developments, so it would cover the A12 widening scheme. Smaller more local highway infrastructure projects should if they are necessary for growth be covered in the Councils IDP.
Andy	Quelch		I would recommend option 1 also please see comments in question 15	This question does not refer to the growth options so no further comment can be made.
James	Rushton		I agree with the range of options - but I remain concerned, as expressed in relation to Q13 above, that determining what defines a "sustainable" settlement needs to be looked at afresh. The existing data is likely not to be accurate. Making decisions for housing growth policy outside the major centres - ie in the medium or smaller villages - is extraordinarily sensitive, and needs to be based upon transparently accurate and secure information and thinking. I am also concerned with the lack of provision / forward thinking within major infrastructure projects as regards healthcare and education etc etc.	The respondants comments do not relate to the question, however, the Rural Facilities Study is an up to date piece of work and any comments which relate to its contents in terms of accuracy and specific details will be looked at as part of the response to the Issues and Options Document.
Catherine	Champion			
Terence	Hughes	Burnham-on-Crouch constituent	The increased population along the Woodham Ferres to Southminster line would be a disaster as the increased motorised traffic would be counteracting the aim of reducing emissions. Only people who can get jobs near railways would use the train. The trains are already full in rush hours with London workers. The time necessary to get to work by train to South East Essex is horrendous and would make a car necessary. Option 5, a satellite town is the most sensible as the infrastructure would have to be put in place before the housing is built. Burnham-on-Crouch cannot take any more increase in population without massive investment in services and infrastructure.	The respondants comments do not relate to the question so no further comment can be made.
John	Tompkins		It is surely inconceivable that a major review of the LDP should be silent on major infrastructure projects as these will be the driver for highways, employment, housing, education and healthcare. Having a policy that allows additional projects to be included at a later date will safeguard the District's position on such developments.	Support noted
Jeremy	Potter	Chelmsford City Council	It is recognised in the Issues and Options document that progress and timing for the Bradwell B proposed new nuclear power station is currently unknown, but that it could have a significant impact on policy formulation for the eventual Local Plan. The City Council supports the approach of proposing a major infrastructure policy, and encourages the LDP to remain agile and flexible to changing circumstances as the Bradwell proposals develop, due to the potential for significant impacts on the City Council's area.	The Council is considering having a major infrastructure projects policy because there are a number of national strategic projects which cover the District and the Council should be able to set out in policy terms its approach to these. Some of them like Bradwell B may not happen in the life of the Plan but then again they might so instead of spreading the policy throughout the plan it will be contained in one place only to be activiated in decision making if needed. The Council is not the decision maker in regards to Bradwell B site.
Daniel	Goodman	Rochford District council		
Chris	Harvey			
Jane	Senior			
Amanda	Clack		Options for Growth should focus on Options 1, 2, 3, 5 and 6 Bradwell B is a major blight on the District and should be considered against the ability to provide green energy provision such as off-shore wind or solar. The Dengie cannot sustain the provision and the wider impacts that this brings with it. It should be resisted at all costs. The District Council also needs to be more proactive in the increasing air traffic associated with planes flying low over our Towns and Villages, particularly Burnham-on-Crouch and those in the vicinity.	The Council is considering having a major infrastructure projects policy because there are a number of national strategic projects which cover the District and the Council should be able to set out in policy terms its approach to these. Some of them like Bradwell B may not happen in the life of the Plan but then again they might so instead of spreading the policy throughout the plan it will be contained in one place only to be activiated in decision making if needed. The Council is not the decision maker in regards to Bradwell B site.

Question 14

Daphne	Scott		Option 7: Focus growth along the rail line to Althorne, North Fambridge and Southminster is the worst option. Although there has been a lot of development in Southminster this has created a great deal of stress on Burnham-on-Crouch owing to the lack of facilities within Southminster, particularly the lack of secondary school places that has resulted in children having to be bused many miles away to find school places, which can result in children losing the benefit of the support and companionship of their primary school friends and being tired and fractious after experiencing a long day commuting to schools far away from their homes. Although he village of Althorne has a railway station, this is a branch line that runs to Wickford with only a few commuter trains running into London. There is no train service directly to any of the surrounding major towns such as Maldon, Chelmsford or Basildon. There is very little industry within the Dengie which means that the majority of people who would come to live in Althorne would have to commute out by car along the B1010 road, the main road off of the Dengie peninsular, which is still a small country road that was never built to handle the volume or size of vehicles that it currently handles, which lead to levels of car journeys that the Government is seeking to reduce in light of the problems with climate change. It should also be noted that Althorne station is very close to the River Crouch and looking at the maps showing expected ocean and river levels by 2050 (and possibly before as scientist now believe global warming is more advanced than previously thought) the train line running through to South Woodham Ferrers will at some time in the future be under water for a significant extent together with some of the roads exiting the Dengie. It would not be acceptable to build houses in an area where commuting and potentially the housing would be at risk of serious flooding our permanently under water and the cost of building up the sea defences may be prohibitively high.	This question does not refer to the growth options so no further comment can be made.
Kenny	Alexander	Thomas Gainsborough School	Appreciate that there is a need to meet national expectations, however there needs to be appropriate sites for the sites planned, not just relying on computer algorithms.	It is not clear what the respondent means and therefore no further comment can be made.
David	Kennedy		As stated earlier the very specific and particular characteristics of the district means that public transport will never be the total answer to motility for both work and pleasure. Focusing development in the already gridlocked major conurbations of the district without significant improvement and upgrade to the road network will only serve to exacerbate this situation. Give that Highways is the remit of the County Council and beyond the control of MDC it makes greater sense to either pepper new developments around the district to spread the increase in traffic or to develop a significant new road Village which would bring with it new road infrastructure by virtue of its scale.	The respondent has not responded to the question so no further comment can be made.
Mark	Behrendt	Home Builders Federation		
Matthew	Cooper		It will be important to ensure that options for future development are not made and pursued now on the assumption that a major infrastructure project (i.e. Bradwell B) will proceed. Such an option should only be pursued once the major infrastructure project is fully agreed.	The Council is considering having a major infrastructure projects policy because there are a number of national strategic projects which cover the District and the Council should be able to set out in policy terms its approach to these. Some of them like Bradwell B may not happen in the life of the Plan but then again they might so instead of spreading the policy throughout the plan it will be contained in one place only to be activiated in decision making if needed. The Council is not the decision maker in regards to Bradwell B site.
Terry	Inkpen	None	Whoever wrote the paper for this question is to be congratulated on a very candid appraisal of the issues with the current LDP and the options for resolving them. It prompts the approach that whatever option is chosen we should first try to minimise the extra land requirement by speeding up the house delivery on the sites originally approved in the 2017 LDP. No doubt the sites are currently controlled and possibly owned by developers who have at best, no incentive to increase the rate of construction. Can a plan be developed to gain back control of some areas the deficient sites and release them to to smaller construction companies in small lots, with a 'time is the essence' built into all new contracts? Lessons must be learned to ensure that if more land is approved for planning applications we do not end up in the same situation again in 5 year's time.	It is not possible legally to gain control over land already being developed, sites are coming forward albeit slower than previously predicted.
christine	collins		Land that has already been allocated for housing development should be completed first .	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced, therefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months.
Stuart	Williams	Ace group		

Question 14

Reegan	Howles		Section 12.3 highlights how: ' 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' I take issue with the argument that a lack of rural housing is failing to support transport provision. To suggest that adding MORE houses to small villages like Althorne will somehow improve transport is nonsense, with these country roads already struggling to cope with existing demand. to say it 'could' lead to a loss of services and facilities is hypothetical conjecture designed to help drive the narrative of developers.	At the present time the Council cannot comment on whether individual settlements can or cannot accommodate future growth.The LDP Review process has to plan for future growth and it will have to be accommodated within the District. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and this was one of the reasons for the Issues and Options Consultation. In the coming months work will be undertaken to make the necessary decision using the evidence prepared as part of the LDP Review work. Rural transport provision and economic growth does to a degree require the population to grow so that it supports growth in these two areas, this means housing growth.
jasbir	Singh		Selecting the right sites with the correct infrastructure is key. Considering sites in small villages like Althorne are not right.	At the present time the Council cannot comment on whether individual settlements can or cannot accommodate future growth.The LDP Review process has to plan for future growth and it will have to be accommodated within the District. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and this was one of the reasons for the Issues and Options Consultation. In the coming months work will be undertaken to make the necessary decision using the evidence prepared as part of the LDP Review work.
Janice	Jackson		Reduce your housing target.	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced, therefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months.
Roy A	Clare	Charities	Option 5 ought to be central driver. Especially taking a 20 year view. Infrastructure is more likely to be timely and sufficient if that option is followed - including a secondary school. Option 5 also works well with Options 6 and 7.	This consultee response does not relate to the question, checked and the consultee has made the same comments under the appropriate question, which will be responded to
Felicity	Gale		I would like to see housing reduced in the small villages and placed in areas that have existing infrastructure, Chelmsford or Witham.	This consultee response does not relate to the question, checked and the consultee has made the same comments under the appropriate question, which will be responded to
Lindsey	Wright			
David	Hill	Dandara Ltd		
Steven	Potter			
Vysian	Banyard	TKPC		
Diane	Carter			
Luke	Garrett	Obsidian Strategic Asset Management Ltd	Do not wish to comment.	Noted
Robin	Fanshawe			
John	Brown			
Chris	Waumsley	Inovo Consulting		
Phil	Jacklin		Bradwell B in particular would have a huge impact on traffic into and out of the Dengie.	It is not known at this stage how Bradwell B will progress, therefore no further comment can be made.
Robert	Jones	The University of Reading	There is no case - moral or practical - for adopting a soft approach to developers' contributions to infrastructure improvements that are necessitated by their developments. Such a soft approach reinforces the all-too-evident, current tendency towards private affluence at the expense ofOpo pubic squalor.	The respondent has not responded to the question so no further comment can be made.
Robert	Stephens	N/A		
Pete	Butcher		Should the council regulate developments so that large scale developments must include 10 or 20% of land for smaller local developers? This could also include land for custom / self build houses which I understand he council have an obligation to provide. Alternatively, why not package up smaller parcels of land on a large scale site and allow priority for smaller /local developers. There could be a levy on each developer to provide the larger infrastructure. Or the larger infrastructure could be provided and underwritten by the council and the cost later amortised. The council could get more creative and develop a policy to actively encourage smaller builders to get involved, even on medium and large sites. This could be by a allocating a portion of a large site, or encouraging a consortium of small builders to undertake larger projects than normal - this could involve some co-ordination and co-operation from council planning officers.	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. National planning policy does now advocate that at least 10% of the sites allocated should be on smaller sites of land less than 1.0 hectare, this provides choice for the housing market.
JO	COOMBES		Current planned sustainable extensions Burnham-on-Crouch are not feasible given current infrastructure issues	At the present time the Council cannot comment on whether individual settlements can or cannot accommodate future growth.The LDP Review process has to plan for future growth and it will have to be accommodated within the District. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and this was one of the reasons for the Issues and Options Consultation. In the coming months work will be undertaken to make the necessary decision using the evidence prepared as part of the LDP Review work.

Question 14

Jonney	Aldridge		Easy access to nature, the countryside and woodland are well known factors for our health and must be taken into consideration when planning.	The Council will be including a Health Impact Assessment in the LDP Review and this will look at all the policies in the Plan and ensure that they give health consideration.
Mark	Hurley	Selfridges	Absolutely not. "The current approved LDP concentrated housing growth in sustainable extensions to Maldon..." Sustainable in who's mind and in regard to what considerations? We are already seeing issues with roads, traffic, parking, NHS services etc. There are other but the council seems to not care about the people of Maldon or the impact on our lives, but expect us to pay you!!!	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced, therefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months.
Neil	Burke	Bradwell Power Generation Company Limited	Paragraph 12.5 acknowledges Bradwell B and states that the decision on it will be made by the Planning Inspectorate, which is correct and supported. The issues and options consultation states that Bradwell B will be dealt with as follows: "The LDP Review will have a major infrastructure project policy included which will consider the impacts of, and plan for, a gigawatt 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. The policy will also set out how the Council will consider applications connected with any growth arising from a Power Station in terms of material planning considerations. This policy will lie dormant unless the power station proceeds under the NSIP process and/or any ancillary development proposals are required." This overall approach is supported, however, it is important that the Local Plan does not set out policy for the determination of Bradwell B itself. As the Issues and Options consultation notes, it is an NSIP which will be determined in accordance with national policy.The approach to acknowledging Bradwell B and including a policy which would deal with any locally determined development that may arise as a result of growth, for instance in relation to housing and supply chain opportunities generated by Bradwell B, is supported.Given the potential role that the Bradwell B site has to play in meeting wider Local Plan and national policy objectives, we propose that the explanatory text also include a positive acknowledgement of the way in which the Council will work proactively and collaboratively with Bradwell B to promote the achievement of Local Plan objectives. For instance, this could be through supporting and developing skills initiatives to improve education in STEM subjects.	Support noted, the policy will not set out how Bradwell B or anyother major infrastructure project via an NSIP will be determined.
Lynne	Goodbourn			
Christopher	Kent		Not in favour of large development in unsustainable areas.	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth, the Council has a statutory duty to ensure that the future housing and economic needs of the district are planned for and it will make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months. .
Sophie	Pryor			
c/o Agent	c/o Agent	Clarion Housing		
Stephanie	Jones	home	DEVELOPERS SHOULD CONTRIBUTE MORE TO INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS.	The present LDP has an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which was approved through its examination, infrastructure is agreed with statutory providers such as the NHS and ECC and should be to mitigate the impact of development. Infrastructure is being provided under the terms of S106 legal agreements and will be assessed further as part of the LDP Review work. The matter in the majority of cases is not that infrastructure has not been provided but that its trigger points such as the number of homes completed has not been reached. This matter is monitored carefully and contributions pursued as they become liable.
Phillipa	Griffiths			
Matthew	Taylor		In respect of Bradwell Power station, yes. In respect of the A12 road widening and new junctions, the plan assumptions cannot solely rely upon the delivery of these new infrastructure proposals to address the shortfall of housing to date. The proposals continue to be significantly delayed and with global events such as Covid and war in Ukraine, with the inevitable impact that this will have on government finances, MDC needs to adopt a strategy that it can control the delivery of.	Support noted. The A12 widening scheme does not have any impact on the delivery of housing in the District at the present time.

Question 14

Anne	Bailey		Burnham on Crouch is not a area to extend, The schools cannot facilitate any more children, All Doctors surgeries and Dentists cannot cope with more people to give the good service they have done in the past. Cars speed along to roads as occupants need to travel distances to get to work. Hence creating frequent accidents	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth, the Council has a statutory duty to ensure that the future housing and economic needs of the district are planned for and it will make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months. The present LDP has an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which was approved through its examination, infrastructure is agreed with statutory providers such as the NHS and ECC and should be to mitigate the impact of development. Infrastructure is being provided under the terms of S106 legal agreements and will be assessed further as part of the LDP Review work. The matter in the majority of cases is not that infrastructure has not been provided but that its trigger points such as the number of homes completed has not been reached. This matter is monitored carefully and contributions pursued as they become liable.
Lucien	Taylor			
David	Baker			
Glenna	Wilkins			
Danny	Soul			
Fiona	Barkham	Private Individual		
Isabel	Adcock		Need to encourage a cross section of ages and abilities of people. Some communities are predominantly of one type and age	Agreed, developing communities that are multigenerational is more effective in terms of social support and growth.
alan	johnson	sky broadcasting	don't carry on building until you can show you will be able to provide the increased services to match	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced, therefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months.
Victoria	Cutmore	Endurance Estates	The Council is right at paragraph 12.5 to acknowledge the possibility that the Bradwell B Nuclear Power Station development will start to come forward during the plan period, and that the Council itself is not responsible for any decision. However, the use of the word "therefore" in paragraph 12.9 implies that the seven options presented arise from that possibility. A new Local Plan is needed irrespective of what happens at Bradwell and any uncertainty should not delay its progress.	Uncertainty around Bradwell B is not delaying the progress of the LDP.
Jane	Potter	Purleigh Parish Council	The LDP should be able to effectively respond to planning applications for major infrastructure projects, and the effects of those projects including the need for more housing and infrastructure etc, on the locality.	The Council is considering having a major infrastructure projects policy because there are a number of national strategic projects which cover the District and the Council should be able to set out in policy terms its approach to these. Some of them like Bradwell B may not happen in the life of the Plan but then again they might so instead of spreading the policy throughout the plan it will be contained in one place only to be activiated in decision making if needed.
Brian	Haydon	Cold Norton Parish Council	N/A	
Lee	Foster			
Vanessa	Horner		Each hamlet and village should be considered on merit and suitability based on infrastructure using a generalized approach will give wrong answer as it fails to recognise local issues or why people live there at all	The Council is considering having a major infrastructure projects policy because there are a number of national strategic projects which cover the District and the Council should be able to set out in policy terms its approach to these. Some of them like Bradwell B may not happen in the life of the Plan but then again they might so instead of spreading the policy throughout the plan it will be contained in one place only to be activiated in decision making if needed.
Brian	Howson	Pharmaceutical company	From what I've seen living in Purleigh for the last 12 years is where small / rural housing development has gone ahead, this has led to just large 4-5 bedroom executive homes. Also on sites where the wildlife have largely been driven out or destroyed. This might be good for a few families but an absolutely disaster. As in my other sites, if you have develop at all make sure it's only brown field sites.	Unfortunately, the district does not have a history of industrial development and therefore there is very little brownfield land. This means that the majority of future development will be built on greenfield sites.
Marion	Gunn			
BRIAN	COLLINS			
Peter	Lampard		Provided it is brought forward.	Comment noted, though this policy would only become active if an NSIP affected the District.
Tim	Chilvers			
Elliott	George			
Kate	Ellis			
Kevin	Ashman	Estates and Agency Strategic Land	20	The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. National planning policy does now advocate that at least 10% of the sites allocated should be on smaller sites of land less than 1.0 hectare, this provides choice for the housing market.
Jake	Nugent	Endurance Estates Ltd		

Question 14

John	Buchanan			
Tim	Bradford	leadenhall		
Jacky	Bannerman	Woodham Walter Parish Council	It is surely inconceivable that a major review of the LDP should be silent on major infrastructure projects as these will be the driver for highways, employment, housing, education and healthcare. Having a policy that allows additional projects to be included at a later date will safeguard the District's position on such developments.	The Council is considering having a major infrastructure projects policy because there are a number of national strategic projects which cover the District and the Council should be able to set out in policy terms its approach to these. Some of them like Bradwell B may not happen in the life of the Plan but then again they might so instead of spreading the policy throughout the plan it will be contained in one place only to be activiated in decision making if needed.
Mark	Tentori	Mazdev Limited		
Peter	Ingram		Greater use should be made of windfall sites that are available.	The Council is considering having a windfall policy which at the present time is lacking in the approved LDP.
Jane	Pilgrim			
Judith	Radcliffe			
Christopher	Mabbutt	Burnham Primary School	Whilst housing provision is clearly the primary focus, due regard must be given to provision of suitable and quality infrastructure. There is minimal reference to educational needs, which will be insufficient without addition spaces being provided by new schools and where appropriate school expansion projects. Many Schools such as Burnham on Crouch Primary School would welcome sensible and realistic discussion as to how this can be met.	The LDP has an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which was approved through its examination, infrastructure is agreed with statutory providers such as the NHS and ECC and should be to mitigate the impact of development. Infrastructure is being provided under the terms of S106 legal agreements and will be assessed further as part of the LDP Review work. Discussions with ECC education and we hope they will have discussions with local schools to ascertain the future educational needs for the district.
Mary	Putt		Any additional housing should be build as a new settlement closer to the A12 corridor, including utilities and services for the size. It would also benefit from better transport links, health access and remove the requirement for yet another several hundred cars to be travelling across the district daily, poluting the environment.	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth, the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months.
Alan	Shrimplin	N/A	OPTION 4 - Pepper pot growth throughout the Settlement Hierarchy is pragmatically the most sensible and equitable solution, rather than focusing on only the larger settlements as it has been shown that large developments have not resulted in any infrastructure improvements for BOC in the past 5 years, just over development. That said, OPTION 5 and OPTION 6, could give leverage to larger infrastructure improvements using CIL to leverage moneys from large developers.	The answer from the respondant does not relate to the question, they have answered the question relating to the growth option, so no further comment can be made.
Valerie	Coleby	Berrys		
Kevin	Bruce			
William	Shepherd		Larger housing developments should be centered round existing towns where there is the likelyhood of infrastructure to support them. Development in the surrounding villages should be very small scale but supported by the Council for social housing or small private affordable housing for local people. In the recent past the only housing that has been built are very large houses totally out of the price range that local people can afford. The residents of these houses do not integrate with the villagers and want to changer the character of the village	The answer from the respondant does not relate to the question so no further comment can be made.
victoria	newson	Childrens Nursery	The fact remains there are not suitable roads to access the semi rural villages from the bigger towns and public transport is not frequent enough. For example you cannot get back to Cold NOrton or Purleigh after 5.15pm from a job in Chelmsford or a meal out for socialisation.	The present LDP has an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which was approved through its examination, infrastructure is agreed with statutory providers such as the NHS and ECC Highways and should be to mitigate the impact of development. Infrastructure is being provided under the terms of S106 legal agreements and will be assessed further as part of the LDP Review work. This matter is monitored carefully and contributions pursued as they become liable. The Council cannot make any comment regarding individual settlements.
David	Banfield		There is a discrepancy on village sizes. Purleigh is not a large village it does not match the size or amount of already built structures in Great Totham, (which is classed as small and large), Beacon Hill, Cold Norton and Latchingdon all classed as large as any check on Ordnance survey maps will demonstrate. Greenfield sites should be retained as Greenfield sites. The nuclear power station should not go ahead it would ruin the area with the required transport links which do not currently exist for the construction and potential of flooding of the site which is vulnerable to rising sea levels which would be a serious problem for the next generation. I believe the foundation is going in though the project was not meant to be going ahead. It would be far better to put the extensive costs for the power station into renewables, wind/ tide/ solar etc. The benefit to the area is outweighed by the impact. The beneficiaries will be other areas of the country for the power and thousands of construction workers who won't be here for ever. The locals will be left with the last remnant of comparitively unspoilt mid Essex being covered with major roads for the power staiton having suffered even more problems with traffic congestion while the station and the road network to build it are constructed .	The Bradwell B site is a national allocation for energy and though the present plans are on hold at the moment the site may come forward for some other kind of development under the NSIP determination process. The Council is not the decision maker with regard to NSIP appliations but having a major infrastructure policy should set down what the Council can expect from these developments should they come forward. The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that.

Question 14

Phillip	Wright	CALA Homes (North Home Counties) Ltd	We recognise that the Council 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. Paragraph 12.7 states that: "The LDP Review will have a major infrastructure project policy included which will consider the impacts of, and plan for, a gigawatt 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. The policy will also set out how the Council will consider applications connected with any growth arising from a Power Station in terms of material planning considerations. This policy will lie dormant unless the power station proceeds under the NSIP process and/or any ancillary development proposals are required." The Council will need to consider the extent to which the policy can currently be shaped due to the current level of uncertainty associated with it. MDC will also need to consider what role a future Local Plan Review might play in relation to this proposal. The new Local Plan may wish to set out detailed actions and triggers.	The Council is considering having a major infrastructure projects policy because there are a number of national strategic projects which cover the District and the Council should be able to set out in policy terms its approach to these. Some of them like Bradwell B may not happen in the life of the Plan but then again they might so instead of spreading the policy throughout the plan it will be contained in one place only to be activiated in decision making if needed.
.	.	SN Developments		
.	.	Cooper Property Holdings Ltd		
Jane	Coleman	Maldon Town Council		
Roy	Martin	Mr Roy Martin	Option 4 is only reasonable solution - only development spread proportionately across all forms of settlement including Hamlets (see my letter of 11 March 2022) will satisfy Council's 'key issues' for growth in the District.	The answer from the respondant does not relate to the question, they have answered the question relating to the growth option, so no further comment can be made.
Simon	Butler-Finbow	Pigeon Investment Management		
sara	doran		i agree that there has been poor delivery by the national housebuilders in terms of the numbers of houses and the delivery of infrastructure. This has highlighted that this model of development in our community is not working. frequently important assets, eg rights of way and bridle ways have been missed, removed, lost when they have been part of the plans. this is wrong. I agree that there should be more focus on local businesses to deliver smaller projects and that any of the larger builders should not be awarded new developments until they have delivered on the projects that are already live, including the infrastructure. More and more houses cannot be built without providing essential amenities - esp schools and health and road structure	The present LDP has an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which was approved through its examination, infrastructure is agreed with statutory providers such as the NHS and ECC Highways and should be to mitigate the impact of development. Infrastructure is being provided under the terms of S106 legal agreements and will be assessed further as part of the LDP Review work. This matter is monitored carefully and contributions pursued as they become liable. National planning policy does now advocate that at least 10% of the sites allocated should be on smaller sites of land less than 1.0 hectare, this provides choice for the housing market.
Colin	Horner	Villageretreat	Each hamlet and village should be considered on merit and suitability of specific sites as well as impact analysis based on local infrastructure. Using a generalised approach will give the wrong answer as it fails to recognise local issues and shortfalls or why people live there at all.	The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that.
Robert	Scott	Lewis & Scott Retirement Living Ltd		
Rob	Bard			
Tim	Hann		I appreciate that there has to be options on the approach for major infrastructure even if I believe that the majority are are unacceptable.	Support noted
Burnham	Town Council	Burnham on Crouch Town Council	But the general opinion is that Bradwell B is not wanted in any shape or form.	The Bradwell B site is a national allocation for energy and though the present plans are on hold at the moment the site may come forward for some other kind of development under the NSIP determination process. The Council is not the decision maker with regard to NSIP appliations but having a major infrastructure policy should set down what the Council can expect from these developments should they come forward.
Justin	Barkham	Self employed	I am pleased to see the range of options my comments on them below	Comment noted, though the question does not relate to the options.
Poppy	Vidler	Crown Consumer Ltd	.	
Stephen	Sutton			
Tim	Madelin			
Joanna	Jeffery	Althorne Parish Clerk	Whoever wrote the paper for this question is to be congratulated on a very candid appraisal of the issues with the current LDP and the options for resolving them. It prompts the approach that whatever option is chosen we should first try to minimise the extra land requirement by speeding up the house delivery on the sites originally approved in the 2017 LDP. No doubt the sites are currently controlled and possibly owned by developers who have at best, no incentive to increase the rate of construction. Can a plan be developed to gain back control of some areas the deficient sites and release them to to smaller construction companies in small lots, with a 'time is the essence' built into all new contracts? Lessons must be learned to ensure that if more land is approved for planning applications we do not end up in the same situation again in 5 year's time.	It is not possible legally to gain control over land already being developed, sites are coming forward albeit slower than previously predicted.

Paul	Coppin			
Steven	Bardwell	S P Bardwell Ltd		
David	Oxford	Lloyds Banking Group	Based on the approach it ssems clear that Althorne has not been correctly identified as a viable site. Infrasture is poor with 1 single bus service that has very limited options. The village has been categorised as 'Small' with c.650 existing houses and therefore the proposed plans to develop 1750 new homes is an unbelievable 269% increase. We have no schools or local shops. The fact that Althorne is a desigbated Costal Zone and a Special Landscape Area does not appear to have been taken into consideration.	The Council cannot respond on site specifics at this stage of LDP Review. Work on site allocations will be undertaken in the coming months with a Preferred Options consultation being carried out at the end of this period.
Stephen Francis	Dewick	Curry Farm		
George	Dixon			
Douglas	Channer	Private		
Lynda	Bugg			
Paul	Burgess	None		
D	Cooper			
C/O Agent	C/O Agent			
Zoe	May	East of England Ambulance Service NHS Trust	All options require health commissioners to review the suitability and provision of health infrastructure to meet the needs of the local population. EEAST will work with commissioner and the local authority to deliver effective and efficient emergency ambulance services for the local community. Any CIL/S106 legal agreement should support all aspects of health - acute, community, mental health and emergency ambulance services. The need for developer funded ambulance facilities and good quality layout and design, to provide for the necessary health infrastructure to mitigate and manage the health and emergency ambulance service impacts arising from the increased population, associated with major new housing developments within Maldon. Where developers are promoting major new housing developments of 100 dwellings or more, it is recommended that pre-application advice is sought from Integrated Care Service and East of England Ambulance Service at an early stage, in order to agree a suitable level of health facilities provision, reflected in S106 Heads of Terms of Agreement where applicable. Integrated Care Service and East of England Ambulance Service pre-application advice concerning the layout and design principles for residential schemes is also recommended for major new housing developments of 50 dwellings or more. Major new housing developments therefore give rise to significant additional resource needs and implications for EEAST, requiring appropriate funding by developers in order to mitigate and manage the emergency ambulance services including meeting mandated response times. EEAST therefore requires additional ambulance facilities to be funded and/or provided by developers either through CIL or through S106 Agreements in the form of the following assets: • Additional or enhanced ambulance station floor space and facilities, including fit out and refurbishment and new additional parking spaces for ambulances with EV charging facilities; • Ambulance Response Posts wih EV charging facilities; • Communications including ICT; • Additional Medical Equipment and Technology; • Ambulance Vehicles; • Community First Responders - recruit and train new community first responders, provide new volunteer community responder equipment; and, • Funding for additional staff resources, including clinical and non-clinical staff incorporating Operations and Resilience support officers (during the construction and occupation phases of development), Back Office Staff, and associated recruitment, training and equipment.	The Council will be including a Health Impact Assessment in the LDP Review and this will look at all the policies in the Plan and ensure that they give health consideration.
Roger	Woodcock		Have not been able to spend the time necessary to fully review all the supporting documents but they do appear to make sense	Support noted
Braxted and Blackwater Conservation Grou	BBCG	The Braxted and Blackwater Conservation Group (BBCG)	The approach is considered reasonable.	Support noted
raymond	dundas	Householder	Only just	Support noted
John	Watson		The statement is based upon potentially doubtful information. In November 20 the statement was 4.90 years in part due to a backlog in previous years.This statement was infact incorrect due to an addition error leaving 60 properties off . It is also fact that the 3.26 years has now been proven wrong and should have stated 3.78 at the minimum.. That said if major developers have provided evidence that they cannot meet targets moving forwards then there is an argument for smaller developers to be used.But within a strategic plan that clearly identifies delivery timeframes of required Infrastructure to support the development. Looking at the data available the failure to supply is based upon a statement at a point in time that has not been robustly explained and in part due to deficit in the early years. In terms of strategy options recognition of current Infrastructure deficiencies might be prudent so that the most effective strategy option can be selected that prevents an expansion of the deficit and indeed reverses it would be prudent.	The point concerning recognition of current infrastructure deficiences and selecting an option that prevents an expansion of the deficit is agreed, it is important to ensure that the IDP is robust and deliverable with the infrastructure evidenced by need.
Josh	Plant	Gladmans		
*	*			
*	Willmott			
Ivor	Watson			
*	*			
*	*			
*	*			

*	*			
*	*			
*	*			
*	*			
Ben	Binder	University of Adelaide		
Lorraine	Bailey	Wickham Bishops Parish Council		
Ali	Aldis			
David	Smye	The Maldon Society		
Stewart	Newlands	Fambridge Lake		
Stewart	Newlands	Fambridge Lake		
Paula	Stanbury			
Sonia	Whiskin	Financial Services		
Geoffrey	Charge	n/a		
Robert	Collins			
Ben	Thornett			
Matthew	Wood	Phase 2 Planning		
Tim	Aves			
Helen	James			
Kathy	Day			
Peter	Wakling			
Sara	Howarth			
Eissa	Leo			
Michele	Williams		Fambridge road is two narrow and needs to be widened. The current infrastructure also needs to be repaired as a priority as potholes make this district dangerous for drivers cyclists and pedestrians	At the present time the Council cannot comment on whether individual settlements can or cannot accommodate future growth.The LDP Review process has to plan for future growth and it will have to be accommodated within the District. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and this was one of the reasons for the Issues and Options Consultation. In the coming months work will be undertaken to make the necessary decision using the evidence prepared as part of the LDP Review work.
Tara	Strydom		Having SEND school placements locally, will create Employment Growth in local rural areas.	The issue of SEND provision is one that the Council is exploring with Essex County Council and if there is evidence that the provision needs to be catered for in terms of a whole school then this will need to be built into the IDP.
Jenny	Ball			
Cliff	Baron			
Gill	Winsor	Tesco		
Emily	Benham	Servoca complex care and nursing	WE DESPERATELY NEED MORE LOCAL SCHOOLS! we already do not have enough school places for our children to go locally. How will we cope with more housing/more people but no more places available? I understand ormiston rivers academy are making a few extra places next year but this still won't be anywhere near enough. I know personally I could not get my son into my nearest primary school as there are always more children than places available and long waiting lists. I now have to drive him to/from a different village twice a day. I've heard horror stories of parents living in steeple who's children didn't get a place at any of the local schools and were offered brightlingsea and mersea. It's absolutely ridiculous. The same goes for Doctors surgeries, there simply is not enough to warrant the amount of people in these areas. It's already hard enough trying to get an appointment, soon it will be impossible!!	The present LDP has an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which was approved through its examination, infrastructure is agreed with statutory providers such as the NHS for GP surgeries and ECC for schools and should be to mitigate the impact of development. Infrastructure is being provided under the terms of S106 legal agreements and will be assessed further as part of the LDP Review work. The matter in the majority of cases is not that infrastructure has not been provided but that its trigger points such as the number of homes completed has not been reached. This matter is monitored carefully and contributions pursued as they become liable.
Laura	Cannon			
Shaneen	Illanes			
Merryl	Quilter			
Bear	Keen			
Jessica	Cox		Development should take place within settlement boundaries in order to protect views and green corridors.	There is not enough land within the existing development boundaries to accommodate the level of growth that the District needs, therefore it is inevitable that the majority of development will have to go on greenfield sites adjacent to existing settlements, which settlements has yet to be determined.
Robert	Burton			
Yvonne	Wade			
Louise	Bywaters-Smith	Hospitality		
Brooke	Roberts-Morgan			
Patricia	Bunkle			
Marc	Rawinsky	M R Sovereign Services Ltd		
Roger	Tiffn		see previous comments	It is not clear what this respondant is stating.
Kathryn	Beighton	Publishing	Power station unlikely to happen	Comment noted, though this policy would only become active if an NSIP affected the District.
Roy	Warren	Sport England		

STUART	SOWTER		More focus should be given to putting housing in areas where current infrastructure is in existence, Chelmsford/Witham. Burnham and Althorne cannot cope with the housing you have approved thus far.	At the present time the Council cannot comment on whether individual settlements can or cannot accommodate future growth.The LDP Review process has to plan for future growth and it will have to be accommodated within the District. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and this was one of the reasons for the Issues and Options Consultation. In the coming months work will be undertaken to make the necessary decision using the evidence prepared as part of the LDP Review work.
Mark	Raffray		The preamble rationale presented under Options for Growth conflates strategic issues, e.g. [12.2] building capacity of major builders), with those pertaining to Council policy inadequacies, e.g. [12.2] on windfall allowance direction, and also tactical planning constraints of variable relevance to local settlements, e.g. [12.3] on settlement boundaries. No attempt is made to provide a quantitative impact assessment as to the relative importance of each identified issue. Furthermore, whilst it is acknowledged that there are current uncertainties relating to the Bradwell B Nuclear Power Station development, the commentary provided, e.g. [12.6] and [12.7] is vague and ambiguous. It must at least be possible to define scenario alternatives linked to LDP options — for instance covering the possibility of a gigawatt station versus more limited small modular reactor site versus the less likely possibility of a STEP Fusion facility. Adding in uncertainties about when development *might* occur in future leads to an unsatisfactory policy vision in overall terms.	The Council is considering having a major infrastructure projects policy because there are a number of national strategic projects which cover the District and the Council should be able to set out in policy terms its approach to these. Some of them like Bradwell B may not happen in the life of the Plan but then again they might so instead of spreading the policy throughout the plan it will be contained in one place only to be activiated in decision making if needed.
April	Rowley			
Bill	Withers			
joanna	jeffery			
John	Mitchell			
Peter	Layley			
Rex	Davenport			
Lesley	Mitchelmore	Danbury Parish Council		
Karen	Neath	Tolleshunt Major Parish Council		
N	DA			
Dorreen	Linton	our group consists of adults, playschool and brownies group		
John	Wileman			
Richard	Courtney	University Of East London		
sue	Rawlinson	Evolve	build a new village somewhere else.	It is not clear what this respondant is stating, therefore no further comment can be made.
Douglas	Milsted	Heybridge Basin Conservation Society		
Alan	Outlaw	Self Emplyed		
Lindsey	Squire	North Fambridge Parish Council	The preamble rational presented under Options for Growth conflates strategic issues, e.g. [12.2] building capacity of major builders), with those pertaining to Council policy inadequacies, e.g. [12.2] on windfall allowance direction, and also tactical planning constraints of variable relevance to local settlements, e.g. [12.3] on settlement boundaries. No attempt is made to provide a quantitative impact assessment as to the relative importance of each identified issue. Furthermore, whilst it is acknowledged that there are current uncertainties relating to the Bradwell B Nuclear Power Station development, the commentary provided, e.g. [12.6] and [12.7] is vague and ambiguous. It must at least be possible to define scenario alternatives linked to LDP options — for instance covering the possibility of a gigawatt station versus more limited small modular reactor site versus the less likely possibility of a STEP Fusion facility. Adding in uncertainties about when develoopment 'might occur in future leads to an unsatisfactory policy in overall terms.	The Council is considering having a major infrastructure projects policy because there are a number of national strategic projects which cover the District and the Council should be able to set out in policy terms its approach to these. Some of them like Bradwell B may not happen in the life of the Plan but then again they might so instead of spreading the policy throughout the plan it will be contained in one place only to be activiated in decision making if needed.
K	Jeffries			
John	Lakin	?		
Samantha	Weeks			
Carlie	Mayes			
Richard	Martin	Scott Properties		
Mike	Spurgeon	Phase 2 Planning and Development		
C/O Agent Mike	Spurgeon	Phase 2 Planning & Development		
Amanda	Mickelsen			
Samuel	Newton	Anglo European School		
Mary-Ann	Munford			
Jo	Harvey			

Question 14

Terry	Fleming		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. .A greater spread ,more opportunities to avoid the large national construction companies and small builders and local labour opportunity. 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 and residents can also access the railway connections at Hatfield Peverel and Witham and the strategic road connection of the A12. Residents of the District 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. Good links in these areas public transport,less stress on infrastructure ,good opportunity to develop brown field	This consultee response does not relate to the question, checked and the consultee has made the same comments under the appropriate question, which will be responded to
Philip	Davies			
Susan	Cumming	not applicable		
Ronald	Edge	Construction Industry		
Gordon	Mussett	Little Braxted Parish Council		
Ronnie	Tongue	state school		
Sue	Dobson	Essex Bridleways Association		
David	Webb			
Andrew	Marsh	Historic England		
Brian	Haydon			
Hazel	Notley			
Jean	Brown			
Joanne	McGinity			
Stuart	Dedman	Nil		
Kerry	McKenna			
Penny	McCauley	Tiptree dental	Don’t agree with option 2	This consultee response does not relate to the question, checked and the consultee has made the same comments under the appropriate question, which will be responded to
Jane	Phillips	Solicitors		
David	Rees		Since the areas served best by existing facilities and infrastructure are the towns of Maldon, Heybridge and Burnham it seems logical that this should form the basis for future development. Local development boundaries in smaller communities should continue to applied as creeping growth is inevitable. There should be no major development in medium or small villages as infrastructure to support sustainable communities is lacking .	This consultee response does not relate to the question, checked and the consultee has made the same comments under the appropriate question, which will be responded to
Darren	Weeks			
Phil	Manning			
Peter	Clack		Options for Growth should focus on Options 1, 2, 3 ,5 and 6 only. Bradwell B is a major blight on the District and should be considered against the ability to provide green energy provision such as off-shore wind or solar. The Dengie cannot sustain the provision and the wider impacts that this brings with it. It should be resisted at all costs. The District Council also needs to be more proactive in the increasing air traffic associated with planes flying low over our Towns and Villages, particularly Burnham-on-Crouch and those in the vicinity.	The Bradwell B site is a national allocation for energy and though the present plans are on hold at the moment the site may come forward for some other kind of development under the NSIP determination process. The Council is not the decision maker with regard to NSIP appliations but having a major infrastructure policy should set down what the Council can expect from these developments should they come forward. The Council can only comment on flight path alterations and this would fall within the Civil Aviation Authority.
Doug	Lockwood	National Grid		
Sally	George			
Vara	Szajkowski			
Bob	Calver			
Tessa	Lambert	Natural England		
Dawn	Howles			
natasha	frith			
Anthony	Bates		Althorne should not be considered as urban	At the present time the Council cannot comment on whether individual settlements can or cannot accommodate future growth.The LDP Review process has to plan for future growth and it will have to be accommodated within the District. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and this was one of the reasons for the Issues and Options Consultation. In the coming months work will be undertaken to make the necessary decision using the evidence prepared as part of the LDP Review work.

Question 14

Russell	Howles	WSP	I do not agree with the extend of some of the proposals that would fit within Option 5 and 7. Options 5 & 7 should not be considered without significant government funding to public transport and/or significant developer contributions to drastically change the transport network, particularly the train services and active travel networks in these rural areas.	Sustainable transport options are being considered in the LDP Review and are a priority for both ECC and national objectives because they link in with climate change and the need to reduce carbon emissions.
Gillian	Hollamby			
Brian	Townsend			
Malcolm	Finch			
Peter	Taylor	Retired		
Chris	Melbourne			
Robert	Hollamby			
Kate	Priest	Purleigh Community Primary School		
Gary	SPICER			
Helen	Bridge			
Melanie	Allen	Government	As above,	Refers to Althorne - At the present time the Council cannot comment on whether individual settlements can or cannot accommodate future growth or on site specifics. The LDP Review process has to plan for future growth and it will have to be accommodated within the District. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and this was one of the reasons for the Issues and Options Consultation. In the coming months work will be undertaken to make the necessary decision using the evidence prepared as part of the LDP Review work.
Adam	Medlycott			
Joanne	Maloney			
Portia	Roelofs		I oppose the building of a new nuclear power station (Bradwell B) in Bradwell-on-Sea. Climate change will cause various forms of volatility and instability in the coming years, this amplifies the risks of nuclear power making it untenable. Moreover, the plans threaten the unique countryside and habitats of the Dengie Peninsula. It threatens the Othona Community of which I am a member going back 25 years.	The Bradwell B site is a national allocation for energy and though the present plans are on hold at the moment the site may come forward for some other kind of development under the NSIP determination process. The Council is not the decision maker with regard to NSIP appliations but having a major infrastructure policy should set down what the Council can expect from these developments should they come forward.
Lisa	Singh	Direct Call Centres Ltd		
Kevin	Head		Paragraphs 12.1 to 12.8 are considered to represent a realistic acknowledgement of the problems and issues faced by the Council that result from the current Local Plan. The Review should adopt a more flexible approach to growth and should not adopt a rigid one option strategy, but a 'mix and match' based on the environmental capacity of various locations. For example, Maldon, Heybridge and Burnham have considerable constraints relating to coast and flood issues, whereas some of the smaller settlements are relatively unconstrained. Choosing a specific percentage of say 10% or 20% to be directed to settlement types as a formulaic approach is not considered appropriate.	The growth option chosen though it should focus on one of the options the policies in the Plan should be flexible enough to offer choice to the market and ensure enough growth both housing and economic can come forward to support the needs of the residents of the District.
Elizabeth	Sawyer Bayliss		Dont know	N/A
Michael	Partridge			
Kenneth	Northfield			
Jerry	Petts			
Frederick	McMahon		Inadequate infrastructure between Chelmsford and Maldon	The Council is considering having a major infrastructure projects policy because there are a number of national strategic projects which cover the District and the Council should be able to set out in policy terms its approach to these. Some of them like Bradwell B may not happen in the life of the Plan but then again they might so instead of spreading the policy throughout the plan it will be contained in one place only to be activiated in decision making if needed.
Tracey	Merritt	Dengie Hounds and Horses	Where is the approach for major infrastructure projects discussed in this document?? Can't comment on what has not been shown.	The approach was set out in the Issues and Options Document
Jo	Crump	Servoca Secure Soutions		
Susan	ARCHER			
Winifred	Sutherland			
Chris	clark		Totally disagree with building on Green Open Space	The district does not have a history of industrial land use so there is limited brownfield land opportunities. When carrying out site allocations, brownfield land should be prioritised in the settlements chosen for growth.
Jeremy	Richardson		Focus growth in Maldon and Burnham otherwise our countryside will be destroyed	This consultee response does not relate to the question, checked and the consultee has made the same comments under the appropriate question, which will be responded to
Cheryl	Carter	Education		
Susan	Mason			

Question 14

Melad	Kamlow		Proposals are primarily focused on building new houses, with little afterthought given to how these villages can actually cope with this.	The present LDP has an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which was approved through its examination, infrastructure is agreed with statutory providers such as the NHS and ECC and should be to mitigate the impact of development. Infrastructure is being provided under the terms of S106 legal agreements and will be assessed further as part of the LDP Review work. The matter in the majority of cases is not that infrastructure has not been provided but that its trigger points such as the number of homes completed has not been reached. This matter is monitored carefully and contributions pursued as they become liable.
Dave	Draper	The Hartford Insurance Group		
Kevin	Cooper			
Katherine	Whitehouse			
Linda	Soul			
Robert	Wilson			
Sarah-Jayne	Hunt	SJ Aesthetics LTD		
Jonathan	Hunt			
Deborah	de Boltz	Farleigh Hospice		
Tim	Murphy			
Claire	McGrane			
Tracey	Munford	NA		
Rowan	Rampersad		No to Option 5. This option is the most impactful on residence of incumbent village and surrounding areas from a conservation standpoint. South Woodham Ferrers is approx 2 miles from Stow Maries which is only safely traversed by car. Roads are already insufficient for the current commuter and farm traffic.	At the present time the Council cannot comment on whether individual settlements can or cannot accommodate future growth.The LDP Review process has to plan for future growth and it will have to be accommodated within the District. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and this was one of the reasons for the Issues and Options Consultation. In the coming months work will be undertaken to make the necessary decision using the evidence prepared as part of the LDP Review work.
LUKE	MACFARLANE	S A RAVEN		
Anna	Wombwell	Morris Farm		
Ronald	Owen	Not applicable		
Elizabeth	Johns			
Colin	Day		I disagree with building on green open space outside the settlement boundary	The district does not have a history of industrial land use so there is limited brownfield land opportunities or opportunities to build within settlement boundaries. Therefore it is inevitable that greenfield sites will be required to accommodate future growth. When carrying out site allocations, brownfield land should be prioritised in the settlements chosen for growth.
Natalie	Bradford			
Harriet	Hurst-Smith			
Tony	Vanner			
Josie	Vanner			
Tracy	Carroll			
Ian	Roberts	N/A		
Tony	Ashton	none		
mandy	SHORT			
Kevin	Money	St. Lawrence Parish Council		
Claire	Udall	1		
Linda	Raffray			
John	Cooper		I do not agree that any further devleopement on green open spaces should be allowed	The district does not have a history of industrial land use so there is limited brownfield land opportunities or opportunities to build within settlement boundaries. Therefore it is inevitable that greenfield sites will be required to accommodate future growth. When carrying out site allocations, brownfield land should be prioritised in the settlements chosen for growth.
Leah	Jewiss			
Elaine	Ketley	South Woodham Ferrers Town Council	The infrastructure growth does not support the current suitable site selections shown in the South of the district, B1010/12 & A132 and Southminster Railway branch line improvements.	The Council is considering having a major infrastructure projects policy because there are a number of national strategic projects which cover the District and the Council should be able to set out in policy terms its approach to these. Some of them like Bradwell B may not happen in the life of the Plan but then again they might so instead of spreading the policy throughout the plan it will be contained in one place only to be activiated in decision making if needed.
Ruth	Bull	The Othona Communty		
Mark	Jackson	Mark Jackson Planning		
ann	cutting			

Question 14

Sharon	Cushen		Transport infrastructure to the MDC - particularly roads inadequate/insufficient emphasis on its development within the LDP	The Council is considering having a major infrastructure projects policy because there are a number of national strategic projects which cover the District and the Council should be able to set out in policy terms its approach to these. Some of them like Bradwell B may not happen in the life of the Plan but then again they might so instead of spreading the policy throughout the plan it will be contained in one place only to be activiated in decision making if needed.
Ian	Tooley			
Sally	Tokeley			
Christina	Chan		"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." I do not agree with this w.r.t Purleigh. Purleigh is a rural village with the facilities and services as required by a village of it's size. By increasing it's size significantly, it will deteriorate the community and potentially have an adverse effect on the community spirit and thus services the community provides.	Some growth in rural villages may assist in sustaining the existing services and facilities. At the present time the Council cannot comment on whether individual settlements can or cannot accommodate future growth.The LDP Review process has to plan for future growth and it will have to be accommodated within the District. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and this was one of the reasons for the Issues and Options Consultation. In the coming months work will be undertaken to make the necessary decision using the evidence prepared as part of the LDP Review work.
Tim.	Holdsworth			
Graham	Snow			
Sarah	Packard			
Martin	Cook			
Clifford	Brown		Option 1 is most appropriate, options 2,4 and 6 should also bwe adoopted.	This consultee response does not relate to the question, checked and the consultee has made the same comments under the appropriate question, which will be responded to
Steve	Gallant	Crouch Valley Defence Group		
Lesley	Woodley			
Kirsty	Rowsell			
Philip	Wakeling			
David	Brock			
Niki	Halls			
Stewart	Geden			
Anita	Thomas	Bank	A	N/A
Andrew	Ashworth			
michael	smith			
Simon	Priest			
Philippa	Marshall			
Lewis	Cook	Form Architecture Ltd.		
EDWARD	GITTINS	Edward Gittins & Associates		
Steve	Williamson			
James	Cowell	E & B R Cowell	Maldon District Council must consider the availability of suitable small sites, such as SMIN20, to contribute towards housing supply. Increasing rural housing in sustainable rural villages would help to support transport provision and rural business improvements.	The Council cannot respond on site specifics at this stage of LDP Review. Work on site allocations will be undertaken in the coming months with a Preferred Options consultation being carried out at the end of this period.
Colin	Hawkes			
Ronald	PIPER			
John	McLarty			
John	McLarty			
Norman	Branch	N/A		
John	McLarty			
James	Clarke			
David	Stilwell			
Ann	Thomas			
michael	harris			
Geoffrey	Cox			
John	McLarty			
Barrington	Thomas			
Richard	Edwards		Little account sems to have been taken over the posssible development of Bradwell B power station	The Council is considering having a major infrastructure projects policy because there are a number of national strategic projects which cover the District and the Council should be able to set out in policy terms its approach to these. Some of them like Bradwell B may not happen in the life of the Plan but then again they might so instead of spreading the policy throughout the plan it will be contained in one place only to be activiated in decision making if needed.
Robyn	Woloszczuk			
Lesley	Speller			
Nicola	O'Dean	Balgores Motors		

Question 14

Alexander	Romang			
Hayley	Holgate	ECC		
Eirlys	Parry	N/A		
Michael	Unwin	N/A		
Tony	Barber			
Nick	Mason	ECOClassics	"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." I do not agree with this w.r.t Purleigh. Purleigh is a rural village with the facilities and services as required by a village of it's size. By increasing it's size significantly, it will deteriorate the community and potentially have an adverse effect on the community spirit and thus services the community provides.	Some growth in rural villages may assist in sustaining the existing services and facilities. At the present time the Council cannot comment on whether individual settlements can or cannot accommodate future growth.The LDP Review process has to plan for future growth and it will have to be accommodated within the District. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and this was one of the reasons for the Issues and Options Consultation. In the coming months work will be undertaken to make the necessary decision using the evidence prepared as part of the LDP Review work.
Melanie	Osborne	Motor Trade		
Stuart	Turner	Essex search and rescue	Preferred options in order of preference option 1 maintain status quo Then option 6 - growth in the north of the district Then option 2 focus on large towns Then option 4 - proportional pepperpot approach Other options are not preferred	The Council cannot respond on site specifics at this stage of LDP Review. Work on site allocations will be undertaken in the coming months with a Preferred Options consultation being carried out at the end of this period.
Mike	Carpenter	CODE Development Planners Ltd		
ian	wilson	cm36pt		
c/o Agent	c/o Agent			
kelly	tilley		I disagree with building on green open spaces outside the settlement area.	The district does not have a history of industrial land use so there is limited brownfield land opportunities or opportunities to build within settlement boundaries. Therefore it is inevitable that greenfield sites will be required to accommodate future growth. When carrying out site allocations, brownfield land should be prioritised in the settlements chosen for growth.
Catherine	Bicknell	Mid and South Essex Health and Care Partnership		
N	Baseley	IBA Planning Ltd		
Sue	White		Although I have no issue with the options in principle, unless they can be tied down under an unbreakable S109 prior to any development taking place, they are proving to be of no use, as developers continually find ways around them. In the previous LDP, land was identified off Limebrook way, which was considered suitable with a new relief road, allowing the current road to become pedestrianized. Of course, the housing has been built, but with no infrastructure, other than that required to allow the traffic to ingress and egress from the site. Nothing for existing road users or residents. Unless this can be addressed, in my opinion we cannot even comment on major infrastructure, as it often does not happen in practice.	The present LDP has an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which was approved through its examination, infrastructure is agreed with statutory providers such as the NHS and ECC and should be to mitigate the impact of development. Infrastructure is being provided under the terms of S106 legal agreements and will be assessed further as part of the LDP Review work. The matter in the majority of cases is not that infrastructure has not been provided but that its trigger points such as the number of homes completed has not been reached. This matter is monitored carefully and contributions pursued as they become liable. The matter of bringing the new relief road is still being worked on and it should come forward once all the funding is in place.
Sarah	Yates			
Leonard	Lewis			
R	Minney			
Tim	Grant	Evolution Town Planning		
ANNE	OSBORN	Purleigh Community Shop	Purleigh is unsuitable for expansion because it is a small rural village with a small community. The proposed development of the green field sites with adversely affect wild life and is unnecessary when there are towns near by which can be expanded, having links to railway stations and shopping facilities.	At the present time the Council cannot comment on whether individual settlements can or cannot accommodate future growth.The LDP Review process has to plan for future growth and it will have to be accommodated within the District. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and this was one of the reasons for the Issues and Options Consultation. In the coming months work will be undertaken to make the necessary decision using the evidence prepared as part of the LDP Review work.
Stephen	Hodgkinson		Paragraphs 12.1 to 12.8 are considered to represent a realistic acknowledgement of the problems and issues faced by the Council that result from the current Local Plan. The Review should adopt a more flexible approach to growth and should not adopt a rigid one option strategy, but a 'mix and match' based on the environmental capacity of various locations. For example, Maldon, Heybridge and Burnham have considerable constraints relating to coast and flood issues, whereas some of the smaller settlements are relatively unconstrained. Choosing a specific percentage of say 10% or 20% to be directed to settlement types as a formulaic approach is not considered appropriate.	The growth option chosen though it should focus on one of the options the policies in the Plan should be flexible enough to offer choice to the market and ensure enough growth both housing and economic can come forward to support the needs of the residents of the District.
c/o Agent	c/o Agent	Maldon Wick Limited		

Question 14

ZOE	HOSTY		I disagree with building on green open space outside the settlement boundary.	The district does not have a history of industrial land use so there is limited brownfield land opportunities or opportunities to build within settlement boundaries. Therefore it is inevitable that greenfield sites will be required to accommodate future growth. When carrying out site allocations, brownfield land should be prioritised in the settlements chosen for growth.
S	Swain			
Kevin	Coleman	Phase 2 Planning		
John	Lawrence		Maldon District Council must consider the availability of suitable small sites, such as the site east of Spar Lane, to contribute towards housing supply. Increasing rural housing in sustainable rural villages would help to support transport provision and rural business improvements.	The Council cannot respond on site specifics at this stage of LDP Review. Work on site allocations will be undertaken in the coming months with a Preferred Options consultation being carried out at the end of this period.
Diane	Wallace			
Jonathan	Aldis	Good life Countryside Services		
Grace	Godwin		Maldon has become an absolute dive with all the new housing here. It used to be one of the best places to live in the UK, with low crime rates and nice people to back it up. This has completely turned on its head thanks to the massive overdevelopment of the town. Burnham is now on your hit list and will be the same as Maldon in a few years time. Such a shame you've destroyed our towns.	Towns are places that grow, historically and in the present, they have the services and facilities require in order to sustain their day to day lives. Unless there is a clear evidenced reason why a town should not grow, it will inevitably do so.
Sue	Hillman		Larger projects near existing settlements are preferable	Comment noted, though this policy would only become active if an NSIP affected the District.
michael	carr	NHS		
Simon	Plater	Plater+Claiborne		
Mark	Anderson			
Karen	Wellum			
Emma	Wright			
Linda	Coom		I understand that, locally, we have no choice but to suffer this growth.	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced, therefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months.
Caitlin	Soul			
Michelle	Curtis	Tollesbury Parish Council		
Mary	Hammond			
Ian	Drinkwater			
john	hand	N/A		
Emma	Smith	Bradwell on Sea Parish Council		
Tim	Dixon			
Nicola	Taylor	Elixirr		
Graham	Johnson	graham v johnson		
Chris	Yates			
Sally	Everritt	Community360		
Mark	Garrett			
Paul	Vidler			
Victoria	Long			
Victor	Staines			
Jayne	Moore	Essex County Fire and Rescue Service	A large amount of building has already gone on across the whole of the Maldon district, however the infrastructure has not been updated to cope. New residents into the area struggle to find Doctors and Dentists and the schools are full meaning local schools are attended by children from other villages, causing parking problems in the residential areas around the school. The roads around the Latchingdon area are terrible. The recent repairs are atrocious, with the main road having a section where the white lines haven't been replaced. Despite the repairs being carried out again because they were so uneven. The area LD2 on the proposed plan, is a flood plain. We have had Aviva refuse us house insurance for that reason. Gardens in this area are flooded throughout the winter. The field is currently a swamp, where as those that are not flood planes are drying up. Another site in this area was given planning permission several years ago but has yet to be built on due to the costs of the flood alleviation scheme making the project not viable. LD2 would require significant flood alleviation so as not to cause further damage to the gardens of the current residents and to allow for the proposed houses. I can't see that this option is a viable one for the 31 houses suggested on this identified area on the plan. Going back to the infrastructure. Latchingdon cannot cope with the traffic that goes through it presently. You LDP will essentially turn Latchingdon from what you class a large village, into a small town, without suitable infrastructure to support it,	At the present time the Council cannot comment on whether individual settlements or sites can or cannot accommodate future growth.The LDP Review process has to plan for future growth and it will have to be accommodated within the District. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and this was one of the reasons for the Issues and Options Consultation. In the coming months work will be undertaken to make the necessary decision using the evidence prepared as part of the LDP Review work. The present LDP has an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which was approved through its examination, infrastructure is agreed with statutory providers such as the NHS and ECC and should be to mitigate the impact of development. Infrastructure is being provided under the terms of S106 legal agreements and will be assessed further as part of the LDP Review work. The matter in the majority of cases is not that infrastructure has not been provided but that its trigger points such as the number of homes completed has not been reached. This matter is monitored carefully and contributions pursued as they become liable.
Kevin	Bennett			

Nicholas	Matthams		There are too many options on this that could have very different outcomes to give a blanket yes. Ideally major infrastructure projects should remain in the existing main towns with smaller developments only in the villages so as not to upset the existing village demographics. Ideally in villages this should be limited to ideally not more than a 15% increase in any village size over the 15 year period to allow the villages to adjust and not destroy the village life for the existing residents. This should also help reduce the carbon footprint as secondary schools, doctors, major shops etc. will be based in these towns i.e. mostly within walking distance.	Comment noted, however the Council cannot give an arbitary % figure for settlement growth, it depends on a number of factors all of which will require to be evidenced.
Christian	van Stolk	RAND Europe		
Nicholas	Jepson			
Pamela	Lacey			
Chloe	Soul			
carole	kirk			
Sharon	Jackson			
RICHARD	GROUT			
Charles	Bishop			
Paul	Jewiss	Self Employed		
Deborah	Anderson	NHS		
John	Pilgrim	Self employed		
Gloria	Gold	London Design and Engineering UTC		
Linda	Curry			
Lucy	Waterhouse			
Jon	Mayhew			
James	Goody	James Goody refurbishments		
Johanna	Dale			
Tracy	Kinnane			
Carlos	Rodriguez			
Rebecca	Tucker			
Mark	Faraway		New villages instead of expanding existing. With infrastructure that can cope with the development	This consultee response does not relate to the question, checked and the consultee has made the same comments under the appropriate question, which will be responded to
T	Ketteley			
Elizabeth	Weston			
Jacky	Barber			
Ursula	Benjafield			
Paul	Mitchell			
Kristian	Tokeley	CTC Construction Ltd		
Ziyad	Thomas	Churchill Retirement Living / McCarthy Stone		
James	Campbell	HMPPS	I do not agree with the expansion of the use of greenfield sites outside of the settlement boundaries. This could easily lead to more expansion and natural disruption outside of the main areas if left unchecked into the future.	The district does not have a history of industrial land use so there is limited brownfield land opportunities or opportunities to build within settlement boundaries. Therefore it is inevitable that greenfield sites will be required to accommodate future growth. When carrying out site allocations, brownfield land should be prioritised in the settlements chosen for growth.
William	Moss			
Simon	Mackenzie Smith			
Richard	Udall			
Rosalind	Bishop			
John	Symington			
Michael	Manning			
Jack	Inglis	Kelvedon Hall		
Peggy	Shields			
Dawn	Adams	Catesby Estates		
Wayne	Tilley	RTG Group Limited		
David	Dronfield	Braxted park		
John	Peirson			
Ron	Brown	Corporate		
Roger	HAWES			
Anne	Hull	Elmwood Equestrian Centre		
Matthew	Bloxham	Matt		
Julia	Morris			
Amanda	MacKenzie			
Jenny	Shepherd			
Jack	Ellum			
Bernard	Steeples			
Anna	mccomb	NHS Property Services Ltd		
Natalie	Kermath	Environment Agency		

Question 14

Peter	Knights			
Unknown	Unknown	Ministry of Defence		
Duncan	Clark			
Patricia	Smith			
Mick	Sargeant		The Bradwell possibility is accepted but what about infrastructure in general. The often quoted need for rural development in order to enhance services is suspect. In Goldhanger there have been recent developments of 17 in Benham Close and 8 om Maldon Road a 10% increase with nothing improved	The Council is considering having a major infrastructure projects policy because there are a number of national strategic projects which cover the District and the Council should be able to set out in policy terms its approach to these. Some of them like Bradwell B may not happen in the life of the Plan but then again they might so instead of spreading the policy throughout the plan it will be contained in one place only to be activiated in decision making if needed.
John	Cockerell	Hatfield Peverell Parish Council		
Catherine	Williams	C/O Savills (Agent)		
Tom	Kelly			
Linda	Gemmill			
Linda	Gemmill			
Mark	Norman	Highways England		
Thomasin	Foster			
*	*			
Alan	Massow			
*	*			
Ian	Butt			
Sarah	Sayer			
*	*			

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 15. Which growth option do you consider to be the most appropriate for the District of Maldon?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Jenny	Clemo	Langford & Ulting Parish Council	Option 7 - There is sufficient residential development in the north of the District with the new North Heybridge Garden and South Maldon suburbs. A majority of the traffic generated from new developments is funnelled through Langford and Ulting to the detriment of those living and working there and this is the main reason why any more development proposed should be in the south of the District.	Comment noted, though Burnham on Crouch as the Districts second town did accommodate growth so not all growth was directed to Maldon/Heybridge
Gavin	Rowsell		Whilst Option 2 seems the most obvious to protect the rural landscape, all options need more flexibility akin to Option 4, as setting such specific restrictions (such as some within the existing 2017 policy) have proved quite obviously detrimental (as accepted in the consultation text).	Impact on landscape will be a consideration when assessing sites for allocation and is a part of the assessment during the planning application process.
Gareth	Davies	N / A	I favour Option 2 as this seems to afford the best chance to address the current (and currently unavoidable) damage to Burnham due to the lack of new infrastructure. I strongly oppose Option 7 because the Southminster Branch is capacity constrained and the B1012 is also insufficient for existing traffic. Upgrading the B1012 will damage the local environment. The Crouch Valley is a beautiful area and extensive development will degrade the beauty and also put pressure on and damage the River Crouch as an amenity and habitat.	Comment noted, though the railway line in the south is not at capacity and can accommodate an increase in use.
Jackie	Gibbs			
Mike	Hayes		OPTION 2: Will unequivocally leads to the best form of sustainable development and healthy, properous communities throughout the district.	Support noted for option 2
David	Sismey		Option 4 and option 7 are most appropriate. Maldon and Heybridge have taken the brunt of the existing LDP housing and infrastructure / traffic etc is now reaching breaking point. Consequently future development should be pepper-potted around the district or placed along the railway line which would reduce traffic etc. Of these 2 options, option 7 is most appropriate.	Comment noted, though Burnham on Crouch as the Districts second town did accommodate growth so not all growth was directed to Maldon/Heybridge
Stuart	Willsher	Persimmon Homes Essex	The Plan presents seven options; Persimmon Homes would support Option 2. Our comments of which are as follows: • OPTION 1 – It is clear that Maldon/Heybridge and Burnham on Crouch have received significant growth in the current local plan, and therefore further significant growth (over and above planned permissions and emerging sites) may place a further strain on existing services and facilities. In addition, focussing growth on these two settlements would not allow significant investment in other parts of the District, many of which may not have received any growth from some time. Persimmon Homes would not therefore endorse Option 1. • OPTION 2 - 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. In our opinion, the more sustainable larger villages to focus development in would be Maylands, Southminster, Great Totham South and Tollesbury, all of which benefit from services and facilities, access to public transport and are of a size that could accommodate a certain level of sustainable growth (which would in turn provide investment towards existing, or new, services and facilities in those villages). Furthermore, with reference to the January 2022 Housing And Economic Land Availability Assessment, it is clear that those four settlements have suitable sites to accommodate further development, with the HELAA identifying: o Maylands – Potential capacity of 949 dwellings from the 10 suitable sites; o Southminster – Potential capacity of 1,914 dwellings from the 6 suitable sites; o Great Totham South – Potential capacity of 353 dwellings from the 8 suitable sites; and o Tollesbury – Potential capacity of 754 dwellings from the 8 suitable sites. The above would provide c.4,000 dwellings, or over ten years supply; clearly the Council would not need to allocate each suitable site but serves to illustrate that these settlements present suitable opportunities to make significant contributions to housing delivery in the Local Plan. This Option would also allow for a windfall policy for housing for the medium and small villages, which Persimmon Homes would endorse. • OPTION 3 - 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. Our concern with this Option is that it is apparent that many of these settlements do not have sufficient 'suitable' sites (as identified in the January 2022 Housing And Economic Land Availability Assessment); for example: o Wickham Bishops - Potential capacity of 15 dwellings from the 1 suitable site; o Purleigh - Potential capacity of 150 dwellings from the 2 suitable sites; o Tillingham - Potential capacity of 109 dwellings from the 3 suitable sites. In addition, the less sustainable larger villages, such as the four above, feature services and facilities than the other larger villages; thereby by applying economies of scale those villages would need to be allocated fewer	Support noted for option 2
Anthony	Fittock		Option 5 - the complaints from residents accross the district are the conditions of roads, school places , GP's and protection of geenspace and the changes being made to their choice of location by housing growth. If growth is required to meet housing tagets an assesment of the forecast required Infrastructure is required to support that growth . The farther east that gets built the more traffic will travel along roads to access services. The more that is developed to the east the farher the distances will need need to be travelled to access secondary school places.South Woodham Ferrers is already used creating journeys of up to 45 minutes. A large garden suburb offers the opportunity to justify a clearly needed secondary school and primary if required to support that growth. Failure to do so will continue to create a disjointed and lagged approach to infrastructure. Current situation using NOR Primary 2021 year 7 in 2028/9 census ORA area PAN 210 Planning group 02 127 Pg 03 97 pg 04 41 total 265 vs PAN of 210 a 55 deficit How would more growth from this date (which is already planned) be accomodated in a sustainable manner without cross boundary movement	Comment noted. The LDP has an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which was approved through its examination, infrastructure is agreed with statutory providers such as the NHS and ECC and should be to mitigate the impact of development. Infrastructure is being provided under the terms of S106 legal agreements and will be assessed further as part of the LDP Review work.

Question 15

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 15. Which growth option do you consider to be the most appropriate for the District of Maldon?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Daniel	McAllister	Robert Mulholland And Company Limited	Option 4 is the most appropriate for the district - New housing, employment and infrastructure and services should be available to all settlements, with the larger villages taking a proportionate share of the growth. Affordable housing and local employment must be available in all settlements (at an appropriate scale) Specialised housing should be available in all settlements to support highly localised need of elderly residents wishing to remain in their villages. If development is not distributed throughout the district then these improvements will not be delivered throughout the district	Support noted for option 4.
Sarah	Sapsford		Option 4.	Support noted for option 4.
Stephanie	Ireland		Securing the infrastructure, The visitor economy.	The LDP has an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which was approved through its examination, infrastructure is agreed with statutory providers such as the NHS and ECC and should be to mitigate the impact of development. Infrastructure is being provided under the terms of S106 legal agreements and will be assessed further as part of the LDP Review work.
e	e	e	I think we should target most growth in an entirely new settlement; plan for a small amount of growth in the three towns and the topmost sustainable villages; and prevent all large developments elsewhere. The scores should be recalculated with the correct formula and with some revised weightings as described in my response to question 11. When the settlements are then listed in rank order of sustainability it may be that the fifth and sixth villages have almost identical scores – in which case the cut-off should be drawn slightly higher or lower – wherever there is a more significant difference. Once that cut-off point is known then I think the quantity of new homes in each village "above the line" should be based on that village's total weighted sustainability score. eg A weighted sustainability score of 200 would mean 10 new homes per annum for that village. As the total weighted sustainability scores for the top five villages are likely to total about 700, between them they would have 35 new homes per annum. That same number – 35 – could also be the annual target for each of the three towns, as they have already contributed significantly to our supply of housing. This would give a total of 140 new homes per annum in existing settlements, with the remainder coming from an entirely new settlement. OPTION 1 - focus on Maldon/Heybridge and Burnham I don't think we should build any more large developments in these towns. Instead we should focus on mainly small sites for local builders and self-build. We should also consider making the most of the buildings we already have: Eg In Heybridge the outer-most commercial units could take another storey for residential use (and other units could take solar panels on the roof). Residents would clearly require segregated side or rear access, and careful design would be needed to ensure that windows don't just look onto a factory. Eg Encourage residential use above shops in the High Streets. OPTION 2 - A strong focus on the towns and larger sustainable villages As above, plus: I don't agree that the larger villages are fully sustainable, they are just more sustainable than the smaller villages. Any building in the villages should focus on mainly small sites for local builders and self-build. OPTION 3 - Growth generally focused on the towns Maldon/Heybridge and Burnham on Crouch and all the large villages of the Settlement Hierarchy As above. OPTION 4 - Pepper pot growth throughout the Settlement Hierarchy (Spread the growth across all the sustainable settlements in the District) NO, our smaller villages are not sustainable enough to be the target for new housing. 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 If this were to include full employment, leisure, transport, education etc and all the necessary infrastructure to make it truly sustainable, then yes, I would be in favour of this option, for most of our target. It should include some small sites as opportunities for local builders, and good quality, pleasant, and safe cycle and pedestrian links to the nearest town and to nearby open spaces. Option 6 - Focus growth in the	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced, therefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months. The amount of growth going into each appropriate settlement cannot just be based on a score because there are many other factors that have to be taken into account such as highway implicationss, heritage and environment constraints, flood risk, etc.
Kevin	Lagan		Rail corridor and new towns.	Support noted for options 5 & 7

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 15. Which growth option do you consider to be the most appropriate for the District of Maldon?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Bethany	Jones	Colchester Borough Council	Option 1 – Retain the option in the LDP approved in 2017 – focus growth in the settlement of Maldon/Heybridge and Burnham on Crouch - This option is essentially a business-as-usual approach as it does not change the spatial strategy from that in the current Adopted Local Plan. This is unlikely to address the issues identified in the District particularly delivery of housing and associated infrastructure, as development and growth is continuing to be directed to large scale sites within the largest settlements in Maldon and limited growth elsewhere, which has been identified is no longer suitable. This is therefore not considered an appropriate strategy for the new Local Plan. Option 2 – a strong focus on the towns and large sustainable villages and Option 3 – growth generally focused on the towns Maldon/Heybridge and Burnham on Crouch and all the large villages of the Settlement Hierarchy Given the similarity of these options, either could be considered an appropriate strategy as development is to be proportionate in accordance with a settlement hierarchy focusing growth in the most sustainable locations across the District. Option 4 – Pepper pot growth throughout the Settlement Hierarchy - This option is not considered appropriate as by providing growth in all settlements based on a proportion of the number of homes in each settlement is 'planning by numbers' and does not take into consideration the constraints to development such as infrastructure capacity, natural and historic environment, etc Option 5 – Creating a new satellite settlement or large urban extension bolted onto one of the towns, large villages and/or settlement adjacent to the District Boundary - Colchester Borough Council strongly objects to this option. If this option is pursued it could increase pressure on already stretched services and facilities over which Maldon District Council have no control because they are in another Local Authority. This approach could lead to coalescence of settlements within Maldon as well as with neighbouring settlements outside of the District. Focusing development in one broad direction could lead to a disproportionate level of affordable housing provision throughout the district. If this option was pursued in relation to a settlement adjacent to the Colchester boundary, CBC would certainly require further engagement via the Duty to Cooperate to explore and identify any cross-boundary impacts and issues. Option 6 – Focus growth in the north of the District to link into the services and facilities available in Tiptree, Witham and Maldon/Heybridge - This option is not supported by Colchester Borough Council. There are already a number of capacity issues within Tiptree, notably health care services, public transport and the road network. These issues are being explored through the Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan, which is currently preparing its Regulation 14 draft. In addition, this option could also further add to the strategic capacity concerns associated with the A12 and the connecting network, including traffic increase to and from and trough Tiptree and surrounding settlements. Views of the Highway Authorities- Essex County Council and National Highways will be important if this option is to	Support noted for options 2 & 3
magnus	Magnusson	Parker Planning Services	Option 1, retaining the option in the current LDP (2017) insofar as the focus for growth should be the settlements of Maldon/Heybridge and Burnham?on-Crouch, is the most appropriate for the district. Maldon/Heybridge and Burnham-on-Crouch are the main 'Towns' within the district. Focussing growth here would ensure that 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 are realised. This scenario could be characterised by the following. • Urban extensions on greenfield sites adjacent to the main towns (potentially including sites BOC4 and BOC5 or parts thereof), • 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	Support noted for option 1
Nick	Whiteley		Option 4: But try to encourage more sustainable travel options into the area, like electric buses.	Support noted for option 4, it will be difficult to bring sustainable travel options into smaller settlements without a large quantum of development to fund them.
Linda	Flowers	Self Employed		
Peter	Holmes		I am strongly opposed to any more development of either Maldon or Burnham towns as I think they have provided more than their fair share of the current LDP housing allocation. In particular I am opposed to the following sites: MAL/HY20 (Longfields). This is the only open space in the centre of the town and provides a much needed (and much used) 'green lung'. MAL/HY15. This is a huge area and would be a massive encroachment on the open countryside. A planning application for the development of Maldon Hall Farm was refused a few years ago because it was considered to be unsuitable and unsustainable. Why change that decision now? MAL/HY10. This is adjacent to Leeches garden, an open space donated to the town by the Leech sisters. A planning application for this site was also turned down (and refused on appeal) as the houses would have blocked the beautiful views from the garden. This area is also a major wildlife reserve. In my opinion, any further development would be best achieved by Section 12, Option 5 of the Consultation document, that is a new 'garden village' to the south of the District, ideally close to a railway station such as Althorne or North Fambridge. This village would need to contain all the necessary infrastructure to make it self-contained, eg. schools, medical services and library. The road network would also need improving to provide good access to Maldon, South Woodham and the A130.	The Council cannot respond on site specifics at this stage of LDP Review. Work on site allocations will be undertaken in the coming months with a Preferred Options consultation being carried out at the end of this period. Coment noted on option 5.
Colin	Pryke		5 A new satellite development. This would at least give the chance for a whole community to be developed on a modern integrated basis with most facilities except secondary schooling and district hospital on site - and also to decent architectural design standards. I fear that the lead time would be too great for it to be adopted.	Support noted for option 5.

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 15. Which growth option do you consider to be the most appropriate for the District of Maldon?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
John	Hitcham		My clear preference is OPTION 4 - Pepper pot growth throughout the Settlement Hierarchy (Spread the growth across all the sustainable settlements in the District) as it will enable multigeneration families to remain living in the same settlement, thereby building social cohesion. However this has to be dependent upon funding forward availability of required enabling infrastructure. With LDP I, one of the big flaws was the late availability of infrastructure well behind the housing build out rate. One reason for this was that there was a legacy shortfall of infrastructure in most settlements, small developments were exempt from contrubuting (which led to salami slicing of developments to avaoid making any contribution and MDC completely flunked the introduction of CIL which had been presented to PINs as an integral enabler for LDP I. Pepper Pot growth should to some degree make the provision of infrastructure kess challeging. It will also help greatly in terms of growing local jobs for local people	Support noted for option 4
Richard	Kelly	Croudace Homes	Option 1 – it is concerning that the Council continues with fundamentally the same as the existing strategy having acknowledged this Option takes "a long time from concept to delivery of housing on the ground", which has subsequently led to the Council not being able to maintain a robust and up to date 5 Year Housing Land Supply ('5YHLS'). If this Option is to be taken forward, sites which are deliverable in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework ('NPPF') in that they are available now, offer a suitable location for development now and have a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on site within five years need to be the focus of allocations. This will then ensure the Council can demonstrate a robust and up to date 5YHLS. Furthermore, this Option would only be supported should the cross-boundary strategic matter of delivering housing being agreed and development adjacent to South Woodham Ferrers (which is recognised as a "high order settlement" considered to be "the most sustainable as they have the most functions and the best services and facilities including transport links and employment opportunities" in the Chelmsford Local Plan) is allocated through the Review. Option 2 and Option 3 – subject to South Woodham Ferrers being included/recognised within the settlement hierarchy in recognition of the town being designated as "high order settlement" considered to be "the most sustainable as they have the most functions and the best services and facilities including transport links and employment opportunities", these Options can be supported. Similar to the response to Option 1, should these Options be taken forward, sites which are deliverable, and which are adjacent to sustainable towns need to be the focus for allocation. Not only will this approach assist the Council with housing delivery, but the provision of affordable housing will also be able to be maximised as schemes on greenfield sites can viably support delivery of this type of housing. Option 4 – it is concerning that the Council acknowledges this Option could lead to a "decline in the amount of affordable housing coming forward because of smaller sites being allocated" and "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". Selecting this Option would be completely opposed to the Council achieving its objectives one of which is to "increase and support the supply of affordable housing, including affordable home ownership". This Option should therefore be discounted. 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 is supported (subject to South Woodham Ferrers being referred to / recognised as a sustainable town). Whilst this Option is supported, given the location of satellite towns, these schemes are often associated with long-lead in times owing to the number of parties involved and the significant costs in delivering infrastructure which can often be to the detriment to rates of supply and the resultant provision of affordable housing. The Council therefore needs to	Support noted for option 5.
Andy	Quelch		I don't agree at all that the small village of Althorne for example currently consisting of approx 650 homes could it time grow by 1750 or more. I don't actually agree with adding additional housing to existing villages or towns. I believe that new villages should be built separately from existing communities. the infrastructure]re for these communities should be provided by the developers. building and selling houses in the south east is a very profitable business due to the high selling to build price ratio so the developers may not like it but they can easily afford it. even better would be to build away from the south east completely. this would support the "levelling up" of the country and the economies of the north and south. housing and viable businesses are a bit like the chicken and the egg, which comes first? the south east is just too crowded and a fact of life is unfortunately that younger first time buyers are not able to afford to buy new houses, so therefore need to. one away to ore affordable locations. this will eventually drive a population that will support business growth away from the south east. failing this I would suggest option 1 or 6. concentrating on the north of the region.	Comment noted. The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced, therefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months.
James	Rushton		Option 1 - I prefer this option - ie to maximise the sustainability, 'local hub' nature of both towns, whilst retaining the policy of maintaining individual settlement boundaries for the villages, beyond which development may not take place.	Support noted for option 1
Catherine	Champion			
Terence	Hughes	Burnham-on-Crouch constituent	5 as it takes the pressure off services and infrastructure in the already overwhelmed towns. The power station will take years to obtain necessary permissions and government backing. With hydrogen and mini reactors in the pipeline they could be implemented far quicker than the massive Chinese reactors. Therefore if and when the go ahead for the power station goes ahead then a new plan would have to be made.	Support noted for option 5.

Question 15

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 15. Which growth option do you consider to be the most appropriate for the District of Maldon?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
John	Tompkins		Option 1 - Of the seven options listed for housing growth, it is considered that option 1, to focus growth on the settlements of Maldon/Heybridge and Burnham on Crouch and retaining the continuation of the policy of having settlement boundaries with development restricted in the other settlements to sites within the settlement boundaries. In retaining settlement boundaries, the character of the individual villages would be retained. The village defined settlement boundaries are a sure way of maintaining the character of individual areas and the rural aspect oof the District. Once these are disregarded that rural character will not be regained. Given the lack of infrastructure investment in the District, it would make sense to maximise existing communication routes and the railway would appear to be the best option.	Support noted for option 1
Jeremy	Potter	Chelmsford City Council	The seven options for growth are noted. The City Council believes that the options selected for further consideration should be guided by the evidence base, in particular the emerging transport modelling and opportunities for sustainable transport, sustainability appraisal, and provision of new jobs close to new housing. Choices should also be informed by the impact on the capacity of services provided in adjoining local authority areas such as education, medical and community facilities, and on coastal habitats. The City Council wishes to ensure that sufficient weight is given to the impact of development proposals in the Maldon district on the City Council's area. Whilst it welcomes local initiatives and improved connectivity between Maldon communities, it is essential that site specific development proposals should not be seen in isolation, but in combination with other proposals in the LDP and allocations in Local Plans for adjoining local authorities. Given high levels of commuting, the relative prosperity of Chelmsford and ongoing demand for services and facilities, road transport infrastructure is already under pressure. Traffic modelling supporting Chelmsford's Local Plan identified significant constraints that even when mitigated left little room for further growth. The City Council considers it is essential that the proposed traffic modelling gives robust consideration to the wider traffic implications and impact of development from the proposed growth of Maldon on the City Council's area, particularly in relation to the following: • A414 Maldon to Chelmsford corridor As a key primary route, the A414 east of Chelmsford has been identified as a particular area of congestion, with the potential for this to be exacerbated by growth in Maldon district, to access the City Centre for work, leisure and study, and from vehicular access to the new railway station north-east of the City Centre – specifically from Options 1 to 5. • B1012/A132 into South Woodham Ferrers and links to the A130 The A130/A132junction and the Rettendon Turnpike are forecast to be over capacity by 2036, and traffic modelling for Chelmsford's Local Plan identified significant constraints. This led to requirements in the Chelmsford Local Plan allocation for the development to maximise opportunities for sustainable travel, provide new public transport routes, improve pedestrian and cycle connections to the railway station, build specific junction improvements, and make contributions to strategic network improvements. Significant development to the south of the Maldon district could have an unacceptable impact on the road network through South Woodham Ferrers, and whilst Option 7 focuses growth along the rail line, rail travel would only form a partial role in meeting the overall transport needs from such growth. • Chelmsford City Centre The City's roads are under significant strain with only 4% capacity (in 2018) during peak periods. This leads to queueing, unreliable journey times, reduced air quality and increased traffic on residential streets. Any incidents on the wider network result in significant congestion. The City Council believes that the outcomes of the traffic modelling should be used to determine the spatial	The consultee does not favour any option but wishes the Council to look to the transport modelling to assist in the choice of an option for growth, this will form part of the evidence base for the work of the review of the LDP.
Daniel	Goodman	Rochford District council	The Council has no detailed comments to make on the settlement pattern or spatial options being considered. However, the Council considers that MDC should continue to develop its evidence base and determine its spatial strategy on the basis of clear sustainability objectives, ensuring that any negative impacts on neighbouring authorities are fully understood, assessed and mitigated through the plan. At this stage of plan-making it is not possible to discern in detail the implications that the different spatial strategy options could have on communities in Rochford District. It is however recognised that the two authorities do not share a land boundary and the extent of overlap in housing and labour markets is fairly modest. The two policy areas where it is considered that there is a more significant overlap between the two areas is in relation to transport and movement; and the beneficial use of the River Crouch for tourism, commerce and leisure. The Council would therefore support ongoing engagement at key stages of the local plan to ensure that the implications of the strategy option ultimately selected on communities in Rochford is understood and where necessary, collaborative solutions can be secured. This may include further collaboration to understand how different strategy options may impact on the wider transport network, including the Rettendon Turnpike, A130 and A1245, as well as rail services along the Southminster branch line as they connect onto the Southend Victoria line serving Rochford District.	Comment noted, the duty to co-operate is a fundamental part of the process of the local plan review.
Chris	Harvey		My strong preference would be for Option 4 - I believe there is a need for incremental growth in settlements throughout the District which are manageable in size, and which enable the supporting additional infrastructure to be put in place. The comment was made that small scale developments might not attract enough affordable housing provision - surely the Council can make this a condition for planning consent?	Support noted for option 4
Jane	Senior			

Question 15

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 15. Which growth option do you consider to be the most appropriate for the District of Maldon?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Amanda	Clack		Options for Growth should focus on Options 1, 2, 3, 5 and 6. There is clear evidence of service and facility deterioration from 2008 to 2021. Development prioritisation should therefore be concentrated to the Towns and Larger Villages (only) where these facilities can be built up to better serve all the local community. Development concentration around the Towns and Larger Villages allows a focus for access and infrastructure as well as service and facility provision, thereby enabling the quality of rural life and enjoyment for the remaining areas to the benefit of everyone. A spread and scattering of development dilutes provision and spreads wider impact to the detriment of the rural landscape. Object to Option 7 - ALT2 - Althorne - the increase in size and nature of this site being identified as a 'yes' in the HELAA Call for sites 2022 would severely negatively impact the landscape as well as increase volumes of traffic to a road that currently cannot cope in an area which was originally designated as a Special Landscape Area and Coastal Protection Belt.	Comment noted. The Council cannot respond on site specifics at this stage of LDP Review. Work on site allocations will be undertaken in the coming months with a Preferred Options consultation being carried out at the end of this period.
Daphne	Scott		Considering all the options, the one which appears to be the most oppropriate for development in the Maldon District is Option 6 -Focus growth in the north of the District to link into the service and facilities available in Tiptree. The reason for this is that Tiptree already has a thriving community with good shopping and facilities, and is close to Colchester, Witham and Chelmsford for good work opportunities and because of their close proximity to Tiptree means that community would not be as great as from the South of the area.	Support noted for option 6
Kenny	Alexander	Thomas Gainsborough School	Use the larger sustainable towns to develop as the infrastructure is better suited.	Support noted for option 1
David	Kennedy		As stated earlier the very specific and particular characteristics of the district means that public transport will never be the total answer to motility for both work and pleasure. Focusing development in the already gridlocked major conurbations of the district without significant improvement and upgrade to the road network will only serve to exacerbate this situation. Give that Highways is the remit of the County Council and beyond the control of MDC it makes greater sense to either pepper new developments around the district to spread the increase in traffic or to develop a significant new road Village which would bring with it new road infrastructure by virtue of its scale.	Support noted for options 4 & 5
Mark	Behrendt	Home Builders Federation	The HBF cannot comment on which of the growth options is most appropriate and the eventual strategy will depend on the types of sites that are not only available but also deliverable or developable within the plan period. As such we welcome the recognition by the Council of the need to support the delivery of a wider range of sites, and in particular the provision of smaller sites, to ensure a more balanced supply of housing across the plan period. The delivery of housing on large strategic sites is an important part of any areas housing supply but this needs to be in conjunction with the allocation of small and medium sized sites that will deliver earlier in the plan period and ensure the delivery of new homes is more consistent and less prone to shortages in supply should there be delays in homes coming forward on the larger sites.It is also important that the Council ensures that sites are distributed across the Borough providing opportunities not just in the largest settlements but also smaller towns and villages. However, in many of the options the Council appear to have focussed solely on using a windfall policy to increase delivery of smaller sites rather than on allocating such sites. Wherever possible the Council should seek to allocate small sites and not rely on windfall policies to increase the supply of such sites. The NPPF requirement for 10% of homes to be on small sites identified in the local plan or brownfield register should be seen as a minimum. Policies that seek to support the supply of windfall on smaller sites will of course be an important and necessary part of the local plan, but the priority must be allocations.	Comment noted
Matthew	Cooper		Option 4 would be most appropriate. This would allow for fair and flexible expansion in response to supply and demand across the District. Option 5 would be very damaging to the local area, be at complete odds with existing planning policy, and require substantial integrated infrastructure with neighbouring districts (which in itself would be challenging given existing infrastructure in place in current town).	Support noted for option 4
Terry	Inkpen	None	We consider that Option One would be the best choice for the district. It would preserve the integrity and character of the small villages and minimise the impact on the countryside. Windfall Sites are a feature of all the other options with no definition of how they are to be implemented. The information published so far on the HELAA does not include small sites and it is suggested that they would be brought forward as 'windfall'. Further information on these small sites has been sought, but is not available to the public or councillors. The implementation of several windfall sites with up to 5 houses or more would be a significant addition to a small village. Adding to the existing new growth in the large settlements would cause the minimum disruption, and new infrastructure and services should already be underway. New building plots should be limited in size so the small builders can become involved and speed up delivery. This must be linked to regaining control of sites with planning approval that are not being progressed and reallocating them to smaller builders with 'time is of the essence' contracts thus reducing the number of extra plots required to achieve the delivery rate. With the adoption of smaller plots new arrangements will need to be made to provide the proportion of affordable housing. Distribution of new sites should be based on the size of the settlements prior to the 2015 start of the current LDP so that Burnham, which has already been the focus of more building than was allocated on the LDP does not receive a disproportionate share of the added requirements.	Support noted for option 1

Question 15

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 15. Which growth option do you consider to be the most appropriate for the District of Maldon?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
christine	collins		Option 1 would be the most appropriate as all the others allow windfall sites which are too ill defined and nebulous	Support noted for option 1
Stuart	Williams	Ace group	6 as they already have some kind of infrastructure in place and reopen the train line linking maldon to witham and chelmsford.	Support noted for option 6
Reegan	Howles		Option 6 seems the most appropriate. Focussing development in the North is important because of the access to the A12. Having good vehicular access is critical to any development site. There is good access into major cities like Chelmsford and Colchester, and residents can also access the railway connections at Hatfield Peverel and Witham Other options such as option 7 are NOT appropriate for the district of Maldon. These areas do not have the infrastructure and road networks to cater for this focussed growth. They also have fragile habitats and biodiversity with many of the areas being 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).There are significant areas of semi-natural habitat that make an important contribution to the area's diverse landscape character and offers key landscape views across the estuaries.	Support noted for option 6
jasbir	Singh			
Janice	Jackson		reduce housing target	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth, the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months.
Roy A	Clare	Charities	As above … namely: Option 5 ought to be central driver. Especially taking a 20 year view. Infrastructure is more likely to be timely and sufficient if that option is followed - including a secondary school. Option 5 also works well with Options 6 and 7.	Support noted for option 5.
Felicity	Gale		The complete obsession with house building is destroying the area and causing families to move away, you should be trying to give people a better quality of life and encouraging them to spend their money and time locally rather than building houses and forcing people to move away	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth, the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months.
Lindsey	Wright			
David	Hill	Dandara Ltd	Option 1 - Retain the option in the LDP approved in 2017 - focus growth in the settlements of Maldon/Heybridge and Burnham on Crouch The previous growth strategy of focusing development in the towns has clearly not delivered housing at the required rate, hence this is not considered to be a deliverable approach to development going forward. Option 2 - A strong focus on the towns and larger sustainable villages This approach appears to offer the potential for improved delivery rates by distributing development further down the hierarchy, especially if it is based on the opportunities and the potential benefits that development could bring. It is clear that there are opportunities in the settlements below the main towns in the settlement pattern to accommodate a significant amount of development. The inclusion of more settlements in the strategy will help overcome issues of deliverability. Therefore, it could be considered sustainable to allow levels of development in the larger villages potentially above that in the towns, which have largely accommodated growth in the past and not delivered at the required rate, largely because they are so few. Option 3 - Growth generally focused on the towns Maldon/Heybridge and Burnham on Crouch and all the large villages of the Settlement Hierarchy Similar to option 2, this option appears to spread the development further down the settlement hierarchy, however, this approach would appear to be artificially constrained by proportionality. This approach would not reflect the potential to deliver positive opportunities purely based on a mathematical constraint of which there does not appear to be an evidence base to support. Option 4 - Pepper pot growth throughout the Settlement Hierarchy (Spread the growth across all the sustainable settlements in the District) Whilst providing development further down the settlement hierarchy will aid with deliverability, allocating sites in locations without the supporting infrastructure will not lead to sustainable patterns of development, therefore Option 4 is not considered to be sustainable. 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 A development of this scale, which is likely to meet the local authority's requirement in one location, is unlikely to be able to deliver homes in the short to medium term (i.e. within the plan period) due to the well documented lead in times for infrastructure and planning processes, hence this approach will continue to exacerbate issues with the 5 year land supply. This approach could aid with future delivery (i.e. for a future review) however, for this iteration of the plan, it is unlikely to deliver the necessary homes when they are needed. 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 approach is not considered to be sustainable as it is encouraging more vehicular movements and is essentially discharging ownership and responsibility of growth to its neighbours. It is also ignoring its own the settlement pattern if Maldon	Support noted for option 2 & 7

Question 15

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 15. Which growth option do you consider to be the most appropriate for the District of Maldon?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Steven	Potter		Option 6 in conjunction with option 4. With option 6 it is easier to get out of the district without having to travel through South Woodham Ferrers or Danbury, both of which are bottlenecks now and will be far worse, if not impossible, once the proposed new development in South Woodham Ferrers has taken place. However, the impact of option 6 could be mitigated to some extent by some pepper-pot growth as described in option 4, provided parish councils made a major input into which sites were chosen, which should be predominately infill sites. If individual parish councils were given an allocation of new house sites required in their parishes in the next plan period, they could draw appropriate sites to the district council's attention. New development via in-fill would then be absorbed into places where development already existed; would not be very obvious; and would not extend into the open countryside.	Comments noted, sites have to be allocated they cannot be left for parish councils to bring to the District Councils attention.
Vysian	Banyard	TKPC	Options 2 & 3 sound similar but are probably about right, however Option 7, with development along the railway line would need to be part of that. Option 6 relies on Tiptree (see above - facilities already over-subscribed and difficult to access, as are those in Maldon & Witham). Importantly, this would also involve development on agricultural land and the loss of the rural character of the small villages.	Support noted for option 2 & 3 & 7
Diane	Carter		Option 6 As it makes logical sense to group housing in the NW of the district where the infrastructure is in place (roads, community resources, health, education etc) to support a large development.	Support noted for option 6
Luke	Garrett	Obsidian Strategic Asset Management Ltd	Obsidian Strategic consider that Options 3 (growth generally focused on the towns of Maldon / Heybridge and Burnham-on-Crouch and all the larger villages in the settlement hierarchy) and 6 (focus growth in the north of the District to link into the services and facilities in Tiptree, Witham and Maldon / Heybridge) are most appropriate for the District. Option 3 is considered most appropriate having regard to national policy as development would be focused on the most sustainable settlements in the District, together with the amount of growth being explicitly proportioned to each settlement. This approach would also avoid an overreliance on windfall sites, whilst ensuring economies of scale necessary to support and generate a wide range of facilities. Option 6 is also considered appropriate given the current relationship with settlements outside of the District that have a high-level of services and facilities, proximity to existing road and rail infrastructure, and to avoid an overreliance on the existing towns of Maldon / Heybridge and Burnham-on-Crouch which have historically accommodated significant growth. Given the District Council's acknowledged overreliance on urban extensions and strategic growth as set out in its current adopted planning policies, an element of 're-balancing' is considered necessary to spread growth across the sustainable settlements in the District.	Support noted for option 3 & 6
Robin	Fanshawe			
John	Brown			
Chris	Waumsley	Inovo Consulting	Option 3 or option 4	Support noted for option 3 & 4
Phil	Jacklin		Option 2 would appear to make sense in terms of making use of existing infrastructure which can then be readily expanded.	Support noted for option 2
Robert	Jones	The University of Reading	Option 5. The promotion of a new satellite settlement will be best suited to the creation of new, core infrastructure - like a new secondary school or medical centre - whilst reducing the pressure for the incremental damage to existing communities by unmanageable levels of development. Failing that, option 7 would be best from the point of view of travel access - whether by road or rail.	Support noted for option 5 & 7

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 15. Which growth option do you consider to be the most appropriate for the District of Maldon?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Robert	Stephens	N/A	MDC should prioritise two of the listed options, in the following order of preference: 1. Option 1 - Continue the existing LDP's approach by allocating all new growth in Maldon, Heybridge and Burnham providing the existing infrastructure is able to support an overall increase in growth of 4000+ units 2. Option 5 - Create a new garden settlement adjacent to a town within the District, but not an existing settlement .However the overarching priorities the essential prerequisite, must be infrastructure and climate change requirements, must be put in place prior to building of the new housing units .My reason for supporting this approach is that, by continuing the existing approach to put new growth in the towns, there are likely to be a smaller number of large developments, rather than a larger number of small developments. This should then enable: • Appropriate and safe road access can be designed into schemes • Optimise and maximise the usage of public transport which becomes more cost effective and reduces reliance on the car • Roads and pavements are developed for cyclists, pedestrians, wheelchair, and mobility scooter users • Securing the maximum number of badly needed affordable housing units for both the younger and older residents. • Ensure that new housing and workplaces are served by appropriate and funded infrastructure developments including primary health care, schools, drainage, sewage treatment works, public utilities and community facilities e.g. heating • Economies of scale will result in a reduction in overall infrastructure costs for larger developments compared to the costs of multiple smaller developments. Even greater economies would result through joint developments being undertaken, wherever possible, with neighbouring councils • A better response to climate change and reducing emission challenges by ensuring better public transport access and minimum travel distances to access facilities and workplaces provided by the towns and out of District • The provision within or adjacent to new developments of open spaces and recreation grounds to support the well being requirements • Increased support for existing retail outlets, and usage of leisure and other facilities in the towns, within a 15 minute walk away. • Access and sustainability can more readily be built into a larger development, e.g. ensuring footpaths which are big enough to take wheelchairs, mobility scooters and prams • A number of settlements in the District do not have access to gas supplies and are reliant largely on oil, wood or electricity for heating. During the transition period, as the country moves to wholly carbon neutral heating systems, gas is a cleaner system of providing power • The development of carbon free heating and hot water features, already proven in Iceland, solutions at a community level, will also maximise economies of scale Options for Growth on which I am Neutral Option 7 suggests focusing growth along the railway line in the south of the District. This would reduce	Support noted for 1, 5 & 7
Pete	Butcher		I don't believe scrapping settlement boundaries is the way forward. if that is done there will need to be further detailed regulation on how this development is controlled. If there is no control then it will be a "free for all" and will mean urban creep into the countryside. The current boundaries clearly defines where and where not developments are allowed. However, It is still possible to build outside the settlement boundary if, for instance, a neighbourhood plan allocates such an area for development and the land owner is in agreement. Rather than scrap settlement boundaries and replace them with a complex set of rules. which, at best, will be subjective. Why not encourage all parish councils to identify future development land either through a NP or some other community voting scheme. My preferred growth options are : Option 1 and Option 5 - for the following reasons: (1) This will allow for economies of scale, delivering the most houses at an affordable cost. (2) It will provide the largest amount of affordable housing (40%) (3) It will allow the infrastructure to be developed at the same time as the housing (4) It is more environmentally sustainable because it concentrates people, jobs, services and public transport in the same area, thus reducing the need to commute. (5) It protects the countryside and coastal areas from unnecessary development, thus helping to protect the tourist industry. Knowing that there is a long gestation period for large scale projects, perhaps the council could start several of the project as early as possible and allow for he fact they will come on stream in a less predictable way	Comment noted, though the retention of settlement boundaries is quite likely to result once again in the Council not having a 5 year supply and a plan which is inflexible with regard to being able to change with differing circumstances.
JO	COOMBES		OPTION 3 - Growth generally focused on the towns Maldon/Heybridge and Burnham on Crouch and all the large villages of the Settlement Hierarchy	Support noted for option 3
Jonney	Aldridge		option 2: I think that option 2 will best place development in order to keep the rural character of the area. To me, and I suppose many residents like me, the rural character of the area is its great attraction, 'development' is less important.	Support noted for option 2
Mark	Hurley	Selfridges	I'd start again. For decades the council has preferred to mass everyone into large settlements, but Essex has a large land mass which could easily spread the load. I don't want to live is a Basildon, but the council seems hell bent on making everyone live in these ghastly ghettos. Spreading the load for housing across Essex and establishing more self-contained settlements would give everyone a better standard of living, people could walk to cycle to local service rather than having to get a car each time and overall would spread the load on roads etc.. Yes it would cost more in the short term as you'd need to provide services and not take the cheap option of stretching existing service to breaking point, but in the longer term would be cheaper and healthier for everyone.	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced, therefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months.

Question 15

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 15. Which growth option do you consider to be the most appropriate for the District of Maldon?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Neil	Burke	Bradwell Power Generation Company Limited	It is noted that the growth options all relate to housing, which Bradwell B does not have any specific comments in relation to. However, Bradwell B are interested in the detailed wording of any policy on major infrastructure and would welcome working with the Council in relation to their proposals for this policy.	N/A
Lynne	Goodbourn		Option 6	Support noted for option 6
Christopher	Kent		Option 4 seems the most sensible. Ideally Option 6	Support noted for option 4 & 6
Sophie	Pryor		We consider option 3 to be the most appropriate option. The majority of development should be focused on areas with existing amenities such as the larger towns however to ensure the viability of the smaller, existing settlements across the District development should also come forward in the medium and large villages. Without new housing in these areas the existing affordability issues are likely to get worse and will reduce the viability of these settlements. There have been historic delays to a number of larger housing schemes on the edge of the main settlements. Therefore a balanced mix of housing sites in scale and location would assist in ensuring a robust delivery pipeline throughout the plan period. The NPPF requirement for 10% of homes to be on smaller or brownfield site should be applied as a minimum. An enhanced allocation of smaller sites would increase choice assist in the expansion of SME housebuilders across the District	Support noted for option 3
c/o Agent	c/o Agent	Clarion Housing	Option 1 is the most appropriate growth strategy for the District of Maldon. This option was thoroughly assessed by the Inspector as part of the previous Local Plan Review in 2017, who noted that 'it is clear that Maldon, Heybridge and Burnham are the most significant settlements with the largest populations and the greatest range of facilities and services. Simply put, they are the most sustainable places in the district'. This statement remains valid; the towns of Maldon and Burnham/Heybridge are the most sustainable locations to direct growth to in the Local Plan Review. As noted previously in the document, there is limited brownfield land available in the District, and greenfield development will be necessary in order to meet the District's housing need. Sites located on the edge of existing settlements will remain the more sustainable options for development, as set out in the NPPF para. 73 which states that the supply of large numbers of new homes can often be best achieved through larger scale development e.g. significant extensions to existing villages and towns, provided they are well-located and supported by the necessary infrastructure and facilities. For example, Clarion has an interest in land at Brookhead Farm, Maldon. This is a sustainable, available and deliverable site that would represent an extension to the South Maldon Garden Suburb, and make a significant contribution towards meeting MDC's housing targets (approx. 700-800 dwellings). The site is deliverable within the 0-5 year period and would make a significant contribution to ensuring Maldon has a continuous five year housing land supply. The site's location adjacent to strategic growth areas represents an accessible location for the facilities and services of the Garden Suburb and Maldon town, and offers the potential for a landscape-led, high quality residential development that meets many of the ambitions set out in the Issues and Options document, with regard to climate change, and the delivery of key infrastructure. There is potential for the development of the site to help facilitate the delivery of the South Maldon Relief Road. It is understood that the delivery of the Relief Road has been delayed due to developer contributions not coming forward within the anticipated timescales. The Relief Road is considered a significant strategic issue for the District and its delivery would bring wider benefits. Passenger Transport improvements for South Maldon are also a priority in the adopted LP and there is potential for contributions to be made to allow these to be brought forward more quickly. Option 5 (satellite settlement/large urban extension) and 7 (growth along the railway line) focus on the creation of sustainable settlements elsewhere in the District. While these options may be suitable for large-scale development in the longer term future, new urban villages and satellite settlements take many years to come forward for development. It is considered that for this Local Plan Review, extensions to the previously identified most sustainable settlements at Maldon and Burnham/Heybridge would provide more certainty in ensuring that the	Comment noted. At the present time the Council cannot comment on whether individual settlements or sites can or cannot accommodate future growth.The LDP Review process has to plan for future growth and it will have to be accommodated within the District. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and this was one of the reasons for the Issues and Options Consultation. In the coming months work will be undertaken to make the necessary decision using the evidence prepared as part of the LDP Review work.
Stephanie	Jones	home	Option 5 The promotion of a new satellite settlement will be best suited to the creation of new, core infrastructure, like a secondary school and medical centre and it will reduce the pressure on existing communities. If not option 5, option 7.	Support noted for option 5
Phillipa	Griffiths			

Question 15

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 15. Which growth option do you consider to be the most appropriate for the District of Maldon?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Matthew	Taylor		Options 1, 2 and 3 can all be supported as these would be sustainable strategies that would focus growth in locations that have existing services, amenities, publicly accessible transport and employment opportunities. Option 4 would limit the delivery of key infrastructure, and indeed place increased pressure on existing infrastructure through growth in travel, and so not an appropriate strategy. I particularly object to Options 5 and 6, which would lead to MDC making the same mistake of focusing development in large strategic development locations, which has led to the shortfall in housing numbers to date. Encouraging employment growth to the north of the district would be inappropriate. There are far more sustainable employment allocations in the district, with closer proximity to publicly accessible transport, housing and other services. It is highly likely that the economic benefit of such employment growth in an isolated location near the district boundary, would only be for the benefit of neighbouring districts, rather than Maldon, owing to the close proximity of settlements such as Witham and the A12. It would be a highly unsustainable location, dependent upon cars as the principle mode of transport; a particular concern considering that we have a climate change emergency. Option 7 would limit the dependency on the car as the primary form of transport, but a more detailed assessment of housing numbers deliverable under this approach would be needed.	Support noted for option 1, 2 & 3
Anne	Bailey		Althorne must NOT be made a large settlement area. You have to have a green Zone. Good agricultural land would be lost if greenfield sites are built on. It is ridiculous to say that as Althorne has a station we should build. The Land in totally unsuitable as I have explaned in answer 7. small springs leak out of the ground either side of the hill creating damp and wet zones. Hence the roads seem to have constant water leaks and undermines the road surfaces. This adds to the flooding which occures both sides of the village. Building on ALT2 on Althorne hill would created unstable houses as many in the area suffer from subsidence due to the geology of the area. NATURAL HABITAT. the fields ALT2 run many Hares and wild life. Hares are not protected as yet but measures are being take to protect them as the numbers are dropping because of development and illigal Hare coursing. Woodpeckers, many species of birds, including owls, snakes, foxes, rabbits live along the railway boarders. They need to have a safe space to live. Great crested Newts live north of Althorne Hill. MENTAL HEALTH AND WELL BEING. As proved by the pandemic, our mental health deteriorates when we are not able to access the countryside. From children to the elderly to be able to walk on the foot paths and sea wall, looking over rolling green fields and woodland from either side of the river. to be able to ride on Bridleways or sail on the river is extremely important. Althorne Railway Station must be used as an access to the country side and clean air. Walks can be taken from Althorne station to Woodham Ferrers and beyond or towards Burnham on crouch. Althorne Station must NOT be used as an access for a commuter zone.	At the present time the Council cannot comment on whether individual settlements or sites can or cannot accommodate future growth.The LDP Review process has to plan for future growth and it will have to be accommodated within the District. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and this was one of the reasons for the Issues and Options Consultation. In the coming months work will be undertaken to make the necessary decision using the evidence prepared as part of the LDP Review work.
Lucien	Taylor		Option 1- these settlements are already urbanised and have the range of services and infrastructure to cope with increased housing.	Support noted for option 1
David	Baker		None are particularly palatable or appear to be based on any real evidence based analysis of genuine needs, rather they appear based on national dictates. Nevertheless it would seem sensible to to consider the option least likely to adversely impact the character of the district defined in the plan in which case Option 7 seems most appropriate continuing as to does to spread developments around locations that have a better chance of supporting increased populations.	Support noted for option 7
Glenna	Wilkins			
Danny	Soul		Option 1	Support noted for option 1

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 15. Which growth option do you consider to be the most appropriate for the District of Maldon?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Fiona	Barkham	Private Individual	For me I believe options 1 2 and 3 are best options. Those options focus on growth in location with existing services and a range of employment opportunities decreasing the need to travel for work. Option 4 – a pepper potting strategy – will inhibit the ability to deliver infrastructure, and indeed place increased pressure on existing infrastructure through growth in travel. I object to Option 6, which would overly focus development in the North of the District with implications for the deliverability of the strategy, and impacts on existing infrastructure including on congestion, road safety and sustainability given the limited public transport infrastructure serving settlements in this area. In respect of Options 5 and 6, strategic growth close to Tiptree and Witham is not justified by the evidence with no evidence that there is an unmet need arising from adjoining areas; cross-boundary issues around the impact that this would place on infrastructure, and a lack of existing services and facilities in these areas which can support growth. Such a strategy would continue to focus development in large strategic development locations. The Issues and Options document highlights the issues with such an approach in strategic terms – such sites have a long lead in-time and require significant investment in infrastructure. The last Plan has demonstrated that this approach is ineffective and will not help to maintain a five year housing land supply. It has not been shown that the infrastructure investment required to support delivery of standalone satellite growth locations can be viably delivered; and we consider that there is a high risk that such a strategy would inhibit the delivery of affordable housing. The uncertainties associated with delivery of strategic infrastructure, such as A12 junction improvements, and risks to local plans are clearly shown through the recent Examination of plans in other areas including North Essex, Uttlesford and Tandridge. The assessment of Site GB1 – Great Braxted is flawed and this cannot be regarded as a suitable location for growth. It is located close to, and within the setting of, Braxted Park which is the only Grade II* listed park and garden in the District and is of exceptional historical significance. Development would harm the setting of this. The Council's evidence shows that the surrounding landscape has a high sensitivity to change. Part of site GB1 is susceptible to flooding, and indeed the River Blackwater regularly floods in this area and is an important natural habitat. Development and associated hardstanding could increase the risk and prevalence of flooding. As we live up river in the Mill House in Braxted the personal impact of flooding is highly relevant No regard has been had of the potential impact of development at GB1 on the buried remains of a Neolithic long mortuary enclosure at Appleford Farm which is a Scheduled Ancient Monument and which was taken into consideration in moving the A12 expansion further to the north We agree that development in the countryside should be restricted, but not just to that which notionally supports the local economy, but that for which there is an identified local need, and which needs to be	Comment noted. At the present time the Council cannot comment on whether individual settlements can or cannot accommodate future growth.The LDP Review process has to plan for future growth and it will have to be accommodated within the District. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and this was one of the reasons for the Issues and Options Consultation. In the coming months work will be undertaken to make the necessary decision using the evidence prepared as part of the LDP Review work.
Isabel	Adcock		2 and 5 seem to give a better selection and allow for an holistic approach	Support noted for option 2 & 5
alan	johnson	sky broadcasting	options 1 and 6 seem the most sensible. Option 1 if Maldon wants to become massive then keep it in Maldon Option 6, it's the only part of the area with half reasonable access	Support noted for option 1 & 6
Victoria	Cutmore	Endurance Estates	Endurance Estates disagrees with some of the material in Section 12 of the Issues and Options document. The two most important points are connected: in the first bullet point of 12.2, the Council is saying in effect that the housebuilding industry is itself responsible for the absence of a five supply of land for housing. Section 12 also refers to opportunities for SMEs in the construction sector. These might be an incidental benefit of a strategy of dispersal however, any such opportunities cannot in themselves justify such an approach. The best way forward would be to ensure that a variety of sites are available within a strategy of mostly concentrated development, so that delivery rates (and a five year supply) can be maintained. Endurance Estates supports Option 4 and a strategy that directs growth across all sustainable settlements in the district, with larger settlements, like Heybridge, receiving a proportion of growth commensurate with the services and facilities they provide. Endurance Estates considers Options 5 and 6 to be particularly inappropriate. In respect of Option 5, there is such a substantial difference between an urban extension and a satellite settlement that this should be regarded as two different options. Neither is desirable. Notwithstanding what the opening paragraph of 12.14 says about economies of scale, free-standing new settlements, whatever they are called, are notorious for services and facilities lagging behind the provision of housing. Similar proposals in other parts of Essex have run into difficulties in recent years; the Uttlesford Local Plan which included three garden villages was found unsound. If on the other hand what is meant here is an urban extension, it is far from clear where any such extension could be located other than to the north of Heybridge consistent with the general thrust of Policy S2 of the approved Local Plan. In respect of Option 6, the opening paragraph of 12.15 is unclear. In particular, it is unclear what is meant by "these settlements" in the third sentence and how precisely Maldon and Heybridge themselves itself fit in. Of the other settlements mentioned, only Witham is of a size which suggests it might provide a level of services broadly comparable with that of Maldon. The first bullet point alone suggests that this option is inferior to Option 1 in terms of the concentration of development in sustainable locations. Bearing in mind the location of the District boundary, the route of the A12 to the south of Witham, the river valley, landscape including extent of woodland and the existing settlement pattern, it would be extremely difficult to integrate large scale development to the south of Witham. Options 5 and 6 would also involve greater procedural burdens in terms of the duty to co-operate. They should in our opinion be ruled out altogether. Option 7: these locations should be considered as part of a balanced strategy to ensure development is directed to the most sustainable locations, but not to the exclusion of settlements which are also sustainable but do not benefit from a train station. Please also see our response to Question 54.	Support noted for option 4

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 15. Which growth option do you consider to be the most appropriate for the District of Maldon?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Jane	Potter	Purleigh Parish Council	Purleigh Parish Council considers that Option 6 (Focus growth in the north of the district to link into the services and facilities available in Tiptree, Witham and Maldon/Heybridge) in conjunction with option 4 (Pepper pot growth throughout the Settlement Hierarchy) would be the most appropriate growth pattern for the Maldon District. Option 6 has the great advantage of being easier for residents to leave the district without having to travel through South Woodham Ferrers or Danbury, both of which are bottlenecks now and will become far worse, if not impossible to use during rush hours, once the proposed new, large-scale development in South Woodham Ferrers has taken place. The impact of Option 6 could be mitigated to some extent however by some pepper-pot growth as described in Option 4, provided parish councils can make a major input into which sites are chosen, which should predominately be in-filling. If individual parish councils were given an allocation of new house sites required in their parishes in the next plan period, they could, with the benefit of local knowledge and experience, draw appropriate sites to the District Council's attention for consideration and assessment during the 'call for sites' process. This small-scale new development via in-fill would then be absorbed into places where development already exists; would not be very obvious; and would not extend into the open countryside, which in the existing LDP is largely protected because of the massive benefits it brings to the district, the rural economy and residents. Option 6 should however be the focus of most new development.	Support noted for option 4 & 6
Brian	Haydon	Cold Norton Parish Council	Option 6 : Focus growth in the north of the District to links into the service and facilities available in Tiptree, Witham and Maldon/Heybridge. * Focuses growth in areas which are currently less densely developed but benefit from good access to commerce and employment opportunities via the A12 / A120 strategic road network and Railway connections at Witham and Hatfield Peverel * Reduce dependency on the transportation and commuting bottleneck represented by the only alternative road connections from the south of the District via B1012 / A132 through South Woodham Ferrers and A414 through Danbury, both already overburdened. * Relieve the main towns of Maldon / Heybridge and Burnham-on-Crouch of further development over and above recent expansion to permit time for infrastructure shortages (health, education, employment opportunities) to catch up. * Permit economies of scale to facilitate improvement in public transport, localised employment reducing commuting and enhanced retail offer. * Limit growth causing loss of rural amenity in the Dengie area of the Maldon District which includes unique ecological features, an increasing importance in Tourism and burgeoning growth and recognition of the Crouch Vale wine producing area	Support noted for option 6
Lee	Foster		Option 5 - close to Major transport roads/links in north of the district I.E A12 road and 2 line train links with enough facilities to accommodate the new population, therefore not putting poor pressure on the already failing services of the district or Option 4 - share the shortfall of 4492 evenly throughout the district to spread population and needs on services	Support noted for option 5 & 4
Vanessa	Horner		Options 5,6 and 7. This will allow building to integrate with focused infrastructure and retain the green field satellite villages and sites for all farming and future generation. A pepper pot approach will need a spread infrastructure which is not affordable, sustainable or eco friendly. Focus around railways will attract commuters and A roads who will bring wealth without detriment to existing communities.	Support noted for option 5 & 6 & 7
Brian	Howson	Pharmaceutical company	None - as per my other answers. I think there needs to be a push back to the U.K government. I think there needs to be a wider conversation in the U.K government which sets the expectations for increased development about controlling migration to the U.K and making the inner cities (which have already lost most of their wildlife) a better place to live. Presently, it's quite clear to me, many people are leaving London / bigger / inner cities as they and their families don't feel safe.	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced, therefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months.
Marion	Gunn		Option 6 focussing growth in the north of the district. This focuses growth on areas that are currently less densley populated bur have better access to to employment and transport via the A12/A120 and acces to railyway stations at Witham and Hatfield Peverel. Development in the South will further increase congestion and pollution along the few access roads to the Dengie, particularly the B1012/A132 through South Woodham ferrers and the A414 through Danbury both of which are overburdened with traffic Currnt large developments in Maldon and Burnham on Crouch have overburdened the infrastructure in terms ofG.P surgeries, lack of school places both primary and secondary Public Transport and employment opportunities. These areas need a rest from development to allow the infrastructure to 'catch up' to current needs	Support noted for option 6

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 15. Which growth option do you consider to be the most appropriate for the District of Maldon?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
BRIAN	COLLINS		Maldon requires a railway link. As for rural development, consideration must be taken of the fact that approx out of 1000 people, 669 own a car/van, therefore the roads in these rural areas, need developing to avoid a log jam. Providing or maintaining bus services is not going to cut it. Schools need to be increased in size, as well as an increase in Doctor surgeries. In other words you have to make it worthwhile for people to move into an area & ultimately to stay.	The LDP has an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which was approved through its examination, infrastructure is agreed with statutory providers such as the NHS and ECC and should be to mitigate the impact of development. Infrastructure is being provided under the terms of S106 legal agreements and will be assessed further as part of the LDP Review work.
Peter	Lampard			
Tim	Chilvers		Options 1, 2, 3 which seek to focus growth on Maldon and Heybridge are considered to be the most suitable growth option. In accordance with paragraph 32 of the NPPF it is important that Local Plans and spatial development strategies address the relevant economic, social and environmental objectives of the area. In this regard, it is considered that a key objective should be to focus growth in Maldon/Heybridge, which is clearly the largest and most sustainable settlement within the District and it should be the focus for growth. In accordance with paragraph 32 of the NPPF it is considered important that an adequate number of medium sized sites are allocated within Maldon/Heybridge to ensure choice and competition for market land. In addition, it is important to focus both housing and employment growth in Maldon/Heybridge to further strengthen its position at the top of the settlement hierarchy and to promote inward investment within the District. Options 5 and 6 are not considered to be suitable options. As identified within the Issues and Consultation, there have been delivery issues with the allocations under the 2014 Local Plan, in that the majority of the growth allocated, consisting of two large garden settlements, have taken a long time to be delivered, due to infrastructure and master planning complications. The allocation of these garden communities has also meant that growth has been reliant wholly on larger house builders to deliver this growth. Land to the north of Goldhanger Road, is being promoted by the Anderson Group, which is a medium sized housebuilder that operate from Chelmsford. Allocating this site for development would give the opportunity for a local housebuilder to deliver housing and a range of complimentary uses within Heybridge. In addition, the size of the site would allow the development to be delivered quickly (within the first 5 years of the plan). From the initial HELAA it is clear that there appears to only be a limited number of medium sized sites identified as suitable for development in and around Maldon/Heybridge. It is therefore considered imperative that Land to the North of Goldhanger Road, is re-assessed as a suitable site and allocated for development, with the composition of any scheme and placemaking done in a genuinely plan-led manner.	Comment noted. At the present time the Council cannot comment on whether individual settlements can or cannot accommodate future growth.The LDP Review process has to plan for future growth and it will have to be accommodated within the District. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and this was one of the reasons for the Issues and Options Consultation. In the coming months work will be undertaken to make the necessary decision using the evidence prepared as part of the LDP Review work.
Elliott	George		Option 1 - This would see the retention of existing strategy within the adopted Local Plan which, by the Council's own admission, failed in terms of housing delivery. It would therefore be perverse to continue to pursue such a failing strategy and ultimately an unsound approach. Option 2 - We support this option to include a strong focus on the towns and large sustainable villages. Paragraph 12.11 of the emerging Local Plan states that "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." Having regard to the results of the Council's Rural Facilities and Settlement Hierarchy (Jan 2022) it is clear that there is a stark difference between the sustainability credentials of the top performing Large Village – Southminster, with a score of 220 points compared to mid performing Large Villages such as Wickham Bishops scoring 101 points, less than half that of Southminster. Given the above, any growth strategy looking at the Large Villages should focus on the top three or so settlements at most, with growth significantly weighted towards the top performing villages, such as Southminster. Option 3 - This approach would continue to focus growth at the main Towns a strategy which as previously outlined in responses to other questions has demonstrably failed to deliver housing in accordance with the trajectory originally assumed. Furthermore, by allocating growth on a proportionate basis relative to population it would result in a somewhat backwards looking strategy, simply serving to reinforce existing settlement pattern, rather than addressing any existing underlying issues or aspirations for growth. Option 4 Taylor Wimpey consider that it would be better to pursue a more targeted growth strategy rather than simply evenly dispersing growth across the District as this is likely to better meet the strategic objectives of the emerging Local Plan. Option 5 We note that this option would place the overwhelming majority of growth in one new settlement/urban extension. In this context, we would note that the NPPF outlines at paragraph 60 that: "it is important that a sufficient amount and variety of land can come forward where it is needed, that the needs of groups with specific housing requirements are addressed and that land with permission is developed without unnecessary delay" Furthermore, paragraph 68 states that: "planning policies should identify a sufficient supply and mix of sites, taking into account their availability, suitability and likely economic viability" Advancing a strategy which is too overly reliant upon a new settlement / urban extension would therefore be contrary to the above policies of the NPPF. Furthermore, there is a wealth of evidence demonstrating new settlements often require significant lead-in times due to a range of factors including complicated land assembly and the need to deliver critical on-site infrastructure. As a	Support noted for option 1 & 7

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 15. Which growth option do you consider to be the most appropriate for the District of Maldon?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Kate	Ellis		I believe that the development work should be done in the TOWNS that already have the facilities that will be needed and that will not require further substantial works that will be needed for the infrastructure. These are also areas in which people have chosen to live in more urban areas. Unfortunately, due to the inaccuracies outlined in my comments above, I the classification of my own village and possibly then some of the classifications of the villages, I am extremely concerned about stating a preference option that includes large villages as I do not feel that the data presented to us is reliable enough for me to make a decision.	Support noted for option 1
Kevin	Ashman	Estates and Agency Strategic Land	EASL support Option 7, which seeks to provide sustainable growth within or immediately alongside existing settlements on the rail line to Althorne, North Fambridge and Southminster. This option provides a catalyst to offer new services and facilities within existing settlements. It also aims to create a modal shift by encouraging people to use the local rail infrastructure, which provides linkages to London. These locations also speak to the provide of accessible family homes, rather than high-density living. EASL recognise that Maldon is a rural-based District and that the character should remain. A dispersed growth option may impact the character of the area. Therefore, as set out above, the focus of the growth should be towards places are that connectable (either now or in the future).	Support noted for option 7
Jake	Nugent	Endurance Estates Ltd	We consider that a combination of Growth Options 4 and 7 would be the most appropriate. Option 4 would involve pepper-potting growth across the settlement hierarchy; Option 7 would involve focusing growth along the railway line. The use of Option 4 would de-risk the Plan by ensuring that there is no more heavy reliance on large-scale growth in the District's main towns, in which the Garden Suburb allocations by themselves have been too slow to deliver under the adopted Local Plan. A strategy involving the use of Option 4 would require growth to be spread to the villages instead, where development parcels would be smaller, more easily deliverable in the short term and therefore solve the issues currently in play. This option would also directly resolve the issue raised at paragraph 12.3 of the consultation which identifies a lack of rural housing in the sustainable villages, which is failing to support transport provision and rural business improvements; this could ultimately lead to a loss of services and facilities and increased rural isolation and accessibility. Failure to act on this would simply result in the increased loss of services in the villages, contrary to paragraph 79 of the NPPF which identifies that planning policies should identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive. There is also a need to deliver affordable housing within rural locations such as Althorne, as identified by MDC Housing Services in Committee Report reference 21/01200/FUL.. The consultation recognises that Option 4 may lead to an inability to provide essential infrastructure because of a lack of economies of scale and we agree with this. We therefore consider that Option 4 needs to be coupled with another option as a hybrid to ensure that infrastructure contributions can be funded and delivered as part of a focused strategy. Use of Option 7 alongside Option 4 would ensure that the Plan would make excellent use of existing transport infrastructure in the Crouch Valley Railway Line. The consultation document recognises the reliance on car journeys within the District in any event, so in the district's rural areas it would be sensible to exploit opportunities to make the locations more sustainable, by allocating new sites for housing within close proximity of the railway line, in accordance with NPPF paragraph 85. This approach should be coupled with a strategy to direct new infrastructure investment through the Local Plan's Infrastructure Delivery Plan to improve the scope for access by foot and for cycling. Despite directing much growth to allocation sites in other locations along the railway line in the adopted Local Plan (e.g. North Fambridge, Burnham-on-Crouch and Southminster) Althorne remains a significantly underserved station for its catchment and has not been subject to any strategic level growth in the current or previous Local Plans. This can all change by utilising this option. This combination of options, Option 4 and Option 7, would address the immediate issues of short-term land supply which triggered the need for a Local Plan review in the first place, whilst at the same time directing growth to settlements that are or could be made more sustainable along the railway line	Comment noted. At the present time the Council cannot comment on whether individual settlements can or cannot accommodate future growth.The LDP Review process has to plan for future growth and it will have to be accommodated within the District. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and this was one of the reasons for the Issues and Options Consultation. In the coming months work will be undertaken to make the necessary decision using the evidence prepared as part of the LDP Review work.
John	Buchanan		I favour Option 3 with a tweak. ie put some developement into some of the sustainable villages as well as the main centres, in order to increase their critical mass in terms of attracting shops, cafes etc. However I would also to look specifically at opportunities with villages along the railway line to allow people to benefit from work opportunities further west in Essex and in London.	Support noted for option 3
Tim	Bradford	leadenhall		
Jacky	Bannerman	Woodham Walter Parish Council	Option 1. Of the seven options listed for housing growth, it is considered that option 1, to focus growth on the settlements of Maldon/Heybridge and Burnham on Crouch and retaining the continuation of the policy of having settlement boundaries with development restricted in the other settlements to sites within the settlement boundaries. In retaining settlement boundaries, the character of the individual villages would be retained. The village defined settlement boundaries are a sure way of maintaining the character of individual areas and the rural aspect oof the District. Once these are disregarded that rural character will not be regained. Given the lack of infrastructure investment in the District, it would make sense to maximise existing communication routes and the railway would appear to be the best option.	Support noted for option 1

Question 15

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 15. Which growth option do you consider to be the most appropriate for the District of Maldon?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Mark	Tentori	Mazdev Limited	On behalf of our client, we would like to support Options 2, 4 and 6, with a preference for Option 4 as being the most appropriate. As recognised within the Maldon District Issues and Options Consultation most of the pressure for housing and infrastructure provision falls upon large settlements. It is sensible to focus growth in sustainable large villages which have existing facilities and can effectively absorb the pressing needs on housing provision. As the consultation identifies, the historic over reliance on larger, strategic sites, has led to slow delivery and a lack of homes. Instead, a strategy that promotes more smaller/medium sized sites at sustainable locations throughout the District would lead to the timely delivery of housing. The use of CIL would overcome concerns about infrastructure delivery and instead place the Council in control of the infrastructure, removing the reliance upon the development industry. More focus and weight should be put on villages and sites within them that are deliverable, sustainable, and available. Locations such as Wickham Bishops, which have been confirmed in planning appeals as being sustainable locations, should be the focus for growth. This approach would have further benefits by supporting the vitality and viability of the settlements through the delivery of new family housing. Focusing on areas outside of main towns could reduce pressure upon those settlements, while supporting the viability of other sustainable settlements. The approach would be more in line with paras 11, 69, 79 and 84 of the NPPF.	Support noted for option 4, 2 & 6
Peter	Ingram		1 is still largely appropriate	Support noted for option 1
Jane	Pilgrim		I consider option 1 to be best for a few reasons. Firstly as the original plan, it must have been thoroughly researched and planned for. It seems to me that there would be more opportunities for work, shops and public transport. It would be easier to expand the current facilities such as doctors, dentists and schools than starting from scratch. Also, the road system is much better and was planned around the towns, whilst the smaller roads around the villages are already busy and it will not be easy to widen them sufficiently.	Support noted for option 1
Judith	Radcliffe		Support option 5 only in terms of settlement adjacent to the district boundary. Support option 6 but do not accept windfall policy for Maldon or Heybridge because of what is currently being suffered there unfairly already. Future development should be contained. The sites identified by landowners currently were all rejected with good reason last time! Specifically opposed to Maldon Hall Farm for housing development due to its elevated position and proximity to cemetery, and importance for wildlife such as larks. Support option 7 to make best use of the railway line and minimise car use.	Support noted for option 5, 6 and 7
Christopher	Mabbutt	Burnham Primary School		
Mary	Putt		Option six, Any additional housing should be build as a new settlement closer to the A12 corridor, including utilities and services for the size. It would also benefit from better transport links via Witham, health access to Broomfiled and remove the requirement for yet another several hundred cars to be travelling across the district daily, poluting the environment.	Support noted for option 6
Alan	Shrimplin	N/A	OPTION 4 - Pepper pot growth throughout the Settlement Hierarchy is pragmatically the most sensible and equitable solution, To cram maximum housing on identified sites MDC are looking at increasing the density of dwellings both in dwellings per acre and multi storey height . I believe that this would destroy our area's character and cause lasting damage to our area, it has been shown that the only infrastructure improvements that have happened in MDC district have only happened in Maldon, none have happened in BOC, even with BOC being the second largest Town in the MDC district, this has become un acceptable	Support noted for option 4

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 15. Which growth option do you consider to be the most appropriate for the District of Maldon?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Valerie	Coleby	Berrys	We consider Option 2 is the closest preferred option to delivering housing for the District with the plan period. It focuses development in the most sustainable locations. However, matching up sites assessed through the call for sites as suitable sites for development shows the preferred growth would be on the edge of and potentially within Maldon/Heybridge where sites for up to 1,420 dwellings could be allocated. Such peripheral sites would complement and support additional infrastructure at this important location at the heart of the district. In this respect our client's site referenced MAL/HY10 Land to the Rear Of 50 To 58 London Road, would be a suitable allocation with a short-term delivery of around 37 dwellings. Indeed, the site could come forward earlier to meet the current housing supply shortfall. The suitability of the site for allocation is fully set out through the call for sites submission. The call for sites assessment identifies where land is available and the Council's assessment considers which sites may be suitable. The assessment notes 9 sites of varying size in and around Maldon that could together deliver about 1,500 dwellings meeting just over a quarter of the Council's housing needs within the plan period at the District's most sustainable location. The town of Burnham on Crouch appears to have limited suitable sites. The three large villages of Southminster, Tollesbury and Maylands all have available and suitable sites which together with the focus on Maldon could deliver over half of the required housing land supply, leaving further capacity for smaller scale growth at other settlements. The preferred strategy that would be most likely to deliver housing in appropriate and sustainable locations would be to focus on Maldon as the Districts key town with growth at South Woodham Ferrers and Southminster as larger villages with the remaining allocation spread through-out the district.	Comment noted. At the present time the Council cannot comment on whether individual settlements can or cannot accommodate future growth.The LDP Review process has to plan for future growth and it will have to be accommodated within the District. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and this was one of the reasons for the Issues and Options Consultation. In the coming months work will be undertaken to make the necessary decision using the evidence prepared as part of the LDP Review work.
Kevin	Bruce		Option 2 - As you have placed Tillingham in the large village category, I would not support option 3. Tillingham is only a medium village and should have been placed in that category as it is much more liking to Bradwell. These 2 villages have always until very recent development been similar in population size. Tillingham is a compact settlement and Bradwell a dispersed one. Tillingham should only be considered for very small additions, 15 max on any site. Option 5 - could have potential for providing future housing need - creating a mini 'New Town'. This though would be a very sensitive issue and existing settlements could be heavily impacted. As there does not appear to be specific section to be able to comment on individual locations as appear in the list of potential sites I'm adding them here as this is why I accessed this questionnaire TILL2 and TILL4 Sites 44 & 60 houses respectively. These are far too large units for Tillingham which has already in recent years had much additional housing. These latter developments were small in scale and fitted into the existing cartilage of the village. They would be constructed on good agricultural land that has seen centuries of a variety of food crops. We should be preserving as much agricultural land as possible for the future well being of this country especially now with the loss of Ukraine. These 2 now suggested would intrude radically eastwards from the village and into the coastal landscape of the village. Although it states that there is a tree/hedge eastern boundary to the TILL2 site there is very little there. If developed they would seriously reduce the amenity value for all those living on the present eastern boundary with the loss of the views over open fields to the coast and north sea, very valuable assets for well being of Tillingham residents. TILL2 would be accessed through Birch and Mill roads causing further traffic movements on quiet roads both from new residents and delivery services. The junction with Marsh Road is already difficult and the increased traffic would also adversely effect Tillingham Square. 44 house will probably equate with c60 additional cars, maybe more. TTLL4 Another c80 cars coming and in and out into South Street, plus deliveries and services, not at all a good prospect for our village. There is currently a brown field site within the village envelope on which planning permission has been granted so Tillingham does not need the 2 high volume developments.	At the present time the Council cannot comment on whether individual settlements can or cannot accommodate future growth.The LDP Review process has to plan for future growth and it will have to be accommodated within the District. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and this was one of the reasons for the Issues and Options Consultation. In the coming months work will be undertaken to make the necessary decision using the evidence prepared as part of the LDP Review work.
William	Shepherd		Option 1 - Larger housing developments should be centered round existing towns where there is the likelyhood of infrastructure to support them. Development in the surrounding villages should be very small scale but supported by the Council for social housing or small private affordable housing for local people. In the recent past the only housing that has been built are very large houses totally out of the price range that local people can afford. The residents of these houses do not integrate with the villagers and want to changer the character of the village. Option 7 Would seem sensible to support a growing population where there are better transpost links to areas of high employment	Support noted for option 1 & 7
victoria	newson	Childrens Nursery	Option 6. Build a complete new town like South Woodham Ferrers was built with proper infrastructure of the A12 for example.	Support noted for option 6
David	Banfield		Option 6 For its better transport links, rail and road to the rest of East Anglia/ London and home counties and Stansted. . This area is closer to these transport links and also better placed strategically to reach ports such as Felixstowe or Option 4 A fairer scheme as this will reduce the impact and effect of construction in all areas hopefully retaining the character of the area and encourage local smaller businesses who may otherwise be priced out by larger developers. Is a combination of the two a realistic option?	Support noted for option 4 & 6

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 15. Which growth option do you consider to be the most appropriate for the District of Maldon?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Phillip	Wright	CALA Homes (North Home Counties) Ltd	Option 1 - Retain the option in the LDP approved in 2017 - focus growth in the settlements of Maldon/Heybridge and Burnham on Crouch: We note that the current approved LDP has sought to concentrate housing growth in sustainable extensions to Maldon, Heybridge and Burnham-on-Crouch in the form of Garden Suburbs and Strategic Allocations and that the Plan did not allocate growth in any of the District's smaller settlements. Instead, it relied on existing commitments and windfall sites within settlement boundaries. We note that the Issues and Options consultation document has raised concerns that by allocating all of the housing on large sustainable extensions has meant that it has only been national building companies who came forward to develop these sites. This being because only they have the funding and economies of scale to bring forward complex large-scale developments. We agree that these types of sites often take a long time from concept to delivery of housing on the ground. Furthermore, it is important to note that the District Council has openly acknowledged that since the approval of the LDP, the amount of housing being given approval and delivered has not been sufficient to ensure that Maldon District has a continuous 5-year supply of housing. The 5-year supply currently stands at 3.26 years. The consultation document refers to the fact that this has meant that small and medium building companies who operated in and around the District could only develop on sites outside of the large allocations. Maldon District Council (MDC) has acknowledged that this lack of clear direction and flexibility has meant that not enough housing has been given permission to be delivered in 5 years and any windfall development was in effect being squeezed into the development boundaries. It acknowledges that this has added to the District`s situation with regard to a lack of a 5 year supply of housing and is starting to have a detrimental effect on the character of the settlements of the District. Whilst superficially, concentrating housing provision at the District's main urban settlements might appear appealing, in reality this is far from the case. Given that the current strategy has failed to deliver sufficient housing, then it cannot be presently seen as a sensible option to now pursue. To do so would only exacerbate existing difficulties and very likely result in further reductions in the District's already weak Five-Year Housing Land Supply. Particularly as the failure to amend other settlement boundaries has been acknowledged in the consultation document as leading to a lack of available land supply for windfall sites, which help support housing supply and that this ultimately is one of the contributing factors to the District not having a 5 year supply of housing from 2021. Furthermore, by seeking to restrict development in other settlements elsewhere to within existing settlement boundaries, would inhibit their growth and prevent development occurring in sustainable locations which are fully able to accommodate it, such as Southminster. Option 2 - A strong focus on the towns and larger sustainable villages: Under this option, the majority of growth would be focussed on the two	Comments noted though there appears to be a lot of commentary it is not clear which option the proposer is supporting. At the present time the Council cannot comment on whether individual settlements can or cannot accommodate future growth.The LDP Review process has to plan for future growth and it will have to be accommodated within the District. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and this was one of the reasons for the Issues and Options Consultation. In the coming months work will be undertaken to make the necessary decision using the evidence prepared as part of the LDP Review work.
.	.	SN Developments	It is clear from national policy that a range of factors should inform the overall development strategy and preferred growth option for emerging MLP, including the following: meeting development needs including housing and affordable housing; accessibility by sustainable modes of transport; impacts on the built and natural environment including flooding, biodiversity and heritage assets. The latest monitoring data demonstrates that the current adopted development strategy has not delivered a sufficient housing land supply or enough affordable housing. As such, the development strategy for emerging MLP must seek to address the current shortfall in the supply of housing and affordable housing, and ensure that housing is delivered throughout the plan period to meet identified needs. Too much emphasis on large scale developments, which are typically more complex, is unlikely to address the shortfall in housing and affordable housing in the short term. It is considered that a range of site sizes including large and medium sized sites in a variety of locations should be allocated in emerging MLP to maintain a sufficient housing land supply position. The larger towns and villages that contain a good range of services and facilities, which are accessible by public transport including bus and rail services, are likely to continue to be the main focus for development in the future subject to any environmental constraints. This approach would be consistent with national policy that seeks to direct significant development to locations that are accessible by sustainable modes of transport. SN Developments is promoting land for residential development at Burnham on Crouch, which has a wide range of services and facilities and contains a railway station and bus services, making it a suitable location for growth. It is noted that the sites in Burnham on Crouch that were allocated in the adopted Maldon Local Development Plan 2017 are either completed, under construction or have planning permission. It is likely that all of the allocated sites will be delivered in the short term. This demonstrates that land in this location is attractive to housebuilders, that there is strong market demand from house purchasers, and that there are no constraints affecting the delivery of sites. The plan period for emerging MLP extends to 2043. If the previous allocations in Burnham on Crouch will be delivered in the short term as predicted in the latest housing trajectory i.e. by 2024/25, then additional land will need to be identified in this settlement to meet local and district-wide housing needs in the medium and longer term to 2043. As set out in these representations, Burnham on Crouch is a sustainable location for development and there are suitable sites available. It would be inappropriate to avoid directing growth for emerging	Comment noted. At the present time the Council cannot comment on whether individual settlements can or cannot accommodate future growth.The LDP Review process has to plan for future growth and it will have to be accommodated within the District. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and this was one of the reasons for the Issues and Options Consultation. In the coming months work will be undertaken to make the necessary decision using the evidence prepared as part of the LDP Review work.

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 15. Which growth option do you consider to be the most appropriate for the District of Maldon?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
.	.	Cooper Property Holdings Ltd	It is clear from national policy that a range of factors will inform the overall development strategy and preferred growth option including the following: meeting development needs including housing and affordable housing; providing a mix of uses; accessibility by sustainable modes of transport; and impacts on the built and natural environment including flooding, biodiversity, and heritage assets. Therefore, it is likely that the preferred development strategy will comprise a combination of the growth options. The larger towns and villages that contain a good range of services and facilities, and are accessible by public transport including bus and rail services, and likely to continue to be the main focus for development in the future subject to any environmental constraints. The latest monitoring data demonstrates that the current adopted development strategy has not delivered a sufficient housing land supply or enough affordable housing. As such, an alternative or variation of Option 1 is required if identified development needs are to be met in emerging MLP and this should focus on the allocation of sites which are deliverable in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework ('NPPF') in that they are available now, offer a suitable location for development now and have a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on site within five years need to be the focus of allocations. This will then ensure the Council can demonstrate a robust and up to date 5YHLS. For similar reasons, a focus on one or two larger developments as proposed in Option 5 is also unlikely to meet the full range of development needs across the Local Plan period, as they may require new infrastructure to be completed before housing can be delivered. It is critical that the Council identifies a number of small and medium sites, to compliment the delivery programme for the larger sites, to ensure a steady housing land supply can be maintained across the life of the Local Plan.	Comment noted. At the present time the Council cannot comment on whether individual settlements can or cannot accommodate future growth.The LDP Review process has to plan for future growth and it will have to be accommodated within the District. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and this was one of the reasons for the Issues and Options Consultation. In the coming months work will be undertaken to make the necessary decision using the evidence prepared as part of the LDP Review work.
Jane	Coleman	Maldon Town Council	In terms of the seven options identified by MDC for growth, councillors support a flexible approach which encompasses creating a new satellite settlement either on the edge of an existing settlement, or town within the District or adjacent to its boundary; Focussing growth in the north of the District to link up with the services and facilities available in Tiptree, Witham, and Maldon/Heybridge and focussing growth along the railway line in the south of the District, around Althorne, North Fambridge and Southminster. This is for the following reasons:- • The parish of Maldon was allocated a significant increase in its housing in the current LDP. Some of these developments have been completed, and some are in the course of completion. • The promised infrastructure (road improvements/increased healthcare provision/school places) has not materialised sufficiently to support this planned growth. Services and roads are currently saturated, so Members consider that any further growth in Maldon is unsustainable. Currently, all the access roads into the town centre become gridlocked at certain times of the day. The parking in the town centre is insufficient. Any additional traffic would exacerbate the existing problems. • Air Quality on Market Hill is an urgent issue which the District Council is addressing through its Air Quality Action Plan. Any development must be compatible with maintaining and improving air quality in the town centre. • The District Council and Town Council have both declared a Climate Change Emergency. Any development must be compatible with the District Council's Climate Action Strategy 2021-2030. • For these reasons, Members consider that any new development within the District should be located within easy access of the main arterial road network (ie A12/A130) and the Crouch Valley railway line. (App 1 shows the existing District Settlement Map). This would provide incentive to further develop facilities in the adjacent villages and generate greater use of the rail services, which should lead to more frequent and improved services for users. • Members do not support any development on any open green space within Maldon town centre, as this is a precious and rare resource which should be protected for the benefit of existing residents. Such areas also given important access to the emergency services (Air Ambulance) at all times (ie access to the area is not restricted by opening/closing times)	Support noted for option 5 & 6

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 15. Which growth option do you consider to be the most appropriate for the District of Maldon?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Roy	Martin	Mr Roy Martin	Option 4 - development spread proportionately across all forms of settlement including Hamlets (see my letter of 11 March 2022) The seven 'Options' – clarification required of type of settlement viz. Stow Maries (defined as a 'Hamlet') It appears none of options specifically cater for Stow Maries which, according to the Maldon Updated Settlement Pattern (updated 6 January 2022 – see Appendix A), remains defined as a 'Hamlet'. Previously there has been 'a presumption against further development in 'Hamlets'. It is respectfully requested the Council clarify the position with regard to Hamlets and their eligibility to contribute sites as part of the future growth of the district. It is noted in the current LDP review that sites within or immediately adjacent the settled areas of Stow Maries have been assessed for inclusion as part of the district's future housing growth and it is assumed therefore that Stow Maries should be considered alongside all other settlements referred to under Option 4 (along with towns and small, medium and large villages). Such clarification is important as exclusion of Hamlets may be suppressing proposals being put forward under the 'Call for Sites' initiative and greater clarity would almost inevitably bring forward other available land for development within the parish of Stow Maries. Stow Maries may otherwise fall outside the scope of the 'seven options' for growth listed in the consultation, except in respect of Option 5 (a new 'Satellite' development) which in any case would be wholly inappropriate whether considered for Stow Maries or any other rural location in the Maldon District. Preferred Option 4 ('Scatter growth across the towns, larger, medium and small villages including Hamlets') – best suited to comply with Maldon Council's own criteria It would be infinitely more sustainable for the Maldon District as a whole to allow some measured and proportionate contribution in growth from settlements of all sizes, including from Stow Maries, in order to meet the overall housing numbers required. Assuming therefore Stow Maries qualifies to form part of Option 4 I would fully endorse this as the preferred choice for growth throughout the Maldon District i.e. 'Scatter growth across the towns, larger, medium and small villages to include Hamlets. Only this option would meet Maldon District's key issues to be satisfied in the selection of sites for growth as prefaced in the Council's consultation document ('Have Your Say'), where it states that 'the Plan' should provide, as follows: Reduce harm from new growth by delivering the community facilities and infrastructure - spreading growth across the district will mean facilities can develop more organically to meet local need and any infrastructure changes would be less drastic in scale. New growth should positively support a vibrant and robust economy, including tourism - only by spreading growth across the district is it possible to grow and share economic success. Large developments close to tourism destinations must be avoided. The natural and historic environment is	Comment noted. At the present time the Council cannot comment on whether individual settlements can or cannot accommodate future growth.The LDP Review process has to plan for future growth and it will have to be accommodated within the District. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and this was one of the reasons for the Issues and Options Consultation. In the coming months work will be undertaken to make the necessary decision using the evidence prepared as part of the LDP Review work. Where a settlement is located in the settlement pattern is not an indication of what growth it is going to get the policies in the plan do that.
Simon	Butler-Finbow	Pigeon Investment Management	MDC has not quantified the distribution of development in the 7 different options. We thus wish to retain the right to comment further at such point that MDC does clarify the proposed distribution. With regard to windfall, MDC should set out clearly how much this is, justified by historic windfall delivery but also taking into account the District's longer term historic lack of a 5YHLS that directly impacted upon windfall rates. The evidence would appear to support a 25dpa allowance, equating to 425 homes over the plan period (not including the first 3 years to avoid double-counting). MDC should also set out reasons for a windfall allowance that is split between settlements. A windfall allowance should not be area specific as MDC should not be in a position to determine where windfall sites will arise. If MDC is able to do so, those sites should allocated, assuming they are known to be deliverable. Furthermore, MDC has stated that there are limited brownfield sites. OPTIONS 1, 2 & 3 These options reflect the settlement pattern and that Maldon, Heybridge and Burnham-on-Crouch are the most sustainable and accessible settlements. Development should be directed towards towns and larger villages that are sustainable; however, MDC must also take into account that existing allocations at Maldon and Heybridge will continue to deliver for some time (see below), and the opportunity for other sites to come forward that can secure delivery concurrently. As quantified below, it is considered that a substantial number of new homes should be directed towards Burnham as a priority, with no less than 12.5% of the new homes required over the new plan period (as per the existing approximate distribution of population – see below). This is considered particularly appropriate given that Burnham is the main, and sustainable, hub for activity in the south of the District and is capable of accommodating further growth of this extent, with the submitted sites offering a good opportunity to support such an approach. Indeed, the submitted sites are adjacent to and connected with existing West Burnham allocation and can be delivered very quickly, with all necessary infrastructure either in place already or capable of being delivered within the first year. The sites provide a reasonably sized urban extensions that, as detailed in the Delivery Statements, can come forward in the early stages of the new plan period, delivering much needed housing, employment and educational space and securing a 20-minute neighbourhood that does not require private car use for access to every day needs. As of 2011 census, the population of the District was: • Maldon: 14,220 (23.1%) • Heybridge: 8,175 (13.3%) • Burnham: 7,671 (12.5%) • Other: 31,563 (51.2%) TOTAL: 61,629 Adopted Policy S2 set out the quantum of development to be delivered in the current plan period, identifying Maldon, Heybridge and Burnham as delivering the majority of strategic growth. However, whilst this was broadly aligned with the adopted Settlement Hierarchy (Policy S8), the allocations within the adopted Plan amounted to: • Completions: 293	Comment noted. At the present time the Council cannot comment on whether individual settlements can or cannot accommodate future growth.The LDP Review process has to plan for future growth and it will have to be accommodated within the District. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and this was one of the reasons for the Issues and Options Consultation. In the coming months work will be undertaken to make the necessary decision using the evidence prepared as part of the LDP Review work.

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 15. Which growth option do you consider to be the most appropriate for the District of Maldon?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
sara	doran		The best option to consider would be the development of a new town/settlement. My view is that we could use this to showcase amazing eco credentials, to drive a climate response across teh whole district and to create a whole community that people would be proud to live in. It is possible that if bradwell goes ahead taht there will need to be infrastructure roads built to service the development, this might afford a new site to develop a new town. The 20 year programme could really work towards achieving an amazing outcome. I think that if this option were considered that there could be a call for self build communities to be part of any development. This could also work towards the goal of creating local jobs. Of course, it will depend on land becoming available, that is a separate identifiable settlement - rather than just being an extension of something that is already present. The main access need would be for schools for such a development. The area between latchingdon, cold norton, stow maries and cock clarkes OR the area between Nounsley and Ulting could both provide areas with nearby train connections, have areas of large stretches of land, that are relatively well linked. I also think that this would also match with eg option 7 - and could be in the zone of fambridge/stowmaries/cock clarkes	Support noted 5 & 7
Colin	Horner	Villageretreat	Options 5, 6 and 7 as this will allow the building to integrate with focused infrastructure and retain the green field satellite villages and sites for the benefit of all , farming and future generations. A pepper pot approach will need a spread infrastructure development which is not affordable , sustainable or eco friendly. Focus around railways and A roads will attract commuters and professionals who will bring wealth without determent to the existing rural communities who rely on local roads and town facilities for survival.	Support noted 5 & 6 & 7
Robert	Scott	Lewis & Scott Retirement Living Ltd	Option 4 is the most sensible as it seeks to address the issues outlined in paragraphs 12.1 to 12.9, and would give each settlement the opportunity to grow proportionately. However, a critical flaw in all the options is the approach to delivering affordable housing. No rural exception sites have been delivered in the last five years as a result of the high hurdle-rate to achieving planning consent. Affordable homes are a clear objective in the new local plan, but this is not reflected in the process for securing planning consent.	Support noted 4
Rob	Bard			
Tim	Hann		I consider option 1 to be the most appropriate for the District of Maldon. All of the options are unattractive, however, this is the least unattractive. Development has already begun in Maldon/Heybridge & Burnham on Crouch, both areas have decent transport links - what one lacks the other compensates (train vs road) , decent High Streets with all amenities, Banks, Library, PH Restaurants, Convenience Stores, Nursery, Primary & Secondary Schools, Pharmacies & Medical Practitioners. These areas also have existing 'Brown' sites than can be developed for new businesses or redeveloped for residential properties reducing the burden on 'Green' sites. This would limit the development of houses in the surrounding & more rural villages to a minimum. Over development of these communities/settlements will highlight even further the strain they are already under. ie lacking in sufficient public services, from education (over subscribed village primary school), transport, Post Office, Drs, Dentist, Pharmacy. All of which puts a greater emphasis on the use of the motor car. With the increase in dwellings will result in an increase in vehicles . This increase in petrol/diesel/hybrid motor cars will increase environmental damage, add to congestion on the roads , which will lead to faster deterioration of the road surfaces. Net result will be increased taxes to pay for these required services, which in-turn removes the 'affordability' banner from these new dwellings. Option 5 and the proposed development of 174 dwellings west of the church and north of St.Stephens Road an area of 8.98ha. This is a completely implausible proposal, as anyone who knows the area will tell you. Any councillor using the Fambridge Road, via Kits Hill in either direction between 8:00 - 9:00am, St. Stephens Road during the school run and when there are road restrictions on the Latchingdon or Lower Burnham Road will see how busy St. Stephens Road is and how difficult access in and out is.	Comment noted. At the present time the Council cannot comment on whether individual settlements or sites can or cannot accommodate future growth.The LDP Review process has to plan for future growth and it will have to be accommodated within the District. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and this was one of the reasons for the Issues and Options Consultation. In the coming months work will be undertaken to make the necessary decision using the evidence prepared as part of the LDP Review work.
Burnham	Town Council	Burnham on Crouch Town Council	OPTION 6 - There has been overdevelopment in Burnham and this still continues. Please note that the infrastructure is now overstretched in our surgery, schools, roads, and other areas , with no plans for improvement. It is not relevant to state there might be spaces in Southminster Primary, as this would require a car/transport to ferry children to that area and parents may well already have children in schools in BOC. Increased car use contradicts the Climate Change Strategy.	Support noted 6

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 15. Which growth option do you consider to be the most appropriate for the District of Maldon?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Justin	Barkham	Self employed	For me I believe options 1 2 and 3 are best options. Those options focus on growth in location with existing services and a range of employment opportunities decreasing the need to travel for work Option 4 – a pepper potting strategy – will inhibit the ability to deliver infrastructure, and indeed place increased pressure on existing infrastructure through growth in travel. I object to Option 6, which would overly focus development in the North of the District with implications for the deliverability of the strategy, and impacts on existing infrastructure including on congestion, road safety and sustainability given the limited public transport infrastructure serving settlements in this area. In respect of Options 5 and 6, strategic growth close to Tiptree and Witham is not justified by the evidence with no evidence that there is an unmet need arising from adjoining areas; cross-boundary issues around the impact that this would place on infrastructure, and a lack of existing services and facilities in these areas which can support growth. Such a strategy would continue to focus development in large strategic development locations. The Issues and Options document highlights the issues with such an approach in strategic terms – such sites have a long lead in-time and require significant investment in infrastructure. The last Plan has demonstrated that this approach is ineffective and will not help to maintain a five year housing land supply. It has not been shown that the infrastructure investment required to support delivery of standalone satellite growth locations can be viably delivered; and we consider that there is a high risk that such a strategy would inhibit the delivery of affordable housing. The uncertainties associated with delivery of strategic infrastructure, such as A12 junction improvements, and risks to local plans are clearly shown through the recent Examination of plans in other areas including North Essex, Uttlesford and Tandridge. The assessment of Site GB1 – Great Braxted is flawed and this cannot be regarded as a suitable location for growth. It is located close to, and within the setting of, Braxted Park which is the only Grade II* listed park and garden in the District and is of exceptional historical significance. Development would harm the setting of this. The Council's evidence shows that the surrounding landscape has a high sensitivity to change. Part of site GB1 is susceptible to flooding, and indeed the River Blackwater regularly floods in this area and is an important natural habitat. Development and associated hardstanding could increase the risk and prevalence of flooding. As we live up river in the Mill House in Braxted the personal impact of flooding is highly relevant No regard has been had of the potential impact of development at GB1 on the buried remains of a Neolithic long mortuary enclosure at Appleford Farm which is a Scheduled Ancient Monument and which was taken into consideration in moving the A12 expansion further to the north We agree that development in the countryside should be restricted, but not just to that which notionally supports the local economy, but that for which there is an identified local need, and which needs to be met at that location and cannot be met on existing	Comment noted. At the present time the Council cannot comment on whether individual settlements or sites can or cannot accommodate future growth.The LDP Review process has to plan for future growth and it will have to be accommodated within the District. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and this was one of the reasons for the Issues and Options Consultation. In the coming months work will be undertaken to make the necessary decision using the evidence prepared as part of the LDP Review work.
Poppy	Vidler	Crown Consumer Ltd	Options 1, 2 and 3 and no to Option 4, 5 and 6. The assessment of GB1 - Great Braxted is not a suitable area for growth and has no public transport services to achieve sustainable movement.	Comment noted. At the present time the Council cannot comment on whether individual settlements or sites can or cannot accommodate future growth.The LDP Review process has to plan for future growth and it will have to be accommodated within the District. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and this was one of the reasons for the Issues and Options Consultation. In the coming months work will be undertaken to make the necessary decision using the evidence prepared as part of the LDP Review work.
Stephen	Sutton		Option 1 is the only realistic way forward without destroying rural areas and villages	Support noted 1
Tim	Madelin		Option 7 - this will put most growth on the only sustainable travel link the Crouch Valley Line which is also best placed for housing potential workers at Bradwell B should this get national approval	Support noted 7
Joanna	Jeffery	Althorne Parish Clerk	We consider that Option One would be the best choice for the district. It would preserve the integrity and character of the small villages and minimise the impact on the countryside. Windfall Sites are a feature of all the other options with no definition of how they are to be implemented. The information published so far on the HELAA does not include small sites and it is suggested that they would be brought forward as 'windfall'. Further information on these small sites has been sought, but is not available to the public or councillors. The implementation of several windfall sites with up to 5 houses or more would be a significant addition to a small village. Adding to the existing new growth in the large settlements would cause the minimum disruption, and new infrastructure and services should already be underway. New building plots should be limited in size so the small builders can become involved and speed up delivery. This must be linked to regaining control of sites with planning approval that are not being progressed and reallocating them to smaller builders with 'time is of the essence' contracts thus reducing the number of extra plots required to achieve the delivery rate. With the adoption of smaller plots new arrangements will need to be made to provide the proportion of affordable housing. Distribution of new sites should be based on the size of the settlements prior to the 2015 start of the current LDP so that Burnham, which has already been the focus of more building than was allocated on the LDP does not receive a disproportionate share of the added requirements.	Supported noted for option 1

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 15. Which growth option do you consider to be the most appropriate for the District of Maldon?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Paul	Coppin		We consider that options 1,2 and 3 are best, where strategies focus growth in locations where there are existing services, provisions and a range of employment opportunities already exist. This minimise the need to travel. Option 4 we do not believe will achieve the improved infrastructure and will cause increased pressure on existing infrastructure through travel. Option 6 we object strongly to, because of the undue focus on the development to the north of district, with its adverse impact on existing infrastructure, congestion, road safety and non existent public transport. Option 5 and 6 With regards to Tiptree and Witham, there is concern regarding impact on an already heavily congested infrastructure with limited improvement for local communities, where cross boundary movement will benefit other areas more, i.e Witham We support that the development of the countryside should be restricted.	Supported noted for option 1, 2 & 3
Steven	Bardwell	S P Bardwell Ltd	Settlement boundaries should not be used.	Comment noted and agreed
David	Oxford	Lloyds Banking Group	Growth through large towns such as Maldon seem most appropriate and even a potential for Heybridge where facilities, transporation links an existing size of communities would seem better suited as oppossed to Althorne. I have serious worries about increased road traffic huge Carbon Emission increases and detramental effect to the beautiful heritage lanscape without even considering the impact on local and often rare wildlife	Comment noted. At the present time the Council cannot comment on whether individual settlements or sites can or cannot accommodate future growth.The LDP Review process has to plan for future growth and it will have to be accommodated within the District. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and this was one of the reasons for the Issues and Options Consultation. In the coming months work will be undertaken to make the necessary decision using the evidence prepared as part of the LDP Review work.
Stephen Francis	Dewick	Curry Farm		
George	Dixon		Option 6 is by far the most reasonable. This district is limited geographically by Sea/Rivers to the south and east, meaning that transport can only be facilitated west via south woodham to rettendon or north via hatfield perveral/witham to the A12. Developing the South of the district means vehicles will have to travel down one of these already congested routes through all other villages, further detrimenting current residents. Placing development in the north near to the A12 allows ease of transport links without those same vehicles having to drive through other villages in the district.	Supported noted for option 6
Douglas	Channer	Private	As much as I am not happy with saying this I think perhaps Option 1 remains. this being based on discussions I recall during the last plan period and what residents were told about economies of scale and gaining real infrastructure benefits for the district. It made sense to place development near to a good variety of services and facilities and where generally better infrastructure was already. Therefore with that in mind Option 7 also has those benefits as there are good facilities in Tiptree,Witham and Maldon and Heybridge that could be linked in to. Plus the widening of the A12 is to take place place so providing a good strategic route /link to areas outside the district. The south and east has already taken masses of development and the roads are not suitable to take even more traffic. I have already in a previous answer stated that buildng new roads is not the answer. There is a massive development also coming to South Woodham Ferrers which is going to have very severe implications for the south of the district as it is. There is an imbalance in the development across the district which if not halted will result in a District of two halves that.	Supported noted for option 1
Lynda	Bugg		Need a better explanation of what a windfall policy is.	If the Council is minded to have a windfall policy there will have to be a full explaination in the plan of what a windfall site is.
Paul	Burgess	None	Option 6 Most of the employment opportunities lie on the A12/A120 corridor. The north of the district has multiple access to the A12 via the A414, Hatfield Peveral and Kelvedon.	Supported noted for option 6
D	Cooper		Option 3: This approach will allow smaller builders/developers/landowners to bring forward development in a more organic way. Large allocations and approvals attract national housebuilders rather than local or smaller builders. They can stifle the opportunity for self build opportunities. Options 1 and 2, coupled with tightly drawn settlement boundaries and restrictive policy, will result in perfectly sustainable, smaller sites near to other villages being rejected. That approach doesn't accord with NPPF paras 69a) or paragraph 79. Option 3 allows growth to be evenly spread through the district offering district wide opportunity in established sustainable locations. It is relevant that many of the villages show capacity at GP and primary schools indicating that there is opportunity for growth at these villages.	Supported noted for option 3

Question 15

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 15. Which growth option do you consider to be the most appropriate for the District of Maldon?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
C/O Agent	C/O Agent		We consider that growth Options 2 and 3 which seeks to provide a strong focus on the towns and larger sustainable villages would be the most suitable and appropriate growth option for the district. The existing development strategy (as proposed in option 1) has failed to secure the plan area's priorities for sustainable development and the current spatial distribution as set out in Policy SP2 of the adopted Local Plan cannot be rolled forward effectively to meet minimum local housing need. Options 2 and 3 allows for a strategy which enhances and maintains the vitality of the most sustainable rural communities in accordance with paragraph 79 of the NPPF2021 and would place less of a reliance on the main towns for delivery, which as set out above, has failed as a strategy in the adopted Local Plan. None of the growth options set out a sound basis to ensure that the role of Neighbourhood Plans support the delivery of an appropriate strategy for sustainable development which underpins objective 2 (at paragraph 8.3 of the consultation). It is an essential requirement of national policy that the Local Plan fulfils this purpose. Paragraph 66 of the NPPF2021 specifies that strategic policies should also set out a housing requirement for designated neighbourhood areas which reflects the overall strategy for the pattern and scale of development and any relevant allocations. In our client's view the development options chosen should therefore be clearer in terms of how the housing requirements for designated areas will be identified and the levels of development anticipated at the district's most sustainable locations. While any requirement would be indicative at this stage, there is scope to provide more detail than has been set out (for example, option 2 sets out that at this stage, the larger sustainable villages are yet to be determined however will most likely be the top three/four/five larger villages set out in the settlement hierarchy but there is no clarity on this point. While any requirement would be indicative at this stage, there is scope to provide more detail. For the avoidance of doubt our client continues to fully support the scope and opportunity to bring forward detailed non-strategic policies within a Neighbourhood Plan for Tollesbury, whether or not this is a made prior to adoption of a new Local Plan. This position is fully justified given the existing support for the allocation of sites within Neighbourhood Plans as part of ensuring general conformity with existing strategic policies (and noting the shortfall in housing land supply resulting from under-delivery against other parts of the strategy). Our client would welcome the opportunity to inform detailed policies on matters such as design and open space that can be appropriately set out through the Neighbourhood Plan process.	Comment noted. At the present time the Council cannot comment on whether individual settlements or sites can or cannot accommodate future growth.The LDP Review process has to plan for future growth and it will have to be accommodated within the District. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and this was one of the reasons for the Issues and Options Consultation. In the coming months work will be undertaken to make the necessary decision using the evidence prepared as part of the LDP Review work.
Zoe	May	East of England Ambulance Service NHS Trust	All options require health commissioners to review the suitability and provision of health infrastructure to meet the needs of the local population. EEAST will work with commissioner and the local authority to deliver effective and efficient emergency ambulance services for the local community. Any CIL/S106 legal agreement should support all aspects of health - acute, community, mental health and emergency ambulance services.	Comment noted. The Council works with all duty to co-operate partners to ensure that the LDP Review takes on board as far as possibly their concerns.
Roger	Woodcock		Option 6 on the face of it would appear to have merit with regard to road and rail communications.	Supported noted for option 6

Question 15

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 15. Which growth option do you consider to be the most appropriate for the District of Maldon?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Braxted and Blackwater Conservation Grou	BBCG	The Braxted and Blackwater Conservation Group (BBCG)	We consider that the best options are Options 1, 2 and 3. These strategies focus growth in locations where there are existing service provision and a range of employment opportunities and therefore minimise the need to travel. Focused growth in these locations will use existing infrastructure and will support infrastructure delivery. Option 4 – a pepper potting strategy – will inhibit the ability to deliver infrastructure, and indeed place increased pressure on existing infrastructure through growth in travel. We object to Option 6, which would overly focus development in the North of the District with implications for the deliverability of the strategy, and impacts on existing infrastructure including on congestion, road safety and sustainability given the limited public transport infrastructure serving settlements in this area. In respect of Options 5 and 6, strategic growth close to Tiptree and Witham is not justified by the evidence with no evidence that there is an unmet need arising from adjoining areas; cross-boundary issues around the impact that this would place on infrastructure, and a lack of existing services and facilities in these areas which can support growth. Such a strategy would continue to focus development in large strategic development locations. The Issues and Options document highlights the issues with such an approach in strategic terms – such sites have a long lead in-time and require significant investment in infrastructure. The last Plan has demonstrated that this approach is ineffective and will not help to maintain a five year housing land supply. It has not been shown that the infrastructure investment required to support delivery of standalone satellite growth locations can be viably delivered; and we consider that there is a high risk that such a strategy would inhibit the delivery of affordable housing. The uncertainties associated with delivery of strategic infrastructure, such as A12 junction improvements, and risks to local plans are clearly shown through the recent Examination of plans in other areas including North Essex, Uttlesford and Tandridge. The assessment of Site GB1 – Great Braxted is flawed and this cannot be regarded as a suitable location for growth. It is located close to, and within the setting of, Braxted Park which is the only Grade II* listed park and garden in the District and is of exceptional historical significance. Development	Comment noted. At the present time the Council cannot comment on whether individual settlements can or cannot accommodate future growth.The LDP Review process has to plan for future growth and it will have to be accommodated within the District. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and this was one of the reasons for the Issues and Options Consultation. In the coming months work will be undertaken to make the necessary decision using the evidence prepared as part of the LDP Review work.
raymond	dundas	Householder	Option 1 - Any significant development will spoil the charm and appeal of Maldon and it's environs. If Option 1 is not acceptable Options 2 & 4 will best preserve the look and feel of the South of the district. Option 6 might also be attractive if the A12 is improved. The A12 being the nearest major route to the Maldon district.	Supported noted for option 1
John	Watson		Option 6 was most favoured by a basic poll of residents albeit a small sample on facebook. The Parish Council support this option but on balance option 5 would be of equal protection and benefit and potentially provide faster delivery of Infrastructure. The complaints from residents across the district are the conditions of roads, school places , GP's and protection of greenspace together with the changes being made to their choice of location by housing growth. If growth is required to meet housing targets an assessment of the forecast required Infrastructure is required to support that growth . The farther east that gets built the more traffic will travel along roads to access services. The more that is developed to the east the farther the distances will need to be travelled to access secondary school places.South Woodham Ferrers is already used creating journeys of 45 minutes. A large garden suburb offers the opportunity to justify a clearly needed secondary school and primary if required to support that growth. Failure to do so will continue to create a disjointed and lagged approach to infrastructure. Current situation using NOR Primary 2021 year 7 in 2028/9 census ORA area PAN 210 Planning group 02 127 Pg 03 97 pg 04 41 total 265 vs PAN of 210 a 55 deficit already How would more growth from this date (which is already planned) be accommodated in a sustainable manner without cross boundary movement	Supported noted for option 6 & 5

Question 15

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 15. Which growth option do you consider to be the most appropriate for the District of Maldon?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Josh	Plant	Gladmans	As highlighted throughout this representation, the current growth scenario employed in the adopted Local Development Plan places an over-reliance on large-scale strategic development sites which have faced significant infrastructure issues and delivery delays. This over-reliance is a significant factor as to why the district cannot currently demonstrate a five-year housing land supply and has experienced a significant supply shortfall against the adopted housing requirement. Furthermore, the majority of growth has been focussed in Maldon, Heybridge and Burnham-on-Crouch. Gladman consider that there is a need to employ an alternative growth strategy which directs appropriate growth across the settlement hierarchy and smaller settlements to support their future vitality and sustainability alongside ensuring identified housing needs are met. In this regard, Growth Options 3 and 4 represent the most suitable options for delivering future growth in Maldon, ensuring that the sustainability of the Large Villages as identified in the Rural Facilities and Settlement Hierarchy Study (January 2022) is recognised proportionally. Gladman support the updated Settlement Pattern and recognition of the suitability of large villages. Accompanying this representation is a Story Map which highlights the sustainability and suitability of large villages to accommodate future development needs at an appropriate scale. Additionally, the Story Map sets out a portfolio of development sites located in Large Villages which offer the opportunity to deliver future residential needs in sustainable locations in close proximity to services, facilities and public transport connections.	Support noted for option 3 & 4
*	*		4.21 In respect of the growth options, the issues and options consultation has already acknowledged that the growth strategy in the existing Local Plan is failing to deliver. However, it also has to be recognised that there are existing allocations and commitments which are unlikely to be abandoned and as such will be carried forward. Therefore, in respect of the new growth options they must avoid focusing any additional development in the main towns and as such exacerbating the existing problems with housing land supply. Ideally, they should be looking to locations with capacity within existing infrastructure. 4.22 Accordingly. option one is considered to be wholly inappropriate. Furthermore, it must also be highlighted that this scenario does not recognise the need for growth in the rural areas which make up the majority of the District. These are matters which are clearly recognised and acknowledged in the existing consultation. Furthermore, the housing needs evidence identifies that the greatest local need, especially for affordable housing, is in the south of the District. As mentioned in response to Question 13 above, Southminster is one of the most sustainable locations outside of the main towns with the benefit of being served by a railway station. It is, therefore, considered that the successful development option should seek to maximise the benefits of locating growth in this part of the District. Options 2, 3 and 7 could clearly support such an approach. 4.23 Given that the previous Plan focused growth on the main towns, Option 3, which is to focus the new growth on all of the larger villages would seem to be a sensible option and as such, is supported. However, this Option should have regard to the settlement hierarchy and the respective ranking of each settlement. Accordingly, the levels of growth should be distributed through the larger villages with the amounts allocated proportionately reflecting the settlements with the sustainability scores. 4.24 Option 4 could also form the basis of an appropriate strategy. However, the current strategies inclusion of the term 'pepper-potting' lacks sufficient refinement to ensure that the development strategy meets local needs and recognises the existing infrastructure available in order to secure sustainable development. If this option is to be pursued, it requires greater refinement. 4.25 Option 5 is not considered to be an appropriate strategy given the length of time of that the delivery of a new satellite settlement would take. This also would not allow local housing needs to be addressed, provide sufficient growth to the rural communities to sustain them or redress the acute	Support noted for option 3

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 15. Which growth option do you consider to be the most appropriate for the District of Maldon?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
*	Willmott		4.19 In respect of the growth options, the issues and options consultation has already acknowledged that the growth strategy in the existing Local Plan is failing to deliver. However, it also has to be recognised that there are existing allocations and commitments which are unlikely to be abandoned and as such will be carried forward. Therefore, in respect of the new growth options they must avoid focusing any additional development in the main towns and as such exacerbating the existing problems with housing land supply especially in the rural villages. 4.20 Accordingly option one is considered to be a wholly inappropriate. Furthermore, it must also be highlighted that this scenario does not recognise the need for growth in the rural areas which make up the majority of the District. These are matters which are clearly recognised and acknowledged in the existing consultation. Furthermore, the housing needs evidence identifies that the greatest local need, especially for affordable housing, is in the south of the District. It is therefore considered that the successful development option should seek to maximise the benefits of locating growth in the southern part of the District. Options 4 and 7 could clearly support such an approach. 4.21 Option 5 is not considered to be an appropriate strategy given the length of time of that the delivery of a new satellite settlement would take. This also would not allow local housing needs to be addressed, provide sufficient growth to the rural communities to sustain them or redress the acute affordable housing needs situation. Furthermore, such a strategy will be slow to deliver and as such unlikely to redress the current five-year housing land supply issues. Authorities which have pursued these strategies have invariably struggled at examination resulting in their emerging local plans being withdrawn. 4.22 Option 6 is not considered to be a suitable option and would simply compound the existing failings of the 2017 Local Plan. While significant growth is already planned outside the District this will be heavier heavily reliant on significant infrastructure improvements and complex cross boundary working with neighbouring authorities. Furthermore, this option would not resolve the acute affordable housing needs in the south of the District. As with the concerns around Option 5 this is not considered to be an appropriate strategy. 4.23 It is worth noting that the recent examination into the Babergh and Mid Suffolk Local Plan was suspended on the basis that their development strategy was not sufficiently underpinned by the plans	Support noted for option 4 & 7
Ivor	Watson		The LDPIO sets out the following growth options: ·Option 1 – Retain the option in the LDP approved in 2017 and focus growth in the settlements of Maldon / Heybridge and Burnham on Crouch ·Option 2 – A strong focus on the towns and larger sustainable villages ·Option 3 – Growth generally focused on the towns Maldon/ Heybridge and Burnham on Crouch and all the large villages of the Settlement Hierarchy ·Option 4 – Pepper pot growth throughout the Settlement Hierarchy ·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 ·Option 6 – Focus growth in the north of the District to link into the service and facilities available in Tiptree, Witham and Maldon / Heybridge ·Option 7 – Focus growth along the rail line to Althorne, North Fambridge and Southminster We do not consider that Options 4, 5, 6, or 7 are capable of providing a sustainable, effective strategy for accommodating the District's development needs. It should be recognised that Burnham (along with Maldon / Heybridge) sits at the top of the District's settlement hierarchy. As one of the District's main settlements, it benefits from a range of facilities and services, helping to make it one of the most sustainable locations to which to direct growth. In addition, it is important for the LDP to support the vitality of existing, established communities such as Burnham-on-Crouch – any strategy ultimately adopted should ensure it facilities this. Options 4-7 fail to recognise the settlement hierarchy, the differing characteristics of settlements and the varying sustainability to accommodate growth, and the need to support the vitality of the District's settlements in a sustainable manner that reflects their existing roles. In addition to the concerns that apply to Option 4-7, in respect of Option 5 specifically, we question the achievability of such an approach, as well as its sustainability. The District has a present housing need that requires housing to be delivered in the short-term. A new settlement would not enable this. A new settlement would also likely have the greatest negative impact on landscape and character of the countryside.	Comment noted. At the present time the Council cannot comment on whether individual settlements can or cannot accommodate future growth.The LDP Review process has to plan for future growth and it will have to be accommodated within the District. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and this was one of the reasons for the Issues and Options Consultation. In the coming months work will be undertaken to make the necessary decision using the evidence prepared as part of the LDP Review work.

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 15. Which growth option do you consider to be the most appropriate for the District of Maldon?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
*	*		As confirmed by its position within the LDPIO's settlement hierarchy, Maldon Town / Heybridge is patently a sustainable location to which to direct a significant proportion of the District's growth. 3.10 It should also be recognised that Heybridge is also subject to its own, specific housing needs. The LHNA identifies a net affordable housing need for the Heybridge & Langdford sub-area totally 32dpa – totally an affordable housing need of 640 homes for the period 2023-2043 proposed to be addressed by the LDP. This is in addition to a separate affordable housing need identified for Maldon Town. 3.11 In these circumstances, there is clear social benefit in directing a significant proportion of growth to Maldon Town / Heybridge. Indeed, to ensure the LDP is sound, including that its spatial strategy is justified, it will be necessary to direct a significant amount of the District's overall development to Maldon Town / Heybridge. Turning to the specific options presented in the LDPIO, these are considered below. Option 1 - retain the option in the LDP approved in 2017 - focus growth in the settlements of Maldon/Heybridge and Burnham on Crouch. Maldon Town /Heybridge and Burnham are evidently sustainable locations to which to focus the majority of the District's growth, for the reasons already set out. It is considered that a LPD predicated on this spatial option has the potential to deliver significant social, economic and environmental benefits for the District, including through reducing the potential 'leakage' of the economic benefits of delivery growth that could otherwise occur if housing were directed to areas of the District with fewer employment opportunities / reduced prospects of retaining retail expenditure. Option 2 - A strong focus on the towns and larger sustainable villages 3.15 The LDPIO confirms that this option would also focus growth on the District's two (Maldon/Heybridge and Burnham on Crouch) but would also direct growth to its larger sustainable villages. 3.16 This is considered to be represent a broadly sustainable option, and it is recognised that directing some growth to settlement beyond the District's main towns will help support their vitality. 3.17 However, it is important this does not come at the expense of directing sufficient growth to the top tier settlements in the settlement hierarchy. This could risk failing to enable delivery of significant infrastructure improvements, meet localised housing needs (including the town's affordable housing needs), and maximise the economic benefits to the District of housing growth within the District. Option 3 - Growth generally focused on the towns Maldon/Heybridge and Burnham on Crouch and all the large villages of the Settlement Hierarchy 3.18 Our comments on Option 2 also apply to Option 3.Option 4 - Pepper pot growth throughout the Settlement Hierarchy (Spread the growth across all the sustainable settlements in the District) 3.19 The LDPIO explains that this option entails growth being pepper-potted across the towns, large, medium and small villages; meaning all settlements would get some growth, and it would be based on a percentage proportion of the number of homes in each settlement. 3.20 This option is considered problematic for a number of	Support noted for options 1, 2, 3
*	*		4.24. Option 2 is considered to be an appropriate strategy for the district as it would encourage growth and economic prosperity in the main settlements where the greatest range of services and facilities are already present. This would be beneficial to those services, maximising their customer base, and allow development to progress promptly without significant additional infrastructure being required.	Support noted for option 2
*	*		Option 2 is considered to be an appropriate strategy for the district as it would encourage growth and economic prosperity in a district at risk of losing ground to an increasingly ageing population and diminishing working age population. In order for a strong economy to be achieved, it is necessary to reach a scale that will generate the range of community facilities, supported public transport network, businesses, employment opportunities, and a strong retail offer that residents would expect. Option 4 could also form the basis of an appropriate strategy, however, the current inclusion the term 'pepper pot' lacks sufficient refinement to ensure that the development strategy meets local needs and recognises the existing infrastructure available in order to secure sustainable development. If this option is to be is pursued it requires greater refinement.	Support noted for option 2 & 4
*	*		Option 2 is considered to be an appropriate strategy for the district as it would encourage growth and economic prosperity in a district at risk of losing ground to an increasingly ageing population and diminishing working age population. In order for a strong economy to be achieved, it is necessary to reach a scale that will generate the range of community facilities, supported public transport network, businesses, employment opportunities, and a strong retail offer that residents would expect. Option 4 could also form the basis of an appropriate strategy, however, the current inclusion the term 'pepper pot' lacks sufficient refinement to ensure that the development strategy meets local needs and recognises the existing infrastructure available in order to secure sustainable development. If this option is to be is pursued it requires greater refinement.	Support noted for option 2 & 4
*	*		3.24 Option 4 is considered to be an appropriate strategy for the district as the site is grouped within the 'medium villages' group in the Settlement Pattern. However, the current inclusion of the term 'pepper pot' lacks sufficient refinement to ensure that the development strategy meets local needs and recognises the existing infrastructure available in order to secure sustainable development. If this option is to be is pursued it requires greater refinement. 3.25 Option 2 could also be an appropriate strategy for the district if it considered 'medium villages' such as Althorne rather than solely towns and large villages. The inclusion of 'medium villages' would encourage growth and economic prosperity in a district at risk of losing ground as a consequence of an increasingly ageing population and diminishing working age population. In order for a strong economy to be achieved, it is necessary to reach a scale of growth that will generate the range of community facilities across the district as a whole, supported public transport network, businesses, employment opportunities, and a strong retail offer that residents would expect.	Comment noted. At the present time the Council cannot comment on whether individual settlements can or cannot accommodate future growth.The LDP Review process has to plan for future growth and it will have to be accommodated within the District. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and this was one of the reasons for the Issues and Options Consultation. In the coming months work will be undertaken to make the necessary decision using the evidence prepared as part of the LDP Review work.

Question 15

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 15. Which growth option do you consider to be the most appropriate for the District of Maldon?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
*	*		Option 2 is considered to be an appropriate strategy for the district as it would encourage growth and economic prosperity in a district at risk of losing ground as a consequence of an increasingly ageing population and diminishing working age population. In order for a strong economy to be achieved, it is necessary to reach a scale of growth that will generate the range of community facilities, supported public transport network, businesses, employment opportunities, and a strong retail offer that residents would expect. Option 4 could also form the basis of an appropriate strategy, however, the current inclusion of the term 'pepper pot' lacks sufficient refinement to ensure that the development strategy meets local needs and recognises the existing infrastructure available in order to secure sustainable development. If this option is to be is pursued it requires greater refinement.	Support noted for option 2 & 4
*	*		3.17 BDW Eastern considers that the most appropriate option for growth as set out by MDC is Option 7: Focus growth along the rail line to Althorne, North Fambridge and Southminster. 3.18 The current Local Plan (adopted in 2017) focuses on the provision of two Garden Suburbs (South Maldon and North Heybridge) and two Strategic Allocations (Maldon and Heybridge and Burnham-on-Crouch). Firstly, whilst larger settlements, neither Maldon or Heybridge benefit from rail connections, making them arguably less sustainable in terms of their accessibility by public transport. This is particularly pertinent from an employment perspective, as it is anticipated a high percentage of residents of Maldon would work outside of the town and District itself. Further, evidence has shown that these large strategic, types of developments are heavily reliant on new and costly infrastructure, which can undermine future viability, the potential to deliver affordable housing and make them subject to delays to delivery (such sites take on average 3 years from grant of planning permission to the delivery of houses (Lichfields 2020), if outline consent is originally granted. The overreliance of garden suburbs and strategic allocations in the current Plan has already contributed to the current lack of a five year housing land supply. Indeed, the Lichfields's Report acknowledges that some large schemes can take around 5 years to deliver any housing, meaning they do not contribute to the Council's immediate five-year housing land supply figures. This is shown with the Council only having a 3.26 housing land supply, despite the current Plan being adopted in 2017. 3.19 Any strategy to largely focus growth on these large sites only serves to enforce the current problems that already exist with delivery. In order for the Council to have a continuous five year housing land supply, it is necessary for a Council to allocate a range of different sized sites (from strategic allocations to smaller infill sites). These sites should not be solely restricted to the largest settlements. Paragraph 68 of the NPPF states that planning policies should identify a sufficient supply and mix of sites, taking into account their availability, suitability and likely economic viability. The proposed two parcels at North Fambridge are available and suitable to accommodate some of MDC's growth across the emerging Plan Period, in a highly sustainable location accessible by public transport. The sites are available immediately and whilst the total number would be subject to a capacity and masterplanning exercise, they would clearly make a significant contribution to the Council's short- and medium-term housing needs, which in turn would help the Council to maintain a five year housing land supply. This reduces the risk speculative developments coming forward. 3.20 BDW Eastern already has experience in North Fambridge delivering a collection of high quality 2, 3, 4 & 5 bedroom homes, constructed by David Wilson, to the south of the Village and the railway line (known as Riverside Grange). This demonstrates BDW Eastern's commitment to providing high quality homes to North Fambridge, which should give confidence to the Council that allocating those two Parcels will	Comment noted.At the present time the Council cannot comment on whether individual settlements can or cannot accommodate future growth.The LDP Review process has to plan for future growth and it will have to be accommodated within the District. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and this was one of the reasons for the Issues and Options Consultation. In the coming months work will be undertaken to make the necessary decision using the evidence prepared as part of the LDP Review work.
Ben	Binder	University of Adelaide		
Lorraine	Bailey	Wickham Bishops Parish Council	Wickham Bishops Parish Council believes that the only option that should be pursued is Option 7. The remaining options are opposed by the Parish Council on the grounds that they would concentrate too much growth on the villages in the District and impact adversely on the rural nature of the villages and the District as a whole.	Support noted for option 7
Ali	Aldis		Option 1 would be my preferred choice, this would mean than we may keep some of our green spaces across the district. Wildlife would then continue to thrive as less trees and hedgerow would need to be removed to make way for additional small roads and housing. Keeping our wildlife corridors available are high on my priority list. Roads in our smaller villages are already taking a beating from increased traffic with bigger issues of pot holes no longer of any priority to Essex Highways. Better Fibre Broadband connectivity would be a great way to stop isolation in our smaller villages. Stopping people from buying 2nd homes which are generally left empty for months on end, instead encourage these same people to invest in smaller homes for family members by ways of tax break incentives.	Support noted for option 1
David	Smye	The Maldon Society	Option 7 - Concentration of the majority of new housing areas to be sited within accessible distance of the railway line. The more development close to the railway line will encourage its improvement and more frequent services (and easy to extend to serve Bradwell). Maldon has now more than enough houses to equate to the cultural/educational/recreational facilities available. Alternative option: Option 6. If option 7 is shown to not be viable then more housing should be concentrated in the north of the district away from flood risk areas.	Support noted for option 6 & 7
Stewart	Newlands	Fambridge Lake		
Stewart	Newlands	Fambridge Lake		
Paula	Stanbury			
Sonia	Whiskin	Financial Services		
Geoffrey	Charge	n/a		
Robert	Collins			

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 15. Which growth option do you consider to be the most appropriate for the District of Maldon?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Ben	Thornett		option 1 would be best as the majority of services are located in the bigger towns, improvements could be made and here is where they will benefit more people. Option 4 would be second best as the district could gradually grow, spreading the improvements needed at a lower level on each town and village. people would then have the choice for new homes closer to the town or in more rural villages. Option 6 to develop in the north of the district could help take the pressure off services development if these residence had better access to other towns facilities and services	Support noted for option 1
Matthew	Wood	Phase 2 Planning	Because of its size this comment is on a separate sheet	N/A
Tim	Aves		The council should allow no more significant housing developments until the district has the schools, GP and dental surgeries, roads sewerage and other vital infrastructure to support all the people who have moved or are moving into the hundreds of homes already built in the past five years! No exceptions. It's time to say enough is enough. I have no problem with building houses per se. We desperately need more homes in this country and they have to go somewhere. However, I do not accept that any planning system worthy of the name should allow so much housing to be built without the infrastructure to support it. Developers should be legally obliged to pay much, much more from the vast profits they rake in from these sites and this should be channeled directly into infrastructure to support that housing. That's what sensible, responsible planning looks like. Anything less amounts to a dereliction of its duty as a local planning authority. It is time for the council to stop making excuses and take a bold stance on behalf of the people of the district. It should publicly state it will no longer capitulate to pressure from major developers or central government to allow further housing until adequate infrastructure is not only funded, but actually in place. It should then be prepared, if necessary, to mount a robust legal defence of this policy in the name of local democracy.	The LDP has an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which was approved through its examination, infrastructure is agreed with statutory providers such as the NHS and ECC and should be to mitigate the impact of development. Infrastructure is being provided under the terms of S106 legal agreements and will be assessed further as part of the LDP Review work.
Helen	James		The only realistic way to provide housing with access to the main through routes is along the existing Southminster branch line. Nowhere else has the transport infrastructure and the realistic likelihood is that new transport infrastructure will never be built	Support noted for option 7
Kathy	Day			
Peter	Wakling			
Sara	Howarth			
Eissa	Leo			
Michele	Williams		3 or 4 as I believe growth should be delivered to villages too and smaller developments allow for employment of smaller local construction companies and prevent stagnation of village life	Support noted for option 3 & 4
Tara	Strydom			
Jenny	Ball		On balance, I think Option 1 is the most appropriate, although there may be some scope for Options 6 and 7 to spread the load on infrastructure outside the District. In my experience, people who have been brought up in rural villages as well as those who move there wish to retain how the village looks and feels and retain the rural character and nature. Maldon, Heybridge, Burnham, Southminster have seen huge amounts of expansion. Anything of this nature, even on a smaller scale, would decimate the character of the villages and their surrounding area. And if Burnham has experienced a "lag in infrastructure coming forward in the town" - the effects of this type of growth on smaller villages with little existing infrastructure would be decimating. Greater leverage should be applied to the national scale building companies to sub contract work to smaller local businesses to ensure local economy and employment benefits are realised.	Support noted for option 1
Cliff	Baron			
Gill	Winsor	Tesco	I think to endure no more villages and communities are decimated beyond recognition the houses that are deemed necessary should be built in a new village/ town away from other settlements but be near rail and road infrastructure. They should have new doctors etc built within the community. Another point is if these houses aren't built then people would have to find alternative places to live. Years ago if you wanted to move you bought a property that was within that area not wait for a development to be built. Dengie and Maldon District used to be called the Jewel of the county. Unfortunately all the developments and overgrowth of areas has made it the cubic zirconia not a jewel. All this development no facilities thought of ie doctors dentists schools etc. The roads are getting ridiculously busy at times in the day whereas it used to be easy to drive into SWF or Maldon now it's a nightmare. Getting between the Rettendon Turnpike to The Dengie is taking twice as long due to all the extra traffic going to SWF and the Dengie. It just seems MDC don't care about the quality of life of anyone who have lived in the area for many years they just want money money money. No wonder many people I know have decided to leave family and friends and move to Suffolk or Norfolk where there is not so much development	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced, therefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months.
Emily	Benham	Servoca complex care and nursing		
Laura	Cannon			

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 15. Which growth option do you consider to be the most appropriate for the District of Maldon?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Shaneen	Illanes			
Merryl	Quilter			
Bear	Keen			
Jessica	Cox		Option 1 continues to be the most logical option for planning across the district. This option protects the rural nature of the district which is often celebrated in planning policy. Option 6 holds some merit in locating new development around already existing transport infrastructure, lessening the pressure elsewhere in the district and protecting rural sites across the rest of the Dengie.	Support noted for option 1 & 6
Robert	Burton			
Yvonne	Wade		Options 6 or 7 Options should be centred around areas where rail access is more readily available. The outlying villages are often only accessible via one or possibly two minor roads. The majority of employment is outside the immediate area requiring some form of commute. Schooling is also a big problem in the more rural areas, incurring large travelling costs for parents.	Support noted for option 6 & 7
Louise	Bywaters-Smith	Hospitality		
Brooke	Roberts-Morgan			
Patricia	Bunkle			
Marc	Rawinsky	M R Sovereign Services Ltd		
Roger	Tiffn		cannot comment as there are no suggested for the proposals an development should be intergrated within the existing so that they are easy to get too by foot or public transport	Comment noted and would agree with the consultee that development needs to be connected via foot and/or to services and facilities.
Kathryn	Beighton	Publishing	7 - making better use of areas around the existing railway line puts the homes where people need them and would improve rail services longer term. North Fambridge has few facilities so would benefit from larger population, Althorne could have major new areas of housing around the railway station without annoying anyone very much.	Support noted for option 7
Roy	Warren	Sport England		
STUART	SOWTER			
Mark	Raffray		OPTION 2 or OPTION 6 appear to represent optimal choices based on balanced considerations of fair apportionment (taking into account recent development) plus practicability and sustainability criteria (including leveraging infrastructure hubs within the District or in adjacent districts). OPTION 5 might represent a viable alternative, but the specifics provided for that option are insufficiently precise to permit an objective judgement. Certain of the presented options have major drawbacks associated with them:- OPTION 4 suffers from multiple disadvantages, including issues with: (a) ensuring appropriate existing or feasible future infrastructure would be available (schools, healthcare, transportation, and other facilities); (b) planning security in terms of predictable housing supply; and (c) assured scalability of development. It is noted that several further issues are detailed in the bullet point listing that was presented alongside this option. OPTION 7 is non-optimal and is also poorly justified in the explanatory commentary. These issues include, but are not limited to the following: 1) Rail connectivity to London represents insufficient justification alone to prefer this option (e.g. other local and regional commuting and connectivity needs should also feature; as well as the local infrastructure current state and the assessed future potential for new infrastructure). 2) In comparison to sustainable development precedents laid down in the existing approved LDP, this option would be a totally disproportionate shift in planning policy (for example cf. LDP para 2.28 and 2.29). 3) Infrastructure and facilities in these locations are inadequate and could not be radically adjusted even in the medium term — see also below. [Evidence base: Maldon District Rural Facilities Survey and Settlement Pattern, Jan 2022.]. This option is also clearly incompatible with established precedents in the current LDP, e.g. Policy I1. 4) Such an option would make poor use of the existing infrastructure and facility hubs in the District (including non-rail transport, schools, primary healthcare and shops). 5) Even considering the rail transport mode in isolation, there are well-known capacity constraints affecting the current Crouch Valley (Southminster) branch line. Furthermore, the connecting mainline services (Wickford/Shenfield - London) are approaching an over-capacity situation [Evidence base: Network Rail, Great Eastern Main Line Study Railway: Investment choices; July 2019]. 6) The 3 settlements and adjacent communities are serviced by a restricted capacity road transport corridor (B1012/A132). That corridor is already facing revisional threat (i.e. the downgrading of a key section of B1012 to 'urban street'). 7) This option would be retrograde in terms of encouraging shifts to sustainable transport modes. Isolated villages such as Althorne and North Fambridge provide little opportunity for walking or cycling as primary personal travel modes. This would be counter-productive in encouraging a modal shift away from use of private cars and improving sustainable transport connectivity. 8) This option encompasses locations	Support noted for option 2 6 & 5
April	Rowley			
Bill	Withers		Broadly speaking options 2, 5 and 6. I feel that Maldon itself has seen enough housing growth for a good few years and it is time to focus growth elsewhere in the district. The northern area seems most suitable.	Support noted for option 2 6 & 5
joanna	jeffery		Option 6 Links to A12, the Dengie does not have sufficient infrastructure to cope with a high volume of new houses.	Support noted for option 6

Question 15

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 15. Which growth option do you consider to be the most appropriate for the District of Maldon?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
John	Mitchell		Option 6. This will be to the benefit of most of the District. Further growth around Maldon becomes less sustainable the greater the distance becomes to the Town Centre. This means that residents of the outer suburbs have little choice but to use their cars to get to the shops and other central amenities/facilities. With the right economies of scale a new settlement can be more sustainable than bolting more development onto existing towns. However the close co-operation of neighbouring councils will be essential.	Support noted for option 6
Peter	Layley			
Rex	Davenport		1. Options for Growth which are set out in the leaflet which I support are as follows My view is that MDC should prioritise two of the listed options in the following order of preference: - 1. Option 1 - Carry on the existing LDP's approach by putting all new growth in Maldon/Heybridge and Burnham-on-Crouch, and 2. Option 5 - Create a new satellite settlement adjacent to a town within the District (but not an existing settlement) My reason for supporting this approach is that, by continuing the existing approach to put new growth in the towns, there are likely to be a smaller number of large developments, rather than a larger number of small developments. This should then enable: • Appropriate and safe road access can be designed into schemes • Securing the maximum number of badly needed affordable housing units • Ensure that new housing and workplaces are served by appropriate and funded infrastructure developments including primary health care, schools, drainage and sewage treatment works • A better response to climate change and reducing emission challenges by ensuring better public transport access and minimum travel distances to access facilities and work places provided by the towns and out of District • The provision within or adjacent to new developments of open spaces and recreation grounds • Increased support for existing retail outlets, and usage of leisure and other facilities in the towns • Access and sustainability can more readily be built into a larger development, e.g. ensuring footpaths which are big enough to take wheelchairs and prams • A number of settlements in the District do not have access to gas supplies and use oil f During the transition period, as the country moves to wholly carbon-neutral heating systems, gas is a cleaner system of providing power NOTE: I am not happy that this consultation form limits the comments I can make and that there is nowhere to set out reasons for not supporting the other Options	Support noted for option 1 & 5
Lesley	Mitchelmore	Danbury Parish Council		
Karen	Neath	Tolleshunt Major Parish Council		
N	DA			
Dorreen	Linton	our group consists of adults, playschool and brownies group		
John	Wileman			
Richard	Courtney	University Of East London	Option 4 would be my most preferred as it follows from existing development and also builds on the development tradition of the area, which has been smaller, localised and managed by smaller firms. It would also make a better usage of areas between settlements without the risk of creating too much low quality housing in new housing estate developments. It would also distribute the footfall more evenly across the district and not put too much added pressure on Burnham. Option 7 seems to be short sighted given the Environment Agency predictions for flood risk over the next 20 years or so. It would also create smaller isolated communities that would not directly benefit from other services in the area	Support noted for option 4
sue	Rawlinson	Evolve	none.	N/A
Douglas	Milsted	Heybridge Basin Conservation Society		
Alan	Outlaw	Self Emplyed	Option 1 is my favoured options. Spreading developments over a wider area will not achieve the infrastructure investment necessary and could be result in spreading 'too little too thin'. Option 7 has merit but for it to be successful, major infrastructure is required. I also believe that the pandemic has changed the working pattern of people and train links to London will not be as important as it once was.	Support noted for option 1 & 7

Question 15

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 15. Which growth option do you consider to be the most appropriate for the District of Maldon?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Lindsey	Squire	North Fambridge Parish Council	Option 6 appears to be the most suitable on the basis that both already have some appropriate infrastructure. In contrast Option 7 would seem the least suitable for the following reasons inter alia: 1) Rail connectivity to London represents insufficient justification alone to prefer this option (e.g. other local and regional commuting and connectivity needs should also feature; as well as the local infrastructure current state and the assessed future potential for new infrastructure). 2) In comparison to sustainable development precedents laid down in the existing approved LDP, this option would be a totally disproportionate shift in planning policy (for example cf. LDP para 2.28 and 2.29). 3) Infrastructure and facilities in these locations are inadequate and could not be radically adjusted even in the medium term — see also below. [Evidence base: Maldon District Rural Facilities Survey and Settlement Pattern, Jan 2022.]. This option is also clearly incompatible with established precedents in the current LDP, e.g. Policy I1. 4) Such an option would make poor use of the existing infrastructure and facility hubs in the District (including non-rail transport, schools, primary healthcare and shops). 5) Even considering the rail transport mode in isolation, there are well-known capacity constraints affecting the current Crouch Valley (Southminster) branch line. Furthermore, the connecting mainline services (Wickford/Shenfield - London) are approaching an over-capacity situation [Evidence base: Network Rail, Great Eastern Main Line Study Railway: Investment choices; July 2019]. 6) The 3 settlements and adjacent communities are serviced by a restricted capacity road transport corridor (B1012/A132). That corridor is already facing an additional threat (i.e. the downgrading of a key section of B1012 to 'urban street'). 7) This option would be retrograde in terms of encouraging shifts to sustainable transport modes. Isolated villages such as Althorne and North Fambridge provide little opportunity for walking or cycling as primary personal travel modes. This would be counter-productive in encouraging a modal shift away from use of private cars and improving sustainable transport connectivity. 8) This option encompasses locations with intrinsically unsuitable areas for development (flood risk zones). Mitigation complexities exist related to feasible solutions to (a) surface water flood risk; and (b) in ensuring surface water run off does not contaminate the river and creek zones	Support noted for option 6
K	Jeffries			
John	Lakin	?		
Samantha	Weeks		Option 1 is my prefered option. The development of the towns of Maldon and Heybridge where existing faciliites and infrastructure either exist or can be incorporated into development makes logical sense - to concentrate development to established larger settlements. Putting signifcant development on greenfield rural locations does nothing for that rural area except cause employment issues, problems with catchments for schooling and makes rural roads much busier as people living in these rural areas still need to access towns for work and other facilities. This has an enviromental impact as well as the loss of green space and wildlife. For similar reasons, option 6 is also preferred. To utilise the more available industrial areas around Witham and the transport links of the A12 and railway connections to London.	Support noted for option 1 & 6
Carlie	Mayes			
Richard	Martin	Scott Properties	Option 1, as it accords with the approved LDP and ensures that growth occurs in the settlements which are best equipped to accommodate it.	Support noted for option 1

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 15. Which growth option do you consider to be the most appropriate for the District of Maldon?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Mike	Spurgeon	Phase 2 Planning and Development	OPTION 1 - Focus growth in the settlements of Maldon/Heybridge and Burnham on Crouch - As discussed above, the existing Plan already makes substantial provision for new homes in Maldon and Heybridge, and there are existing consents which may be expected to deliver new homes at a steady pace for around the next decade. As the largest centre of population in the district, and with a wide range of employment and local facilities, some further growth at Maldon and Heybridge would we assume feature in the new Plan to an extent, but there would be good reason to phase the release of any additional land towards the end of the new Plan period, as there is no short-medium term need for additional supply, and the existing strategic allocations need to be assimilated first. Burnham-on-Crouch is the other major town in the District. As noted above, although Burnham did accommodate a degree of new housing in the existing Local Plan, the scale was relatively minor, and has been substantially implemented. As the consultation document itself notes, Government Policy has altered since the adopted Plan was produced, and there is not only a requirement to make available a greater range of sites, but there is a more general need to address housing requirements in other parts of the District, to meet both market and affordable needs. Therefore overall, a repetition of the growth strategy set out in the adopted Plan would not be appropriate. OPTION 2 - A strong focus on the towns and larger sustainable villages - Although this option starts to address the wider growth needs of the District, it would still result in a concentration of development on a very limited number of settlements, and would also again appear to be reliant on Maldon and Heybridge to deliver the majority of new growth, given the intention to limit the number of larger villages involved to only between 3-5. In essence, therefore, this Option is very much the same as Option 1, but with the addition of a limited number of allocations at a small number of larger villages. It is considered that a broader spread of development across more of the larger villages in the District would be more appropriate and ultimately more deliverable and has greatest potential to meet housing needs (including the provision of affordable housing), across the District. In our view, Option 2 does not therefore go far enough in terms of moving away from an over-concentration of growth at Maldon and Heybridge. OPTION 3 - Growth generally focused on the towns Maldon/Heybridge and Burnham on Crouch and all the large villages of the Settlement Hierarchy We generally support Option 3. For the reasons previously discussed, any future growth at Maldon and Heybridge would be materially less than in the previously approved Plan, and should be phased towards the second half of the Plan period, due to the stock of existing permissions and the need for these to be assimilated first. Burnham-on-Crouch and the larger villages are then well placed to accommodate growth in the short?medium term, as these are the most sustainable locations in terms of population, services, facilities and public transport,	Support noted for option 3
C/O Agent Mike	Spurgeon	Phase 2 Planning & Development	Have had to put on a separate sheet as the response is too large for excel spreadsheet	
Amanda	Mickelsen			
Samuel	Newton	Anglo European School		
Mary-Ann	Munford			
Jo	Harvey		I am against the development in Althorne but development anywhere in the Dengie is a bad idea. The idea of a huge development in Althorne is ridiculous. The accessibility to the proposed development is a massive problem for our village which is currently only 600 dwellings. To add 1750 is a huge amount. How would you expect people to get into and out of the area? It would increase people using cards for all reasons and a lot of people would have to use cars for work, etc. if not on the train. Schools are oversubscribed, where would children go to school? An issue for both primary and secondary education. A big development would cause massive loss of wildlife including foxes, badgers, rabbits, hares, muntjac, stoats, voles, great crested newts, lizards, grass snakes, slow worms and countless birds; this would be a huge loss to the area. The public footpaths are well used in the area and bring visitors in to enjoy what we have here, especially by the river. The vista will be ruined because you can currently see the whole view either side of the river. It would be absolutely destroyed and will be a big blot on the horizon. I am concerned there are no doctors surgeries nearby , Althorne is a 'drive through' village with nothing here. There are plots of land which can be used, although planning has been turned down because it's unsustainable. If these are unsustainable, why are 1750 houses? Infilling is much better for the entire area. Small villages would be able to cater for that much better than a large development. In view of emission targets, development should be investigated near to a main road for better accessibility. Around main routes such as A12, A127, A130. In Altorne, we are 20-30 minutes away from any main road and accessibility is an issue. This will be affected by additional development. Regarding flooding, the proposed site has potential for flooding and rising sea levels could also affect the proposed development. If this area is built on, it will spoil it for future generations; it will be lost forever.	

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 15. Which growth option do you consider to be the most appropriate for the District of Maldon?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Terry	Fleming		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.A greater spread ,more opportunities to avoid the large national construction companies and small builders and local labour opportunity. 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 and residents can also access the railway connections at Hatfield Peverel and Witham and the strategic road connection of the A12. Residents of the District 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. Good links in these areas public transport,less stress on infrastructure ,good opportunity to develop brown field	It is not clear which option this consultee is favouring because they have not stated which one but it would appear to be option 5 - growth in the north of the District.
Philip	Davies		Option 2 is the preferred option. - Reasons are that the Towns and Larger Villages are more sustainable. Medium and Small Villages can have windfall development as long as it is sustainable in the true sense. ie. there is adequate capacity in the GP practices and Schools serving the villages and suitable transport links to the Towns/Large Villages where the majority of the services are.	Support noted for option 2
Susan	Cumming	not applicable		
Ronald	Edge	Construction Industry		
Gordon	Mussett	Little Braxted Parish Council	Option 7 would be the better (greener) solution at there are already established train/bus links to employment centres outside of the District, whereas in options 5 and 6 links to the A12/Witham Station or Colchester would require the use of private vehicles. Perhaps a mixed approach (70% option 7, 30% options 5/6) given the limited opportunity for extensive Greenfield development on the Braintree/Colchester borders	Support noted for option 7
Ronnie	Tongue	state school		
Sue	Dobson	Essex Bridleways Association		
David	Webb			
Andrew	Marsh	Historic England	Historic England has no preference on the specific geographical spilt, however we recommend that the density, scale, character and detailed designed of new housing be appropriate for its context. The capacity for an area to accommodate new housing development whilst maintaining its historic environment should be a key consideration, so that the quality and character of neighbourhoods, towns and villages is conserved. Integrating consideration of the historic environment into plan making alongside other considerations is a key principle of sustainable development. Allocation of new housing sites should be considered in the most sustainable locations and densities and character should reflect that of the surrounding area. This approach will require a careful and detailed analysis of locations to ensure that distribution of housing is appropriate. The historic environment is a critical factor in this analysis in terms of considering the ability of sites and locations to accommodate new housing without undue harm to heritage assets and their settings.	Comment noted the Council will work with statutory partners to ensure that it fulfills its Duty to Co-operate.
Brian	Haydon			
Hazel	Notley		Option 5: This seems to be the only viable option as large developments tagged into existing settlements will radically alter the character of the place. Speaking as a long term resident of Tollesbury, most of the population is very stable with an enviable community spirit. We have welcomed and absorbed the slow and gradual influx of new residents but worry that a large development built either entry road would impact on the unique character we have enjoyed and value highly. With a development creating a satellite village, there is an opportunity to ensure the infrastructure (ie schools, health services, public transport, water, sewage, power, and roads) becomes part of the planning and doesn't compromise existing inhabitants living space.	Support noted for option 5
Jean	Brown			
Joanne	McGinity		Option 1 it seems to be the least awful of all options available. Also these two towns have an existing infrastructure which would facilitate growth.	Support noted for option 1
Stuart	Dedman	Nil		
Kerry	McKenna			
Penny	McCauley	Tiptree dental	1or 3 as the road connections and amenities can cope unlike in option 2	Support noted for option 1 & 3

Question 15

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 15. Which growth option do you consider to be the most appropriate for the District of Maldon?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Jane	Phillips	Solicitors	Options for Growth should focus on Options 1 and 2. Development prioritisation should therefore be concentrated to the Towns and Larger Villages (only) where these facilities can be built up to better serve all the local community. Development concentration around the Towns and Larger Villages allows a focus for access and infrastructure as well as service and facility provision, thereby enabling the quality of rural life and enjoyment for the remaining areas to the benefit of everyone. A spread and scattering of development dilutes provision and spreads wider impact to the detriment of the rural landscape. Object to Option 7 - ALT2 - Althorne - the increase in size and nature of this site being identified as a 'yes' in the HELAA Call for sites 2022 would severely negatively impact the landscape as well as increase volumes of traffic to a road that currently cannot cope in an area which was originally designated as a Special Landscape Area and Coastal Protection Belt.	Support noted for option 1 & 2
David	Rees		Option 3 would generally mean that those communities with the greatest capacity for growth. They have, generally, better existing facilities and infrastructure though clearly these facilities will need to be improved and updated as demand grows	Support noted for option 3
Darren	Weeks		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 offers the best transport links and so will have less impact to towns and villages further from A12 and London-Norwich Train line corridor from added traffic. This area is less congested today than the Maldon district.	Support noted for option 6
Phil	Manning			
Peter	Clack		Options for Growth should focus on Options 1, 2, 3, 5 and 6 There is clear evidence of service and facility deterioration from 2008 to 2021. Development prioritisation should therefore be concentrated to the Towns and Larger Villages (only) where these facilities can be built up to better serve all the local community. Development concentration around the Towns and Larger Villages allows a focus for access and infrastructure as well as service and facility provision, thereby enabling the quality of rural life and enjoyment for the remaining areas to the benefit of everyone. A spread and scattering of development dilutes provision and spreads wider impact to the detriment of the rural landscape. We STRONGLY OBJECT to Option 7 - ALT2 - Althorne - the increase in size and nature of this site being identified as a 'yes' in the HELAA Call for sites 2022 would severely negatively impact the landscape as well as increase volumes of traffic to a road that currently cannot cope in an area which was originally designated as a Special Landscape Area and Coastal Protection Belt.	Support noted for option 1 2 3 5 & 6
Doug	Lockwood	National Grid	None until a infrastructure is approved and put in place which reduces the traffic problems, volume and pollution.	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth, the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months. The LDP has an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which was approved through its examination, infrastructure is agreed with statutory providers such as the NHS and ECC and should be to mitigate the impact of development. Infrastructure is being provided under the terms of S106 legal agreements and will be assessed further as part of the LDP Review work.
Sally	George			
Vara	Szajkowski			
Bob	Calver		Option 6 to meet with the revised housing market of MDC, Chelmoofrd and Braintree.	Support noted for option 6
Tessa	Lambert	Natural England		

Question 15

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 15. Which growth option do you consider to be the most appropriate for the District of Maldon?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Dawn	Howles		I do not think option 7 is viable. I live in Althorne, there are numerous reasons why our village is not suitable to have a new housing estate placed upon it: We don't have the infrastructure, facilities, a good enough drainage system by the park area, our residents have to drive to a doctors or dentist as the bus services are not regular enough and we don't have these amenities in our lovely, quiet village. The roads between North Fambridge and Althorne are narrow and winding and not conducive to heavy traffic alongside the normal large farm vehicles. There is hardly any employment in our village. We do not have a post office. There is not a school here and local schools are all oversubscribed. The people who live here love the rural aspect, the peace and the uninterrupted panoramic views. We have a wonderful environment in which wildlife and marine mammals and birds thrive, this must be protected for future generations to enjoy.	At the present time the Council cannot comment on whether individual settlements can or cannot accommodate future growth.The LDP Review process has to plan for future growth and it will have to be accommodated within the District. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and this was one of the reasons for the Issues and Options Consultation. In the coming months work will be undertaken to make the necessary decision using the evidence prepared as part of the LDP Review work.
natasha	frith		Option 1 and Option 6 - this is where the amenities, current housing/schooling/transport infrastructure is located and supported. -These options will also support local business and ensure sustainability. -These plans will ensure that the local transportation links, both rail and road are maximised and not put pressure of local villages small roads. -These options will ensure that we retain the identity of our villages. People choose to live in villages with small impact to the environment ensuring wider green areas surrounding them. - The other option will put pressure of local villages schools	Support noted for option 1 & 6
Anthony	Bates			
Russell	Howles	WSP	Option 4 is by the far the most appropriate for the District of Maldon. It would better support local business. It would have far less environmental impact. Its a more sustainable method of growth It would better meet housing demand It would not swamp the local transport network. Economies of scale should not be of concern to housing developers during a booming housing market. Smaller sites would not struggle to be brought forward.	Support noted for option 4
Gillian	Hollamby		Option 2 where there are the facilities, services & infrastructure. Small villages do not have the roads, public transport pedestrian pavements for large housing developments.	Support noted for option 2
Brian	Townsend			
Malcolm	Finch		Future growth should be primarily close to existing major road and rail links, not in villages which would lose their rural attractiveness and would see the destruction of valuable ecologically important habitats.	Development should be connected to the main footpath network wherever it is located.
Peter	Taylor	Retired	Options 1 or 2 because of the need to provide adequate infrastructure and facilities to support new housing developments. It is already admitted that the provision of such infrastructure and facilities for the new developments in Maldon/Heybridge is lagging behind - but at least it is planned and ongoing. It would be foolhardy in the extreme to try to follow a policy of building new housing in areas where such needs are barely adequate at present. The 'physical' provision of adequate infrastructure (particularly transport) and facilities must take place in parallel with the building of houses! It would be particularly senseless to adopt a policy to build adjacent to areas where growth is already planned and the local ramifications on infrastructure, etc. are yet to be tested.	Support noted for option 1 & 2
Chris	Melbourne		none of your options are viable in there entirety as i believe they are based on false premises ie infrastructure promises which never materialise and consequently will never sustain any of the options proposed.	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced, therefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months.
Robert	Hollamby		Option 1	Support noted for option 1
Kate	Priest	Purleigh Community Primary School	Option 6. This option offers the best transport links. Less impact on smaller villages and towns further from the A12.	Support noted for option 6
Gary	SPICER		In my opinion options 4 or 6 would be best suited to be included in the LDP	Support noted for option 4 & 6
Helen	Bridge		Option 6 Residents will be able to quickly access colleges and universities, hospitals and quality employment opportunities which are concentrated in Chelmsford and Colchester. It doesn't make sense to build houses in the south of the District forcing traffic to undertake an unnecessarily long journey twice a day. Option 6 is the environmentally cleaner and more sustainable option.	Support noted for option 6

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 15. Which growth option do you consider to be the most appropriate for the District of Maldon?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Melanie	Allen	Government	As above	Refers to Althorne - At the present time the Council cannot comment on whether individual settlements can or cannot accommodate future growth or on site specifics. The LDP Review process has to plan for future growth and it will have to be accommodated within the District. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and this was one of the reasons for the Issues and Options Consultation. In the coming months work will be undertaken to make the necessary decision using the evidence prepared as part of the LDP Review work.
Adam	Medlycott		Option 2 - these are more likely to have existing infrastructure to support expansion in place including roads and public transport links.	Support noted for option 2
Joanne	Maloney		Option 4 - spreading the growth across the whole district, not just the towns and giving work to small and medium sized construction companies	Support noted for option 4
Portia	Roelofs			
Lisa	Singh	Direct Call Centres Ltd	OPTION 2 - A strong focus on the towns and larger sustainable villages. Small villages with no real infrastructure such as Althorne should not be considered.	Support noted for option 2
Kevin	Head		"OPTION 2 - A strong focus on the towns and larger sustainable villages" appears to be the most logical approach to delivering a number of new homes in the most sustainable locations of the district. Because of environmental constraints, the scope to enable medium-large scale urban extensions to be delivered at the existing larger towns of Maldon/Heybridge and Burnham-on-Crouch is limited. Therefore there should be a focus to allocate significant development at the other Large Villages such as Mayland, which will better help to support the vitality and sustainability of these settlements and counter existing trends of rural isolation and economic decline in these places. Greater levels of growth towards the Large Villages would also have potential to deliver a wider range of services to these settlements alongside any new housing, which can create employment growth and economic investment into these areas and enable them to become more sustainable places.Within the Large Villages, sites within very close proximity to existing public transport links should be prioritised (i.e. sites within close walking distances of bus stops or railway stations). Greater housing and employment growth in these areas will support the vitality and viability of these services and ensure they are feasible to be maintained - thus supporting more sustainable settlements and meeting the draft objectives of the Plan. Applying an arbitrary policy of 10% of the District's housing allocation being directed to the other sustainable Large Villages in the settlement pattern" as set out under Option 2, is not considered appropriate. The amount of potential growth should be dictated by environmental capacity of the various settlements and the degree of benefits that can be created through growth and improved sustainability in these villages. Subject to the outcome of the environmental capacity analysis, it might be found to be more logical for a threshold of 20-30% of the district's housing need to be delivered in the Large Villages where there are sustainable transport links. This will encourage the rural parts of the district to grow more sustainably, and ease the burden on the larger settlements. Andrew Martin – Planning (AM-P) act for Mr & Mrs Head of Grange Farm, Grange Avenue, Mayland, CM3 8BG. A response has been submitted on their behalf to the current 'Call for Sites' consultation. This sets out details of the site being promoted, together with adjoining land (MAY7) as shown on the attached plan to demonstrate the sustainability and suitability of the site. The Grange Farm site comprises 10.75 ha and the adjoining MAY7 is 4.78 ha. From AM-P's analysis, Mayland has favourable, suitable and environmental capacity for growth. Scope to expand Mayland/Maylandsea to the north and east is limited due to the constraints of the Blackwater Estuary, Mundon Creek and Mayland Creek and the associated areas of flood risk and important environmental designations and landscape considerations. The most suitable areas for growth are to the south of Steeple Road and west of The Drive. The Grange	Comment noted and At the present time the Council cannot comment on whether individual settlements or sites can or cannot accommodate future growth.The LDP Review process has to plan for future growth and it will have to be accommodated within the District. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and this was one of the reasons for the Issues and Options Consultation. In the coming months work will be undertaken to make the necessary decision using the evidence prepared as part of the LDP Review work.
Elizabeth	Sawyer Bayliss			

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 15. Which growth option do you consider to be the most appropriate for the District of Maldon?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Michael	Partridge		Maldon District Council has described the area as: "... gently rolling wooded farmland overlooking the River Crouch, predominantly large arable fields with treed boundaries. The area has a high sensitivity to change." The proposed development would be visible from a large number of the existing properties in Stow Maries, dominating the view from many parts of the village and from the surrounding area. There has been much interest in recent times in the potential of the village and the wider Crouch valley district as a tourist destination, obviously due to the attractive and largely unspoilt nature of the landscape. The introduction of a large new housing estate in a prominent position on the western approach to the district will seriously detract from its appeal to visitors. I feel strongly that an alternative approach would be more acceptable and in keeping with the nature of Stow Maries. There are several undeveloped areas within the wider village envelope, but outside the settlement boundary as currently defined, which might provide sites for residential properties without significantly changing the nature of the village. Whilst we are not actively seeking to develop, we do own a 2 hectare field adjacent to Woodham Road which we could make available for housing development if it was considered appropriate, and I have now completed and submitted a Call for Sites form in respect of this site. I believe there are several similar small sites, in different ownership, that might be available if the Council's planning policy were to change. Historically there has been hostility towards any development in the village, usually citing the rural nature of the settlement as one of the main objections. This has effectively frozen the village at its present size for the last half century with development being largely limited to improvement and extension of existing properties. If sensitive infill development were to be allowed within the village it could grow 'organically' and accommodate a larger population without compromising its chief asset: the attractive rural setting with views to the south over the river Crouch valley and to the west over undulating farmland and woodland. I believe that a similar approach would be appropriate in most villages in the Maldon District and that Option 4, 'pepper pot' growth across the district in proportion with settlement sizes, would be the best way to preserve the character of the district while still allowing for population growth. I feel that Option 4 (Pepper pot Growth) is the most appropriate. This would allow for the organic growth of the smaller communities, many of which have been effectively frozen for decades. There would seem to be room in or around most villages for sensitive new development, both residential and commercial, which need not compromise the overall nature of the district.	Support noted for option 4
Kenneth	Northfield		Options 5 and 6. Hopefully this would provide adequate infrastructure without straining the existing within current settlements	Support noted for option 5 & 6
Jerry	Petts			
Frederick	McMahon		1. Digital, 2. Health 3. Art, 4. Upgrade promenade	Not sure what this refers to.
Tracey	Merritt	Dengie Hounds and Horses	As data shows most travel to outside of district is to Chelmsford then Option 6 would be most suitable due to closest proximity and existing road and rail link from Hatfield Peveral being 6 minutes by rail and 9 minutes by car. Option 7 least suitable, as travel by train to Chelmsford from Stations here takes 1 hr 33 minutes compared to 27 minutes by car and therefore there is little advantage in living close to these railway stations for train commuting to Chelmsford, rather it would encourage more use of cars thus increase traffic, congestion and pollution. Building in option 7 would simply increase the existing problems of inward migration for London commuters increasing the already disadvantaged local affordability and supply for homes , whilst at the same time increase traffic , congestion and pollution due to the desire to drive to Wickford station for the benefit of direct, more frequent and later train availability. Due to the nature of the branch line with limited service and unreliability of the train service from Southminster these stations should not be considered in the same light as better connected rail links for development opportunities.	Support noted for option 6
Jo	Crump	Servoca Secure Soutions		
Susan	ARCHER			
Winifred	Sutherland		Option 4. I understand there is a possibility of over 100 houses to be built on St Stephens Road West of the village church. This road is an unclassified narrow road and gets extremely busy at certain times of the day especially early morning mid afternoon and late evening. There are also lorries and vans driving up this narrow lane and walkers have often difficulty in getting out of the way. The end of this road opens out onto B1010 Fambridge Rd and is a very dangerous junction especially at peak times. Cars are queuing up to join the B1012 Lower Burnham Rd from about 6.30 am trying to get to the station at North Fambridge and also SWF. Cars are also coming in the opposite direction to go to Burnham on Crouch. At peak times children are getting taken and collected from Cold Norton school which is already oversubscribed. I would suggest one of the planning officers should try this route a few times and especially in the winter months to show how very dangerous this road is as well as all the tail backs to get onto the road to North Fambridge. The idea of housing being approved here is just totally illogical and without proper thought and consideration.	Support noted for option 4
Chris	clark		Keep round the Big towns where they have better structure and hopefully more in the future if what the council have planned ever happens. How ever did the council allow the new houses to be built without a new drs surgery what ever was the council thinking	Comment noted. Advice about what infrastructure is required regarding doctors surgeries comes from the NHS and it is only if they recommend asking for funding for this type of infrastructure can the Council legitimately request it via S106 agreements.
Jeremy	Richardson		Focus growth in Maldon and Burnham otherwise our countryside will be destroyed	Support noted for option 1

Question 15

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 15. Which growth option do you consider to be the most appropriate for the District of Maldon?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Cheryl	Carter	Education	1,2,4,6	Support noted for option 1 2 4 & 6
Susan	Mason			
Melad	Kamlow			
Dave	Draper	The Hartford Insurance Group	Option 4 - scattering growth proportionately across all villages/areas in the District is the fairest way of meeting overall growth targets	Support noted for option 4
Kevin	Cooper		Option 1 Most Appropriate It is more appropriate to focus growth on the larger towns. The villages and small towns do not have the facilities to support significant extra housing	Support noted for option 1
Katherine	Whitehouse			
Linda	Soul		Option 1 or 2 seems to be the most appropriate for the District of Maldon to adopt. This is because there are already the services and facilities that are required, including transport links, business and employment opportunities, retail facilities, schools, therefore less commuting, resulting in reducing air pollution.	Support noted for option 1 & 2
Robert	Wilson		I think option 6 would be the most suitable. being to the north of maldon it would minimise the traffic impact on the already highly loaded south ring road. it also has the links to railway network at witham and hatfield peveral without adding to the traffic going through or round maldon to the south,	Support noted for option 6
Sarah-Jayne	Hunt	SJ Aesthetics LTD	Option 7 as any further housing development needs to be by a strong transport link as roads into and out of Purleigh are country roads and already far too busy.	Support noted for option 7
Jonathan	Hunt		Option 7 - Any housing growth option can only be supported with sufficient transport infrastructure. With the connecting roads in the Maldon district already becoming congested following the ongoing housing development, the only scope to expand local population is along the rail line to Althorne, North Fambridge and Southminster. It is also worth stating the many new home owners may not have a car, so train connection to London would be key.	Support noted for option 7
Deborah	de Boltz	Farleigh Hospice		
Tim	Murphy			
Claire	McGrane		Option 6 - Focus growth in the north of the District to link into the service and facilities available in Tiptree, Witham and Maldon/Heybridge. A12 access, fast rail available on two way tracks to London as well as Colchester, Ipswich and Beyond.	Support noted for option 6
Tracey	Munford	NA		
Rowan	Rampersad		Option 6	Support noted for option 6
LUKE	MACFARLANE	S A RAVEN	Option 1 No. Will result in too much development in the same places as before. Option 2 No. Too restrictive in relation to villages and also likely to result in too much development in the same places as before. Option 3 or Option 4 preferred but reference to development being "proportioned out" should be deleted and replaced with reference to supporting community growth on appropriate sites that fit in with the existing settlement. Option 5 No, not needed and will create similar problems to putting too much development in one place.	Support noted for option 3 & 4
Anna	Wombwell	Morris Farm		
Ronald	Owen	Not applicable		
Elizabeth	Johns			
Colin	Day		I disagree with building on green open space outside the settlement boundary	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced, therefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months. The District does not have a history of industrial use and therefore it is inevitable that greenfield development is going to have to be utilised in order to deliver the housing requirement.
Natalie	Bradford			
Harriet	Hurst-Smith		Option 6	Support noted for option 6
Tony	Vanner			
Josie	Vanner			
Tracy	Carroll		Option 1. The 3 large villages listed already have a good amount of infrastructure, amenities and transport links to support further developments unlike the smaller more rural villages in the district. North Fambridge on the other hand, has just one road into the village which would become heavily congested by further increasing the number of residents. It also has limited transport and no schools, shops, or health amenities within the village, which larger communities would require.	Support noted for option 1
Ian	Roberts	N/A		
Tony	Ashton	none		

Question 15

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 15. Which growth option do you consider to be the most appropriate for the District of Maldon?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
mandy	SHORT		i do not believe that more development in North Fambridge is the way forward. The village has no facilities whatsoever. Therefore it is becoming a dormitory village. To make it worse nearest facilities are a ten min drive away. Entry in and out of the village is hazardous. There are regular accidents here and yet highways say not. My son has had three in last few months(none his fault) . i feel a new town on the edges of maldon would be far more sustainable and also have a low impact on surrounding areas as schools, doctors , shops etc can be built at the same time .	Support noted for option 5
Kevin	Money	St. Lawrence Parish Council	The preferred options have to be either a new satellite settlement which would have the necessary infrastructure or to link up with services and facilities in the north western sector – where there are also better transport links. The Crouch Valley railway line is probably not a realistic option given that it is single line operation so the investment to make this a better link would be enormous. Given the rural and remote nature of most of the District, in particular the Dengie peninsula, the question has be asked whether any more development can actually be supported. There is no point building lots of houses if there is nowhere for residents to work, no schools, no medical facilities, and a poor transport infrastructure. The retail offering is limited for most of the District so residents travel, probably not to Maldon but further afield. Burnham seems to be largely a town of bars, restaurants and hairdressers for example. The net result is residents travelling elsewhere – probably out of the district for other retail opportunities, or, of course, making use of online shopping this increasing the number of delivery vans touring the area.	Support noted for option 5
Claire	Udall	1	Option 6 - there is more infrastructure in this area, railway lines direct into London, A12 road, space in senior schools and space to build new schools/doctors etc that might be needed. The smaller villages have no infrastructure and no services to support more development.	Support noted for option 6
Linda	Raffray		I consider that the best option for Maldon would be Option 6. This is because there has already been much building around Maldon, Heybridge and Burnham on Crouch. There are enough issues regarding infrastructures, roads, doctors, schools etc to be sorted out to accommodate the anticipated growth in population once the new builds are occupied without adding more. These issues also adversely impact Option 7. Option 7 has many problems. Although North Fambridge has a train station, the service to London is not a direct line. It involves changing at Wickford. The trains are already over stretched at peak times. In North Fambridge there is currently a large housing development being built on two sites by David Wilson homes. This is impacting on infrastructure. The road in and out of the village links at dangerous bends to the B road. There is increased traffic from both Burnham on Crouch and South Woodham Ferrers directions. Further pressure on the roads from more building would impact negatively on residents using the roads for work, shopping, leisure and health care. The increased capacity on these country roads can potentially be dangerous delaying ambulances and fire services. In order to access shops (there is none in North Fambridge, despite the new development saying it would be having a shop and business premises the developers abandoned this idea.) , medical centres and schools, it is necessary to drive. The doctors and schools are already struggling and at high capacity. There would need to be improvements in roads and in facilities for Option 7 to work. The villages of North Fambridge and Althorne are beside sites of Special Scientific Interest and North Fambridge has a wildlife Trust reserve at Blue House Farm. More building would again negatively impact these areas. Further developments would also impact on the scenic nature of the landscape views which bring people into the area to enjoy the open spaces and walks along the riverside. Both North Fambridge and Althorne are in flood areas and this would impact building .	Support noted for option 6
John	Cooper			
Leah	Jewiss			

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 15. Which growth option do you consider to be the most appropriate for the District of Maldon?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Elaine	Ketley	South Woodham Ferrers Town Council	We support your development options 1, 4 & 6 .We believe a balanced combination of options 1 & 4 taking into account option 6 represents the best combination of options for future development. New rolling stock has added capacity to the line, but this is not seated capacity. The trains have been designed with more standing area, and any journey from any Southminster branch line station to London is longer than the recommended Government guidelines journey time (IIRC seating for all journeys over 30 minutes) for standing passengers. SWFTC, therefore, will reject any arguments that the new rolling stock carries more passengers on the Southminster branch line. • With the new stock, train length has changed, which could increase the line's capacity if 10 car trains are used. However, 10 car trains cannot be readily 'turned-around' at Wickford so could not be used except for through journeys to and from London Liverpool Street. • The theoretical maximum capacity for peak hours services on the branch is limited to 10 car trains that can provide a through service. These would be able to run at a service frequency of approximately every 50 minutes. • For the morning peak, based on 3 by 10 car and 1 by 5 car through services, we believe with the new developments at South Woodham Ferrers and the additional ones that this call for sites currently proposes, that the capacity at South Woodham Ferrers would switch to standing room only for two out of the three-morning peak services to London (with only the first through-train out at around 6.30 am having seated capacity until Wickford). • The evening peak is more drawn out over a longer time frame, with the potential to run 4 by 10 car through trains (subject to rolling stock) from London to Southminster. The current schedule just about handles the volume, but any increase is going to ensure that branch line commuters will be standing from Liverpool Street and especially Stratford, and this is unacceptable to SWFTC. • SWFTC cannot support the level of dwellings proposed in the south of the district as the peak rail infrastructure would not handle the increase in numbers. • Due to the change of rolling stock from 4 car to 5 car units, only one platform at Wickford has been extended to handle the non-through train services (currently, only 1 train in the morning is a through train). This results in a morning service where commuters must cross the footbridge to reach the Liverpool Street departure platform. For disabled passengers, using any non-through service towards London, there is no ability to cross the tracks without an extensive walk of almost half a mile. Aside from the Southminster branch line, SWFTC feels it should draw attention to the network capacity on the routes into London and concerns around the peak time capacity between Shenfield and Stratford. • Transport for London and Cross Rail will be operating train services from Shenfield, and these services will 100% consume two of the tracks between Shenfield and Stratford with South Woodham Ferrers slower pace, multi-stopping trains. As such, just one pair of tracks remain for all capacity from East Anglia into Liverpool Street from places beyond Shenfield on the network map.	Comments noted and Network Rail will be consulted regarding the options for growth.
Ruth	Bull	The Othona Communty		
Mark	Jackson	Mark Jackson Planning	OPTION 3, Growth generally focused on the towns Maldon/Heybridge and Burnham on Crouch and all the large villages of the Settlement Hierarchy. This will achieve the economies of scale for the large house builders by continuing to develop out the Strategic sites and support the fact that the Government recognises that small and medium size sites can make an important contribution to meeting the housing requirements of an area, and they are often built out relatively quickly.	Support noted for option 3
ann	cutting		option 7 - 1. rail connectivity to London represents is insufficient reason to consider OPTION 7 to be a good choice for very significant development. Other aspects such as the local facilities and services capacity and suitability of roads for local and regional commuting needs all need to be factored in. 2.o OPTION 7 makes poor use of the existing infrastructure and facility hubs in the District (including non-rail transport, schools, primary healthcare and shops). Local infrastructure and facilities in the three settlements are currently inadequate for major development and could not be readily scaled up. Other options presented in the consultation already have much better infrastructure and facilities. 3. The 3 settlements mentioned depend on a road transport corridor (B1012/A132) in and out of the Dengie which has very clear capacity limitations. It is already under stress from recent housing developments in the area. Further development pressure on this corridor without major road improvements would be detrimental to the rural communities who rely on it for commuting, good and services delivery and emergency services response. 4. Significant development around both N Fambridge and Althorne would be complicated by the existence of flood zones.	Objection noted for option 7
Sharon	Cushen		Option 4 - Appropriate development in relation to the infrastructure and amenities, not just here is an available space, lets fill it with housing.	Support noted for option 4
Ian	Tooley			
Sally	Tokeley		Option 6 - this provides the best solution for the reuse of existing infrastructure, service and facilities. This aligns with the A12 as the most effective main artery from the area	Support noted for option 6
Christina	Chan		OPTION 1 - Retain the option in the LDP approved in 2017 - focus growth in the settlements of Maldon/Heybridge and Burnham on Crouch This would focus the growth in a core area where adequate facilities such as schools, health services and council services could be increased to support the increased population.	Support noted for option 1
Tim.	Holdsworth			
Graham	Snow			
Sarah	Packard			

Question 15

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 15. Which growth option do you consider to be the most appropriate for the District of Maldon?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Martin	Cook		Option 1 - Maintains the status quo. Option 2 - The current larger settlements are best placed to absorb development with the least impact on the whole area. Option 4 - As an alternative to option 2 this may work but would be more complex to administer and monitor. Also, it is vital that the new development must not overpower the existing settlement and its facilities. Option 6 - This area is more suited to development.	Support noted for option 1 2 4 & 6
Clifford	Brown		Option 1. Our village of Cold Norton cannot sustain the proposed level of development. The school is already at capacity. The main road through Cold Norton is already very busy. The village has just one shop.	At the present time the Council cannot comment on whether individual settlements can or cannot accommodate future growth.The LDP Review process has to plan for future growth and it will have to be accommodated within the District. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and this was one of the reasons for the Issues and Options Consultation. In the coming months work will be undertaken to make the necessary decision using the evidence prepared as part of the LDP Review work.
Steve	Gallant	Crouch Valley Defence Group		
Lesley	Woodley		1, 2, 4, 6	Support noted for option 1 2 4 & 6
Kirsty	Rowsell			
Philip	Wakeling		Option 1 has been exhausted in the current plan 2) Some sense in this given existing facilities 3) As 2 above 4) Preferred as the overall effect on each settlement will be marginal so retaining the character of each settlement whilst helping to re-invigorate and more more facilities viable. Also it's fair as we all share the load. 5) Unecessary and undesirable in infrastructure and probably landscape terms. I assume that you refer here to the proposed settlement adjacent to South Woodham Ferrers to the far south west of the District. This proposal is appalling in landscape terms and ridiculous in terms of bottlenecking existing infrastructure 6) As 2 above 7) Nonsense for reasons of bottlenecking existing road infrastructure and the infrequency of the train service	Support noted for option 4
David	Brock		Option 1 Clearly this is already in progress and the impact has already happened so no harm in continuing with this. Option 2 As long as only top 3 or 4 villages by size included as our village Cold Norton is listed as 9th largest which maybe true but this does not mean it has infrastructure required to support additional housing, for example there is no mains gas, the BT internet speed is one of the worst in the country, the electric supply is hopeless (28 power cuts in the last 12 months), main sewer / drainage issues, no post office, one small shop, a full primary school, no real bus service (once a day and a school bus does'nt really count). Option 4 Assuming max 5 new homes impact may be absorbed by our village Option 6 Would seem more realistic as closer to main road links and main employment hubs	Comment noted. At the present time the Council cannot comment on whether individual settlements can or cannot accommodate future growth.The LDP Review process has to plan for future growth and it will have to be accommodated within the District. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and this was one of the reasons for the Issues and Options Consultation. In the coming months work will be undertaken to make the necessary decision using the evidence prepared as part of the LDP Review work.
Niki	Halls		North Fambridge has already suffered from the growth of the DWH housing development. The road out of North Fambridge is now dangerously busy, other than a station, there is very little infrastructure and the detrimental affect on the wildlife from the heavy plant, machinery and removal of green areas is huge. I think the village of North Fambridge has been subjected to more than sufficient development over the past couple of years - irreversible damage has been done - too many people and cars - animals and birds have disappeared!	At the present time the Council cannot comment on whether individual settlements can or cannot accommodate future growth.The LDP Review process has to plan for future growth and it will have to be accommodated within the District. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and this was one of the reasons for the Issues and Options Consultation. In the coming months work will be undertaken to make the necessary decision using the evidence prepared as part of the LDP Review work.
Stewart	Geden			
Anita	Thomas	Bank	None of the options should be considered for the Maldon district especially the smaller villages such as North Fambridge and Althorne. The infrastructure is not large enough for more housing. North Fambridge village especially has very little facilities (a station and a pub) but no shop, no school and the North Fambridge main road through the village has already seen an increase in traffic with the ongoing Riverside development which includes a large amount of social housing. North Fambridge has a conservation area for wildlife - building additional housing would disturb any wildlife. Green spaces would disappear that are important for wildlife in this conservation area.	At the present time the Council cannot comment on whether individual settlements can or cannot accommodate future growth.The LDP Review process has to plan for future growth and it will have to be accommodated within the District. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and this was one of the reasons for the Issues and Options Consultation. In the coming months work will be undertaken to make the necessary decision using the evidence prepared as part of the LDP Review work.
Andrew	Ashworth			
michael	smith		Option 4 – a scattered growth across the towns, large, medium, and small villages will allow the area to grow as a whole. Larger villages such as Cold Norton should be more focused for development to reduce the density of towns.	Support noted for option 4
Simon	Priest		Option 2 expanding on the larger settlements	Support noted for option 4

Question 15

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 15. Which growth option do you consider to be the most appropriate for the District of Maldon?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Philippa	Marshall		Option 1 or 2 would be the preferred plan. Option 6 for development along the southminster branch line cannot be supported by the infrastructure in small and medium villages. Train size is limited by platforms lengths and overcrowding on trains from any growth in althorne and north fambridge would have a knock on affect to commuters joining along the route to Liverpool Street. These services are already overcrowded at times and prone to frequent cancellation and shortened trains. Roads in this area equally cannot support increased traffic.	Support noted for option 1 & 2
Lewis	Cook	Form Architecture Ltd.	I feel that Option 2 is the most appropriate in allowing growth in areas which can better support additional housing. Option 4 also allows for growth within the Borough without saturating one particular area, which also seems appropriate as it recognizes the need for growth in all areas but in a proportionate manner which can be supported with available infrastructure in particular area.	Support noted for option 2 & 4
EDWARD	GITTINS	Edward Gittins & Associates	We welcome the frank acknowledgement that the lead-in time and output of large scale allocations without sufficient alternative capacity being provided in medium and smaller sites to maintain housing delivery rates represents a deficiency of the Adopted Local Plan. (We recall in this respect that a separate Development Plan Document was promised which was to make further housing provision in the non-urban settlements but that this never materialised). As a consequence, the tightly drawn settlement boundaries around the villages has seriously limited the contribution they have made to growth and meeting the housing needs of the District. There is now an opportunity to redress this imbalance but doing so in a way that underpins existing rural services and facilities, revitalises the rural economy, and provides opportunities for small and medium-sized builders to acquire sites for release in the short term. Given the fairly limited geographical extent of the of the District and the general proximity and accessibility of the villages to the towns, we strongly support Option 4. We believe that proportionate growth - reflecting the size and constraints or opportunities offered by each settlement - provides the most appropriate pattern of development in socio-economic, environmental and sustainability terms.	Support noted for option 4
Steve	Williamson		Option 1 is the most appropriate - existing transport infrastructure, job creation, shopping facilities, school availability. The main requirements for a thriving town and ability to provide homes for lower income families with all services within walking / public transport.	Support noted for option 1
James	Cowell	E & B R Cowell	OPTION 2 (A strong focus on the towns and larger sustainable villages) and OPTION 3 (Growth generally focused on the towns Maldon/Heybridge and Burnham on Crouch and all the large villages of the Settlement Hierarchy) and OPTION 4 (Pepper pot growth throughout the Settlement Hierarchy (Spread the growth across all the sustainable settlements in the District)) are considered to be most appropriate for the District. Southminster is a larger village that is able to take more growth whilst maintaining a good range of services, facilities, and connectivity. Larger villages that are able to accommodate more growth should do so.	Support noted for option 2 & 4
Colin	Hawkes		Option 4 seems to offer the least invasive way forward to achieve housing targets with locations able to absorb development without drastically changing the rural character of villages.. Housing can be contained within existing boundaries or with boundaries altered by the parish councils to cover requirements.	Support noted for option 4
Ronald	PIPER			
John	McLarty		Option 2 and Option 4.	Support noted for option 4
John	McLarty		Option 4, 5 and 6 would in our opinion be the most successful. The ability to deliver new employment and residential development in close proximity of the A12 corridor and Hatfield Peverel Railway Station will ensure much needed infrastructure improvements are considered for this part of the District.	Support noted for option 2 & 4
Norman	Branch	N/A		
John	McLarty		Option 2 and Option 4.	Support noted for option 2 & 4
James	Clarke			

Question 15

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 15. Which growth option do you consider to be the most appropriate for the District of Maldon?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
David	Stilwell		Appreciate this is an emotive topic however with the recent development in North Fambridge there is a notable increase in traffic which has led to several accidents , near accidents , speeding etc . Only yesterday two cars hurtled passed me while walking with both turning into the new 'Riverside Blot' the issue being the drivers are not used to driving on lanes and country roads.North Fambridge used to be a village (until another 100 properties were built) however there is no consideration being given to flooding concerns -a number of properties had gardens flooded recently or traffic on what is essentially a village road together with other issues. The traffic increase has also occurred due to other external developments and people coming into the village for the pub,station, marinas etc . In conversations I have had with other villagers there is already an expectation that there will be a serious accident due to MDC decision making and complete lack of understanding that the road through the village is not an 'A' road , I am aware a number of concerns have been raised however as per normal they are ignored, and with additional traffic from the 'soon to be started' developments once you have finalised this phoney consultation both in the village and external local developments that probability will increase. I have only answered this question as I am fully aware that MDC has already made up their mind where development will occur and not worth the wasted effort answering the full suite of questions which will be ignored anyway. I and many others objected strongly to the previous development and I proactively engaged in every stage of the consultation process but you went ahead anyway , so this LDP consultation is just a window dressing exercise as will be proven when you again site major development here. I recall a representative from DWH advising me the Riverside Blot developments would be a good addition to the village , when I asked Why and How he just clammed up and went red which sums it up.Appreciate a heads up as to when we can expect the builders to descend on this area as you and I both know they will.The frustrating thing from my perspective is the Council Tax has just gone up and these phoney consultations are what we are paying for.Also aware you will not take up the offer but happy to discuss with the Head of MDC but again that will not happen as they know this is a sham. Not that it matters to you but options 6 or 2 appear the better options.	Comment noted. At the present time the Council cannot comment on whether individual settlements can or cannot accommodate future growth.The LDP Review process has to plan for future growth and it will have to be accommodated within the District. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and this was one of the reasons for the Issues and Options Consultation. In the coming months work will be undertaken to make the necessary decision using the evidence prepared as part of the LDP Review work.
Ann	Thomas		Option 4 would, in my opinion, be the best option. Before large developments are considered, the necessary infrastructure needs to be put in place to support them. This should be in place before rather than after any development. A railway station should not be the most important consideration when deciding whether a location is sustainable. New homes need access to alternative means of transport, to reduce dependence on cars, particularly when there are no local GP's, schools, shops and leisure facilities, not all of which can be found close to the railway network. Now that more people will in future be working from home (which will be better for the environment and lead to fewer cars on the road) the railway will become less important and no longer a priority.. Flood zones also need to be avoided, as global warming is only going to get worse.	Support noted for option 4
michael	harris			
Geoffrey	Cox			
John	McLarty		Option 2 and Option 4	Support noted for option 2 & 4
Barrington	Thomas		The option for growth should be located near the stations because of its connectivity to the wider rail network outside the District. The option for pepper-potting would be suitable because it would not have the impact that large development would have in terms of road infrastructure by not having a concentration at peak times which happens with large developments.	Support noted for option 6 & 4
Richard	Edwards		I consider that the adopted plan should concentrate on areas that have a demonstrable, existing, sustainable infrastructure with the clear ability of the area to enhance this. With this in mind Options 1 and 2 meet these critera, Option 3 less so. Option 4 does not suport these criteria. Option 5 is something of a wild card and depends very much on the location proposed, but does seem a possile option Option 6 and 7 offer a straight geographical choice, north or south on the District. I consider that the north of the district better meets the criteria I have considered, and that undue emphasis has been given to the existance of the rail link in the south of the district	Support noted for option 1 2 & 5
Robyn	Woloszczuk			

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 15. Which growth option do you consider to be the most appropriate for the District of Maldon?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Lesley	Speller		Option 6 seems to be the most suitable. Option 7 seems to be the least suitable for the following reasons: The fact that North Fambridge has a rail station seems insufficient reason to choose this option. The village has no other facilities other than a fortnightly bus to Chelmsford that is for shopping for a couple of hours. There are no other options for people to travel to Chelmsford and surrounding areas except to drive and the infrastructure for roads is insufficient for more traffic. Already the junction into the village has numerous accidents each year and the road towards South Woodham is jammed with traffic without more houses being built. Senior school children are transported to schools in Burnham, Maldon and South Woodham and it is my understanding that these schools are also oversubscribed. The nearest junior school is at Cold Norton and, again, the only way to get there is to drive. Much of North Fambridge sits on a flood plain and more building would only increase the potential for flooding. Essex Wildlife consider Fambridge an area important for wildlife and migratory birds and more building within the village envelope would certainly have an impact on this. The village itself has no shops, post office or other facilities within walking distance and the government seems keen for residents of the uk to swap cars for walking and cycling and realistically this is impossible.	Comment noted. At the present time the Council cannot comment on whether individual settlements can or cannot accommodate future growth.The LDP Review process has to plan for future growth and it will have to be accommodated within the District. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and this was one of the reasons for the Issues and Options Consultation. In the coming months work will be undertaken to make the necessary decision using the evidence prepared as part of the LDP Review work.
Nicola	O'Dean	Balgores Motors	Option 6... the infrastructure and supporting schools/doctors are already set up in these areas. The smaller villages with already limited access and roads and without amenities are not suitable for increased development, they cannot cope now with the Increase in traffic, therefore extend and build on those sites North with amenities already in place.	Support noted for option 6
Alexander	Romang			
Hayley	Holgate	ECC	Only options 1, 2, 4 and 6 are appropriate. Many of the other options do not provide the transport infrastructure needed and will lead to traffic congestion and increased pollution.	Support noted for option 1 2 4 & 6
Eirlys	Parry	N/A		
Michael	Unwin	N/A		
Tony	Barber			
Nick	Mason	ECOClassics	OPTION 1 - Retain the option in the LDP approved in 2017 - focus growth in the settlements of Maldon/Heybridge and Burnham on Crouch. This would focus the growth in a core area where adequate facilities such as schools, health services and council services could be increased to support the increased population.	Support noted for option 1
Melanie	Osborne	Motor Trade		
Stuart	Turner	Essex search and rescue	Preferred options in order of preference option 1 maintain status quo Then option 6 - growth in the north of the district Then option 2 focus on large towns Then option 4 - proportional pepperpot approach Other options are not preferred	Support noted for option 1 6 2 & 4
Mike	Carpenter	CODE Development Planners Ltd	Favour Option 2. In our view, the experience of failing to deliver sufficient homes on very large-scale strategic development sites concentrated in the main towns of Maldon/Heybridge and Burham-on-Crouch demonstrates the need to direct new development towards the Large Villages identified in the updated Settlement Pattern. The evidence also suggests the appropriateness of concentrating larger but proportionate scales and forms of development in those Large Villages with the most extensive range of existing services and facilities , such as Southminster and Mayland at minimum. Additional assessment and evidence will assist in identifying the suitability, accessibility and viability of individual sites within these settlements and the ability of sites to deliver increased benefits to the local community. To be clear, we draw a distinction here between the large-scale strategic sites featured in the the adopted 2017 local plan amounting to numbers in the region of 1,300 and 3,000 homes in individual locations, the small sites of 10-50 homes and the medium sized sites able to deliver in the region of 100 - 500 homes with additional public benefits. Option 1 is not favoured. It would simply represent the same failed strategy of the 2017 local plan with an over-concentration on large-scale strategic sites in too few settlements. The continuation of this strategy would be likely to lead to continued under-delivery off homes. Option 3 is not favoured. It would be likely to lead to a similar under-delivery of homes from large-scale strategic sites in the Main Towns with insufficient contribution from the many smaller sites distributed around the district. In addition, the distribution of small numbers of dwellings to all Large Villages in the settlement hierarchy based solely on existing population sizes would not make the most efficient and sustainable use of existing services and facilities and would be unlikely to generate sufficiently large sites to be viable to deliver additional public benefits. Option 4 is not favoured. It would fail to deliver sufficient homes and would be likely to fail to make the most efficient use of existing services and facilities and deliver additional public benefits. Its failure in this respect would be similar to that outlined in option 3 above. Option 5 is not favoured. The creation of a large satellite settlement or urban extension would be likely to lead to the same under-delivery of housing as the previous local plan strategy with long lead in times and need for substantial infrastructure improvements.	Support noted for option 2
ian	wilson	cm36pt		

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 15. Which growth option do you consider to be the most appropriate for the District of Maldon?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
c/o Agent	c/o Agent		Option 1 is the most appropriate growth strategy for the District of Maldon. 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 being the main towns of the District. The towns of Maldon and Burnham/Heybridge are the most sustainable locations to direct growth to in the Local Plan Review. Sites located on the edge of existing settlements, such as Wycke Hill North are more sustainable options for development, particularly the Wycke Hill North site which is allocated for housing development as part of the South Maldon Garden Suburb commitment.	Support noted for option 1
kelly	tilley			
Catherine	Bicknell	Mid and South Essex Health and Care Partnership	The NHS Long Term Plan (NHS LTP) published in January 2019, the interim NHS People Plan published in June 2019 and the policy paper Integration and innovation: working together to improve health and social care for all, updated February 2021, set out the policy context and guidance for the delivery of services over the next 10 Years. The NHS Long Term Plan is looking to develop a new service model for the 21st Century, increase action on prevention and health inequalities (to include smoking, obesity, alcohol etc.); progress care quality and outcomes; provide better care for major health conditions; and support NHS staff. The policy paper Integration and innovation: working together to improve health and social care for all, builds on the recommendations in the Long Term Plan. At the heart of the changes, is the goal of joined up care for everyone. The NHS and local authorities are brought together in an integrated care system (ICS) and given a duty to collaborate. Health bodies, including ICSs are required to pursue a 'triple aim' to support better health and wellbeing for everyone, better quality of health services for all, and sustainable use of NHS resources. Mid and South Essex context - The Mid and South Essex HCP supports the health and well-being of a community of 1.2 million people residing in the boroughs and districts of Basildon; Braintree; Brentwood; Castle Point; Chelmsford; Maldon; Rochford; Southend-on-Sea; and Thurrock. The HCP has developed four place-based systems, Basildon, and Brentwood; Mid Essex; South East Essex; and, Thurrock, which involve multiple partners operating around and serving populations of c. 170,000 - 400,000 residents. These place-based systems provide a meaningful footprint within which to plan, design and deliver health and care services for and with the local community. The HCP comprises of 17 partner organisations spanning a spectrum of health, local authority, community, and voluntary sector organisations. Mid and South Essex Strategy and Delivery Plan The HCP has developed a Strategy and Delivery Plan outlining the vision. There are four ambitions in place to deliver the vision: 1. Creating Opportunities: for communities to thrive, good education, opportunities for employment, decent housing and a vibrant local economy is needed. The HCP represents some of the largest employers and purchasers of goods and services locally, so has an important role to play. By working together, the HCP can use these opportunities for the benefit of residents. 2. Supporting Health and Wellbeing: by working in different ways and in closer partnership with communities, the HCP can take more preventative measures against poor health and mental illness. 3. Bringing care closer to home: joining up different health, care and voluntary sector services means the HCP can bring services closer people's homes through support on-line and health and care services into the community, such as some hospital outpatient appointments or diagnostic tests such as x?rays and blood tests. 4. Improving and Transforming Services: The HCP want to make sure residents have the highest chances of recovery	Comments noted that services need access to sites which are connected to peoples homes.
N	Baseley	IBA Planning Ltd		
Sue	White		Some growth around the existing towns. Growth around the larger villages. pepper potting in smaller villages, as this will allow local people to stay local and keep small villages viable. Regardless of sustainability in some of the rural areas, we need to be mindful to keep them alive and thriving and all villaged in the Purleigh ward are happy with pepper potting, at a proportionate percentage of the total housing required.	Support noted for option 1 2 & 4
Sarah	Yates		Option 6 - focusing growth to north of district, away from villages which have insufficient infrastructure for any developments, noting the large scale development being built in south woodland ferrets, which is already going to have a hugely detrimental impact to the nearby villages and roads so there is a distinct lack of infrastructure	Support noted for option 6
Leonard	Lewis		Option 6 would be preferable as it involves development around existing large towns that are already close to mainline train routes and major road networks. In addition already well developed infrastructure so saving time and money in having to develop all these from scratch as some of the other options would require. Commuting has to be considered with all large developments as inevitable but larger towns do offer greater possibilities of developing local employment that would reduce journey times an so benefit the environment, a stated aim of Maldon District Council in its LDP. Option 7 would be the worse solution out of all the options. It would destroy one of the Gems of the Dengie, namely The Crouch Valley. Its wide open views and scenic beauty sweeping down to the River Crouch and beyond are unparalleled and an irreplaceable asset to the district. It would be criminal to lose The Crouch Valley to housing estates that could be placed on far more suitable sites with existing infrastructure and be less destructive to the area. You can always build housing estates but you cannot build another Crouch Valley. Once its gone its gone. The destruction of The Crouch Valley would not concur to the declared aims of Maldon District Council in its LDP to safeguard the environment and to encourage more tourism. Lets save The Crouch Valley for the residents now and for future generations to enjoy and appreciate.	Support noted for option 6
R	Minney			

Question 15

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 15. Which growth option do you consider to be the most appropriate for the District of Maldon?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Tim	Grant	Evolution Town Planning	Option 1 is the best as this has been tested in a Local Plan Examination and there have been no change in circumstances to justify altering this approach.	Support noted for option 1
ANNE	OSBORN	Purleigh Community Shop		
Stephen	Hodgkinson		"OPTION 2 - A strong focus on the towns and larger sustainable villages" appears to be the most logical approach to delivering a number of new homes in the most sustainable locations of the district. Because of environmental constraints, the scope to enable medium-large scale urban extensions to be delivered at the existing larger towns of Maldon, Heybridge and Burnham-on-Crouch is limited. Therefore there should be a focus to allocate significant development at the other Large Villages such as Latchingdon which will better help to support the vitality and sustainability of these settlements and counter existing trends of rural isolation and economic decline in these places. Greater levels of growth towards the Large Villages would also have potential to deliver a wider range of services to these settlements alongside any new housing, which can create employment growth and economic investment into these areas and enable them to become more sustainable places. Within the Large Villages, sites within very close proximity to existing public transport links should be prioritised (i.e. sites within close walking distances of bus stops or railway stations). Greater housing and employment growth in these areas will support the vitality and viability of these services and ensure they are feasible to be maintained - thus supporting more sustainable settlements and meeting the draft objectives of the Plan. Applying an arbitrary policy of 10% of the District's housing allocation being directed to the other sustainable Large Villages in the settlement pattern" as set out under Option 2, is not considered appropriate. The amount of of potential growth should be dictated by environmental capacity of the various settlements and the degree of benefits that can be created through growth and improved sustainability in these villages. Subject to the outcome of the environmental capacity analysis, it might be found to be more logical for a threshold of 20-30% of the district's housing need to be delivered in the Large Villages where there are sustainable transport links. This will enable the rural parts of the district to grow more sustainably, and ease the burden on the larger settlements.	Support noted for option 2
c/o Agent	c/o Agent	Maldon Wick Limited	Option 1 is the most appropriate growth strategy for the District of Maldon. This option was thoroughly assessed by the Inspector as part of the previous Local Plan Review in 2017, who noted that 'it is clear that Maldon, Heybridge and Burnham are the most significant settlements with the largest populations and the greatest range of facilities and services. Simply put, they are the most sustainable places in the district' (Inspector's Report to the Secretary of State, June 2017, para. 78). This statement remains valid; the towns of Maldon and Burnham/Heybridge are the most sustainable locations to direct growth to in the Local Plan Review. Opportunities should be taken to develop suitable sites within these settlements. For example, MWL has an interest in Land Adjacent to Tintagel Way, Limebrook Way, Maldon (MAL/HY8). This is a sustainable, available and deliverable former railway line site within the urban area that would represent an opportunity for residential development to the north of the South Maldon Garden Suburb, making a contribution towards meeting MDC's housing targets (approx. 30 dwellings). To facilitate the consideration of its appropriate development (through the development management process), the Site should be brought within the Settlement Boundary of Maldon as it is surrounded by existing and proposed urban development and is not part of the countryside. The site is deliverable within the 0-5 year period and could make a positive contribution to ensuring Maldon has a continuous five year housing land supply. The site's location within the existing urban area and adjacent to a strategic growth area represents an accessible location benefiting from the facilities and services of Maldon town and its emerging Garden Suburb.	Support noted for option 1
ZOE	HOSTY			
S	Swain			

Question 15

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 15. Which growth option do you consider to be the most appropriate for the District of Maldon?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Kevin	Coleman	Phase 2 Planning	This response to the Issues and Options Consultation comprises firstly our review and response to the seven different strategic growth options set out in documentation, and secondly our specific comments in respect of the role of the town of Burnham-on-Crouch in meeting future housing needs. As noted in the consultation document, the adopted 2017 Local Plan was based on a strategy whereby the vast majority of new housing growth was focussed on the two Garden Suburbs at Heybridge and Maldon. Of the 3,493 new homes on sites allocated in the adopted Plan (i.e. excluding previously existing commitments, windfalls, and neighbourhood plan allocations), approximately 45% of these were at Maldon, 43% were at Heybridge, 13% were at Burnham-on-Crouch. The consultation document rightly notes that this was the correct strategy at the time, but goes on to note that there are drawbacks from this approach, including the lack of smaller and medium sized allocations for which there is now an express requirement in national planning policy. A further characteristic of the largest strategic allocations is that, although they are effective in bringing forward associated strategic infrastructure, they tend to be slower at being delivered, because of the scale and complexity of the projects. The result is that, although good progress appears to be being made on both of the Garden Suburbs, these existing consents will take time to build out, meaning that there is still a substantial stock of consented development at Maldon and Heybridge that has yet to be provided. The Council's 2021 Housing Monitoring results indicate that of the Heybridge allocations, 229 homes had been constructed by April 2021, but 1,238 units still have outstanding consents. At Maldon, 269 homes had been built, but 1,159 had outstanding consent. By contrast delivery at Burnham, which had smaller allocations, is more advanced, with 267 homes having been delivered by April 2021, but with consent for only a further 213. The 'baseline' position in advance of the new Local Plan is that there is still a substantial stock of consented new homes at Heybridge and Maldon which will continue to deliver more housing well into the new Plan period. By contrast, there is a rapidly diminishing housing supply at Burnham, and essentially no supply outside of these areas, other than by windfall or as may be allocated in Neighbourhood Plans. OPTION 1 - The existing Plan already makes substantial provision for new homes in Maldon and Heybridge, and there are existing consents which may be expected to deliver new homes at a steady pace for around the next decade. As the largest centre of population in the district, and with a wide range of employment and local facilities, some further growth at Maldon and Heybridge would we assume feature in the new Plan to an extent, but there is good reason to phase the release of any additional land towards the end of the new Plan period, as there is no short-medium term need for additional supply, and the existing strategic allocations need to be assimilated first. Burnham-on-Crouch is the other major town in the District. Burnham did accommodate a degree of new housing in the	Comment noted. At the present time the Council cannot comment on whether individual settlements can or cannot accommodate future growth.The LDP Review process has to plan for future growth and it will have to be accommodated within the District. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and this was one of the reasons for the Issues and Options Consultation. In the coming months work will be undertaken to make the necessary decision using the evidence prepared as part of the LDP Review work.
John	Lawrence		OPTION 2 (A strong focus on the towns and larger sustainable villages) and OPTION 3 (Growth generally focused on the towns Maldon/Heybridge and Burnham on Crouch and all the large villages of the Settlement Hierarchy) and OPTION 4 (Pepper pot growth throughout the Settlement Hierarchy (Spread the growth across all the sustainable settlements in the District)) are considered to be most appropriate for the District. Purleigh is a larger village that is able to take more growth whilst maintaining a good range of services, facilities, and connectivity. Larger villages that are able to accommodate more growth should do so.	Support noted for option 2 3 & 4
Diane	Wallace			
Jonathan	Aldis	Good life Countryside Services	Option 1 is my preferred choice as we would be keeping more of our green spaces. By adding more linking roads and houses you are effectively eroding away the habitats for our local wildlife. The increase in traffic from new developments is causing damage to small rural roads being used as cut throughs. Pot holes are not being fixed and children and cyclists are being put more and more at risk. Clamping down on people buying up affordable homes and then renting them out or leaving them empty for months on end would also ease the need for many unnecessary new homes.	Support noted for option 1
Grace	Godwin			
Sue	Hillman		options 2, 6 or 7	Support noted for option 2 6 & 7
michael	carr	NHS		
Simon	Plater	Plater+Claiborne	Option 3 - This is my preferred option, as it includes more potential for affordable housing and employment in Tollesbury, with some housing and business development, and maintains restricted development in the countryside.	Support noted for option 3

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 15. Which growth option do you consider to be the most appropriate for the District of Maldon?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Mark	Anderson		OPTION 7 my thoughts are that this option is not viable and there are better alternatives that should be considered instead with established infrastructure. My rationale behind this is based on the following: Infrastructure and facilities in these locations are inadequate and could not be easily adjusted and contradicts precedents set out in the current LDP. The NPPF consider the importance of the design principles to ensure that new developments respond to local character. Any large scale development around what we consider to be small settlements would be completely incompatible with this principle due to the predictable impacts on local character and identity. Rail connectivity to London via Wickford is limited and trains already running close to capacity. There is no capacity for extending the platform the line or adding additional services. The rail transportation alone cannot be considered justification to choose as a preferred option. Being a commuter myself I see that the current service is already deteriorated due to recent housing projects in the surrounding area, and could not cope with additional burden as depicted on the Network Rail, Great Eastern Main line Study. Overcapacity would give commuters currently using the branch line services no option than to drive to Wickford to catch the London train, thereby adding additional burden on the road and additional cost to the commuter. The settlements and adjacent communities identified are already effected by a restricted capacity road transport service which I understand is already facing threat of being downgraded. How can we expect to add additional usage to these roads and the infrastructural without major investment. In a time when we are all being encouraged by government and sustainability action groups to shift away from using private transport. Isolated villages such as Althorne and North Fambridge provide scant opportunity for walking and cycling as primary travel modes, this option would only reduce those opportunities. This option would be a huge disproportionate shift in planning policy to the sustainable development precedents identified in the existing approved LDP. Development sites around Althorne and North Fambridge are problematic due to the huge impact that significant development would have on the open landscape views of the River Crouch / Althorne Creek. These rural vistas have previously been recognized within the existing LDP as a key regional asset in terms of landscape character. These cannot be dismissed now! Both Althorne and North Fambridge are surrounded by environmentally	Comment noted. At the present time the Council cannot comment on whether individual settlements can or cannot accommodate future growth.The LDP Review process has to plan for future growth and it will have to be accommodated within the District. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and this was one of the reasons for the Issues and Options Consultation. In the coming months work will be undertaken to make the necessary decision using the evidence prepared as part of the LDP Review work.
Karen	Wellum		Option 6 would be my preferred option as there is the infrastructure there to support more housing.	Support noted for option 6
Emma	Wright		Option 6, as better transport links for London and A12	Support noted for option 6
Linda	Coom		Option 4. The amount of growth the main towns have already accommodated is huge and has had a major impact on the character of the town. It has, I believe, lead to our High Street being much better supported and it's nice to see, but there are limits to benefits. The large sprawl of building around Maldon/Heybridge is ugly and I fear the towns will ultimately be lost in the middle of it all. Despite talk of doctors/dentists/schools, a new hospital and protection of wildlife and wild places, I've seen no evidence of any of this - all I've seen is lots of houses and lack of wild places and green spaces. Villages of all sizes, whilst I feel sure many will want them protected from growth, should have to play their part in the housing supply, This could lead to more business opportunities in those villages and would be beneficial for our existing local builders. Surely, it's natural for all existing settlements to increase in size, rather than towns being overdeveloped? Talking of large developments making the development of local infrastructure more economical is probably true, but there doesn't appear to have been any real improvements. Also, the large builders appear to not be required to contribute to the local areas they're building in. Therefore, it doesn't seem to be relevant to consider this. Local infrastructure shouldn't be only considered on a financial basis, it could develop slowly and more organically if building is spread across the entire area including all developements. Also, if people want to live near their ancestral roots, pepper pot development would be best for them.	Support noted for option 4
Caitlin	Soul			
Michelle	Curtis	Tollesbury Parish Council	The Parish believes that new development is better as a satellite/add-on with new infrastructure, rather than a large development in the remaining green spaces in the centre and east of our village. Ideally the best situation is development bolted on to larger urban settlements, where new infrastructure facilities are more achievable e.g providing a new school in the District.	Support noted for option 5
Mary	Hammond			
Ian	Drinkwater		Option 1 Larger towns could incorporate additional new growth into existing developments where there is the infrastructure in place to support these growing populations as there are better employment opportunities and public services and facilities. It also affords better protection of the rural countryside and open spaces by limiting the size of development in those areas.	Support noted for option 1
john	hand	N/A	Options 1 2 4 and 6.	Support noted for option 1 2 4 & 6

Question 15

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 15. Which growth option do you consider to be the most appropriate for the District of Maldon?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Emma	Smith	Bradwell on Sea Parish Council		
Tim	Dixon		Option 4 would appear to be the most reasonable option to adopt so that no particular area is changed beyond recognition. In Cold Norton where I live there is not the infrastructure to support large developments i.e. the school is already oversubscribed. I read on one of the MDC documents that the design and setting of growth should enhance the rural and urban environment otherwise the District is at risk of looking & feeling the same as everywhere else. This should not be allowed to happen otherwise the individuality of many of the villages within the MDC area will be lost forever. Option 5 should be avoided at all costs. I have read (on the MDC website) that the District was considered particularly vulnerable to the effects of climate change & flooding. The report added that the vulnerability of new development needed to be minimised to ensure that the risk was not worsened for future generations. The report continued: 'New development is not doing enough to reduce emissions and adapt to climate change'. So before large new developments are considered, I submit that the focus should be more on addressing the environmental failings that have been identified with recent developments.	Support noted for option 4
Nicola	Taylor	Elixirr	The only options MDC should be considering are 1,2 and 3. These options ensure growth is achieved within the district in areas of existing provisions (highways infrastructure, employment opportunities) therefore limiting additional travel needs on the more local/rural infrastructure. This also helps to ensure Maldon continues to be recognised for its great things (heritage, maritime, natural landscapes) and doesn't become a lifeless concrete city overspill.	Support noted for option 1 2 & 3
Graham	Johnson	graham v johnson		
Chris	Yates		Option 6 - focusing growth to north of district, away from villages which have insufficient infrastructure for any developments, noting the large scale development being built in south woodland ferrets, which is already going to have a hugely detrimental impact to the nearby villages and roads so there is a distinct lack of infrastructure.	Support noted for option 6
Sally	Everritt	Community360		
Mark	Garrett		Option 7 would be the better (greener) solution at there are already established train/bus links to employment centres outside of the District, whereas in options 5 and 6 links to the A12/Witham Station or Colchester would require the use of private vehicles. Perhaps a mixed approach (70% option 7, 30% options 5/6) given the limited opportunity for extensive Greenfield development on the Braintree/Colchester borders	Support noted for option 7
Paul	Vidler		Focused growth in these locations will use existing infrastructure and will support infrastructure delivery. Option 4 – will inhibit the ability to deliver infrastructure, and indeed place increased pressure on existing infrastructure through growth in travel. and impacts on existing infrastructure including congestion, road safety and sustainability	Comment noted. The LDP has an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which was approved through its examination, infrastructure is agreed with statutory providers such as the NHS and ECC and should be to mitigate the impact of development. Infrastructure is being provided under the terms of S106 legal agreements and will be assessed further as part of the LDP Review work.
Victoria	Long		Minimising the need for travel is paramount and therefore strategies should be focused on development in locations where there is a range of employment and existing service provision. Existing infrastructure can then be utilised. I believe option 1, 2 and 3 are the best options. I strongly object to option 6. The North of the District has issues with road safety and congestion, overuse and therefore damage of the current infrastructure. There is a restricted public transport infrastructure in the North of the District with no safe pedestrian access along many of the roads, surrounding roads are not adequate for increased traffic flow for suggested growth.	Support noted for option 1 2 & 3
Victor	Staines			
Jayne	Moore	Essex County Fire and Rescue Service		

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 15. Which growth option do you consider to be the most appropriate for the District of Maldon?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Kevin	Bennett		The Neighbourhood Plan group in Great Totham spent the best part of a day assessing and discussing the different options for growth. This review of Maldon District Council's Local Development Plan is hugely significant and has major implications for Great Totham Parish and the district as a whole so the work is very important. This group has undertaken analysis of the evidence and options as set out below. One thing which is very clear to us is that this activity in no way invalidates the emerging Great Totham Neighbourhood Plan; indeed if anything, it increases its relevance. The Neighbourhood Plan should therefore continue its journey to full designation, on the timescales agreed with Maldon District Council. It has the full support of village, Parish Council and District Council. The group analysed the 7 options for expansion and development of existing settlements in the Maldon District and the ramifications and benefits of new development. The 7 scenarios for development outlined by Maldon District Council (MDC) are as follows: 1) Carry on the existing Local Development Plan's approach, by putting all new growth in Maldon/Heybridge and Burnham on -Crouch. 2) Have a strong focus on the towns (Maldon/Heybridge and Burnham on Crouch) and larger more sustainable villages that have more facilities. 3) Focus growth on all the large villages. 4) Scatter growth across the towns, large, medium, and small villages. 5) Create a new satellite settlement either on the edge of an existing settlement, or town within the District or adjacent to its boundary. 6) Focus growth in the north of the District to link up with the services and facilities available in Tiptree, Witham, and Maldon/Heybridge. 7) Focus growth along the railway line in the south of the District, around Althorne, North Fambridge and Southminster. After considering the full detailed explanations of the 7 scenarios in the MDC papers also taking into account their explantion of the challenges the district planners face, each option for development/expansion was discussed along with the likely drawbacks and benefits of each scheme. The group then attached a score to each consideration for each option with 1 being the lowest with minimal benefits and 5 being the most positive outcome for the District and the community. Considerations MDC: Options for development/expansion 1 2 3 4 5 6 7. Environment/Climate 3 2 1 1 3 1 5. Affordable homes 5 3 2 1 5 1 5. Transport 4 2 1 1 3 1 4. Employment 3 3 3 3 3 3 3. Protecting Maldon and Burnham 1 2 2 3 3 5 5. Villages - logical development 3 2 1 1 3 1 3. Protecting: Ancient woodland, Landscape, Views, River scene 5 2 1 1 4 1 3. Promote: Tourism, Small local businesses, Local builders 4 3 3 2 3 2 3. Services: Schools, NHS 5 3 2 1 5 1 3. Totals. Scenario 1/ Total 33. Scenario 2/ Total 22. Scenario 3/ Total 16. Scenario 4/ Total 14. Scenario 5/ Total 32. Scenario 6/ Total 16. Scenario 7/ Total 34. Observations: Employment is not currently supported local to major developments. It was also difficult	Comment and work done on this noted.
Nicholas	Matthams		Option 1 would be the most appropriate as this has the best option to keep urbanisation confined to specific areas thus retaining the natural character of the area as far as possible given the constraints. This would also enable the co location of facilities and therefore reduce the reliance on commuting.	Support noted for option 1
Christian	van Stolk	RAND Europe	It is clear that options Options 1, 2 and 3 are the most appropriate for the District. These options encourage economic development in areas where there is existing service provision and infrastructure. It would integrate economic development in areas of existing economic activity in the District. The focus on development in the northern part of the District under Option 6 seems odd. This part of the District s peripheral to wider economic activity in the District. It would have limited economic benefit to the District (rather the benefit would accrue to other local authorities) and would be disproportionate in terms of the impact on the local service provision and infrastructure. Similarly Option 5 places growth close to Tiptree and Witham in areas where there is significant economic opportunity and no evidence that there is an unmet demand. Again, the benefits would accrue to other local authorities and are unlikely to do much for employment in the District. It seems obvious that the focus on strategic developments in the District has had a mixed history. It has done little to increase the number of houses and indeed employment. Rather a focus on economic development around existing services and infrastructure seems a much better approach. As such, we do not think this strategic development approach is sensible. The focus on GB1 as an area for economic development seems odd. It sits in a flood plain, is adjacent to the only Grade II* listed property in the District, would detract massively from the small villages surrounding it, is not supported by the local services and infrastructure, and would have a negative impact on a unique ecological setting around the Blackwater. Again, the development would be peripheral to the District and unlikely to do much for employment in the District.	Comment noted. At the present time the Council cannot comment on whether individual settlements or sites can or cannot accommodate future growth.The LDP Review process has to plan for future growth and it will have to be accommodated within the District. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and this was one of the reasons for the Issues and Options Consultation. In the coming months work will be undertaken to make the necessary decision using the evidence prepared as part of the LDP Review work.

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 15. Which growth option do you consider to be the most appropriate for the District of Maldon?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Nicholas	Jepson		Option 1 with options 2 and 3 as next best. Focusing on the existing towns and large villages that already have good facilities is preferred and these already have good employment provisions. Options 4-7 that mutate smaller villages and hamlets albeit that they are close to the A12/rail fail to recognise the unique blend across the district of rural and town. These options would create an almost endless urban landscape and the character of the villages would be lost. Option 4 – a tail on the donkey strategy – will reduce the ability to deliver needed infrastructure, and increase pressure on existing infrastructure through growth in motor transport. We object to Option 6, focusing development in the North of the District with implications for the deliverability of the strategy, and impacts on existing infrastructure including on congestion, road safety and sustainability given the limited public transport infrastructure serving settlements in this area. In respect of Options 5 and 6, such growth close to Witham and Tiptree is not supported by the evidence and there is a woeful lack of existing services and facilities in these areas. The assessment of Site GB1 – Great Braxted is flawed and this cannot be regarded as a suitable location for growth. It is located close to, and within the setting of, Braxted Park which is the only Grade II* listed park and garden in the District and is of exceptional historical significance. Development would harm the setting of this. The Council's own evidence shows that the surrounding landscape has a high sensitivity to change. Part of site GB1 is susceptible to flooding, and indeed the River Blackwater regularly floods in this area and is an important natural habitat. Development and associated hardstanding could increase the risk and prevalence of flooding. No regard has been had of the potential impact of development at GB1 on the buried remains of a Neolithic long mortuary enclosure at Appleford Farm which is a Scheduled Ancient Monument.	Comment noted. At the present time the Council cannot comment on whether individual settlements or sites can or cannot accommodate future growth.The LDP Review process has to plan for future growth and it will have to be accommodated within the District. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and this was one of the reasons for the Issues and Options Consultation. In the coming months work will be undertaken to make the necessary decision using the evidence prepared as part of the LDP Review work.
Pamela	Lacey			
Chloe	Soul			
carole	kirk		1/ maintains the status quo. 2/limited implication for Cold Norton but dispute it is in the larger village caregory. 4/distributes growth proportionately. 6/ focuses growth in the north of the district which to some extent would direct increased traffic flow commuting out of the dengie through Hatfield Peverel and Witham relieving B1012 traffic congestion	The respondant has just made comments about the options and has not really stated which ones they support or object to.
Sharon	Jackson		We consider that Option One would be the best choice for the district. It would preserve the integrity and character of the small villages and minimise the impact on the countryside. Windfall Sites are a feature of all the other options with no definition of how they are to be implemented. The information published so far on the HELAA does not include small sites and it is suggested that they would be brought forward as 'windfall'. Further information on these small sites has been sought, but is not available to the public or councillors. The implementation of several windfall sites with up to 5 houses or more would be a significant addition to a small village. Adding to the existing new growth in the large settlements would cause the minimum disruption, and new infrastructure and services should already be underway. New building plots should be limited in size so the small builders can become involved and speed up delivery. This must be linked to regaining control of sites with planning approval that are not being progressed and reallocating them to smaller builders with 'time is of the essence' contracts thus reducing the number of extra plots required to achieve the delivery rate. With the adoption of smaller plots new arrangements will need to be made to provide the proportion of affordable housing. Distribution of new sites should be based on the size of the settlements prior to the 2015 start of the current LDP so that Burnham, which has already been the focus of more building than was allocated on the LDP does not receive a disproportionate share of the added requirements.	Support noted for option 1
RICHARD	GROUT		Option 6 might be the lesser of the evils as it has reasonable access to main travel links out of Maldon. Option 7 is the worst because there is only one overcrowded exit routeout of the Dengie peninsular by road and a non expandable rail line already at capacity during work travel times. I strongly believe that the small coastal and tidal river villages are a very important and unique part of essex life and history and need preserving so that people in the ever increasing towns have havens to go to. the development plans for South Woodham Ferrers is also going to create a serious problem for people driving out of the Dengie Peninsular and does not need to be made worse by housing developments in the Dengie. The preservation of our important wildfowl/wildlife is also vital.	Support noted for option 6

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 15. Which growth option do you consider to be the most appropriate for the District of Maldon?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Charles	Bishop		I support options 1, 2, 3. I object to option 4, 5, 6. The assessment of Site GB1 – Great Braxted is flawed and this cannot be regarded as a suitable location for growth. It is located close to, and within the setting of, Braxted Park which is the only Grade II* listed park and garden in the District and is of exceptional historical significance. Development would harm the setting of this. The Council's evidence shows that the surrounding landscape has a high sensitivity to change. Part of site GB1 is susceptible to flooding, and indeed the River Blackwater regularly floods in this area and is an important natural habitat. Development and associated hardstanding could increase the risk and prevalence of flooding. No regard has been had of the potential impact of development at GB1 on the buried remains of a Neolithic long mortuary enclosure at Appleford Farm which is a Scheduled Ancient Monument. This is not a location which is well served by public transport; and development would have a serious impact on congestion and road safety. There is no certainty that infrastructure improvements could be delivered, and when these might come forwards.	Comment noted. At the present time the Council cannot comment on whether individual settlements or sites can or cannot accommodate future growth.The LDP Review process has to plan for future growth and it will have to be accommodated within the District. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and this was one of the reasons for the Issues and Options Consultation. In the coming months work will be undertaken to make the necessary decision using the evidence prepared as part of the LDP Review work.
Paul	Jewiss	Self Employed		
Deborah	Anderson	NHS	OPTION 7 - I live in North Fambridge a small village. We do have a train Station but not the capacity on the line for more commuters and or extra trains if there is more building. We have had over 100 extra houses built already. We have no infrastructure in Road capapcity, buses, schools or Doctors or Shops this would b e clearly incompatible with established precedents in current LDP. Restricted Roads and one entrance. Its an enviromental disaster to pave over more land and has adversive effect on wildlife already severely lost homes through these Building Sites and loss of rural vistas recognised as key assets in LDP. Views of the River are already being lost. Eroding walks and and cycling for well being of residents Flood and surface Water Risks with changing climate . Thiese plans would be a total shift in in planning policy. Unacceptable to turn Farm Tracks into Roads destroying habitat and privacy to exisiting Houses.	Comment noted. At the present time the Council cannot comment on whether individual settlements or sites can or cannot accommodate future growth.The LDP Review process has to plan for future growth and it will have to be accommodated within the District. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and this was one of the reasons for the Issues and Options Consultation. In the coming months work will be undertaken to make the necessary decision using the evidence prepared as part of the LDP Review work.
John	Pilgrim	Self employed	Option 4 the Pepper Pot growth. With ribbon development, residents would have more access to the countryside.	Support noted for option 4
Gloria	Gold	London Design and Engineering UTC	4 - would have less of an impact on our village but all options have implications on infrastructure- I'm a commuter and already suffer from lack of trains etc	Support noted for option 4
Linda	Curry		Option 6 This focuses growth where there appears to be easier access to more developed infrastructure.	Support noted for option 6
Lucy	Waterhouse		Option 5	Support noted for option 5
Jon	Mayhew		The development should be focused on towns with facilities already in place ie althorne,north Cambridge and southminster. Small villages such as Purleigh for example do not support facilities or infrastructure unless building works are to overhaul major parts and thus making said village's over populated and counter productive to the areas green belt and wildlife, also current roads also are not suitable for village expansion.	Comment noted. At the present time the Council cannot comment on whether individual settlements or sites can or cannot accommodate future growth.The LDP Review process has to plan for future growth and it will have to be accommodated within the District. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and this was one of the reasons for the Issues and Options Consultation. In the coming months work will be undertaken to make the necessary decision using the evidence prepared as part of the LDP Review work.
James	Goody	James Goody refurbishments	I support options 1,2 and 3 which will focus growth in locations with existing infrastructure and employment possibilities. Option 4 inhibits the ability to deliver infrastructure and could even place pressure on these areas with increased vehicle traffic. I cannot see a need for employment zones in the North of the district as it borders Witham which has large areas of industrial units with miriad companies. Particularly the area identified as GB1 is beautiful fields which border Braxted Park and other listed properties. The plan talks about protecting the local environment yet allowing the expansion of one warehousing business across 50+ hectares of green fields is massively at odds with your objectives. This particular area has a breeding pair of Red Kites and hares and muntjac deer. The roads local to GB1 already struggle massively with the amount of large lorries that have to pass each other on narrow stretches and a one-way bridge.	Comment noted. At the present time the Council cannot comment on whether individual settlements or sites can or cannot accommodate future growth.The LDP Review process has to plan for future growth and it will have to be accommodated within the District. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and this was one of the reasons for the Issues and Options Consultation. In the coming months work will be undertaken to make the necessary decision using the evidence prepared as part of the LDP Review work.
Johanna	Dale		I think on balance option 1 is still the most appropriate, although it puts a lot of pressure on the two towns, it minimises the very real danger of the suburbanisation of our rural district. Significant development in the villages has already eroded the rural character of the district.	Support noted for option 1
Tracy	Kinnane			

Question 15

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 15. Which growth option do you consider to be the most appropriate for the District of Maldon?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Carlos	Rodriguez		The best options are Options 1, 2 and 3. These strategies focus growth in locations where there are existing service provision and a range of employment opportunities and therefore minimise the need to travel. Option 4 – a pepper potting strategy – will inhibit the ability to deliver infrastructure, and indeed place increased pressure on existing infrastructure through growth in travel. We object to Option 6, which would overly focus development in the North of the District with implications for the deliverability of the strategy, and impacts on existing infrastructure including on congestion, road safety and sustainability given the limited public transport infrastructure serving settlements in this area. In respect of Options 5 and 6, strategic growth close to Tiptree and Witham is not justified by the evidence with no evidence that there is an unmet need arising from adjoining areas; cross-boundary issues around the impact that this would place on infrastructure, and a lack of existing services and facilities in these areas which can support growth. Such a strategy would continue to focus development in large strategic development locations. The Issues and Options document highlights the issues with such an approach in strategic terms – such sites have a long lead in-time and require significant investment in infrastructure. The last Plan has demonstrated that this approach is ineffective and will not help to maintain a five year housing land supply. The assessment of Site GB1 – Great Braxted is flawed and this cannot be regarded as a suitable location for growth. It is located close to, and within the setting of, Braxted Park which is the only Grade II* listed park and garden in the District and is of exceptional historical significance. Development would harm the setting of this. The Council's evidence shows that the surrounding landscape has a high sensitivity to change.Part of site GB1 is susceptible to flooding, and indeed the River Blackwater regularly floods in this area and is an important natural habitat. Development and associated hardstanding could increase the risk and prevalence of flooding. This is not a location which is well served by public transport; and development would have a serious impact on congestion and road safety. There is no certainty that infrastructure improvements could be delivered, and when these might come forwards	Comment noted. At the present time the Council cannot comment on whether individual settlements or sites can or cannot accommodate future growth.The LDP Review process has to plan for future growth and it will have to be accommodated within the District. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and this was one of the reasons for the Issues and Options Consultation. In the coming months work will be undertaken to make the necessary decision using the evidence prepared as part of the LDP Review work.
Rebecca	Tucker			
Mark	Faraway		Option 5 make sense to create village developments near significant roads such as A12 as these will be able to cope with the increase levels of vehicle traffic. And can also be developed with new amenities which will support community and social interaction	Support noted for option 5
T	Ketteley		Option 6 and 7 both recognise the need for Maldon and Burnham to have time to absorb the significant development which has taken place in recent years and which has not been fully integrated. As such, either of these options is preferable to further development in these areas. Option 4 also is attractive in terms of sharing out the new development and ensuring that all areas are able to secure benefits from development and not just Maldon/Burnham.	Support noted for option 6 7 & 4
Elizabeth	Weston			

Question 15

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 15. Which growth option do you consider to be the most appropriate for the District of Maldon?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Jacky	Barber		We consider that the best options are Options 1, 2 and 3. These strategies focus growth in locations where there are existing service provision and a range of employment opportunities and therefore minimise the need to travel. Focused growth in these locations will use existing infrastructure and will support infrastructure delivery. Option 4 – a pepper potting strategy – will inhibit the ability to deliver infrastructure, and indeed place increased pressure on existing infrastructure through growth in travel. We object to Option 6, which would overly focus development in the North of the District with implications for the deliverability of the strategy, and impacts on existing infrastructure including on congestion, road safety and sustainability given the limited public transport infrastructure serving settlements in this area. In respect of Options 5 and 6, strategic growth close to Tiptree and Witham is not justified by the evidence with no evidence that there is an unmet need arising from adjoining areas; cross-boundary issues around the impact that this would place on infrastructure, and a lack of existing services and facilities in these areas which can support growth. Such a strategy would continue to focus development in large strategic development locations. The Issues and Options document highlights the issues with such an approach in strategic terms – such sites have a long lead in-time and require significant investment in infrastructure. The last Plan has demonstrated that this approach is ineffective and will not help to maintain a five year housing land supply. It has not been shown that the infrastructure investment required to support delivery of standalone satellite growth locations can be viably delivered; and we consider that there is a high risk that such a strategy would inhibit the delivery of affordable housing. The uncertainties associated with delivery of strategic infrastructure, such as A12 junction improvements, and risks to local plans are clearly shown through the recent Examination of plans in other areas including North Essex, Uttlesford and Tandridge. The assessment of Site GB1 – Great Braxted is flawed and this cannot be regarded as a suitable location for growth. It is located close to, and within the setting of, Braxted Park which is the only Grade II* listed park and garden in the District and is of exceptional historical significance. Development would harm the setting of this. The Council's evidence shows that the surrounding landscape has a high	Comment noted. At the present time the Council cannot comment on whether individual settlements or sites can or cannot accommodate future growth.The LDP Review process has to plan for future growth and it will have to be accommodated within the District. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and this was one of the reasons for the Issues and Options Consultation. In the coming months work will be undertaken to make the necessary decision using the evidence prepared as part of the LDP Review work.
Ursula	Benjafield		0nly possible option is Option 6 with access to mainline rail line and A12 Option 7 including Dengie peninsula totally unsafe - highly sensitive landscape, poor road infrastructure, poor bus services, second rate branch line rail service.	Support noted for option 6
Paul	Mitchell			
Kristian	Tokeley	CTC Construction Ltd	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 offers the best transport links and so will have less impact to towns and villages further from A12 and London-Norwich Train line corridor from added traffic. This area is less congested today than the Maldon district.	Support noted for option 6
Ziyad	Thomas	Churchill Retirement Living / McCarthy Stone		
James	Campbell	HMPPS	I do not now	
William	Moss		The most best options appear to be options 1,2, 3 and 7. I strongly object to option 6 focusing development in the North of the District with unacceptable impacts on traffic movements, safety and sustainability. An Example of totally unsuitable development is GB1. The proposals ignore the impact of the surrounding landscape as well as the lack of any sustainable transport to the site.	At the present time the Council cannot comment on whether individual settlements or sites can or cannot accommodate future growth.The LDP Review process has to plan for future growth and it will have to be accommodated within the District. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and this was one of the reasons for the Issues and Options Consultation. In the coming months work will be undertaken to make the necessary decision using the evidence prepared as part of the LDP Review work.

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 15. Which growth option do you consider to be the most appropriate for the District of Maldon?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Simon	Mackenzie Smith		The best options are Options 1, 2 and 3. These strategies focus growth in locations where there are existing service provision and a range of employment opportunities and therefore minimise the need to travel. Focused growth in these locations will use existing infrastructure and will support infrastructure delivery. Option 4 – a pepper potting strategy – will inhibit the ability to deliver infrastructure, and indeed place increased pressure on existing infrastructure through growth in travel. We object to Option 6, which would overly focus development in the North of the District with implications for the deliverability of the strategy, and impacts on existing infrastructure including on congestion, road safety and sustainability given the limited public transport infrastructure serving settlements in this area. In respect of Options 5 and 6, strategic growth close to Tiptree and Witham is not justified by the evidence with no evidence that there is an unmet need arising from adjoining areas; cross-boundary issues around the impact that this would place on infrastructure, and a lack of existing services and facilities in these areas which can support growth. Such a strategy would continue to focus development in large strategic development locations. The Issues and Options document highlights the issues with such an approach in strategic terms – such sites have a long lead in-time and require significant investment in infrastructure. The last Plan has demonstrated that this approach is ineffective and will not help to maintain a five year housing land supply. It has not been shown that the infrastructure investment required to support delivery of standalone satellite growth locations can be viably delivered; and we consider that there is a high risk that such a strategy would inhibit the delivery of affordable housing. The uncertainties associated with delivery of strategic infrastructure, such as A12 junction improvements, and risks to local plans are clearly shown through the recent Examination of plans in other areas including North Essex, Uttlesford and Tandridge. The assessment of Site GB1 – Great Braxted is flawed and this cannot be regarded as a suitable location for growth. It is located close to, and within the setting of, Braxted Park which is the only Grade II* listed park and garden in the District and is of exceptional historical significance. Development would harm the setting of this. The Council's evidence shows that the surrounding landscape has a high	Comment noted. At the present time the Council cannot comment on whether individual settlements or sites can or cannot accommodate future growth.The LDP Review process has to plan for future growth and it will have to be accommodated within the District. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and this was one of the reasons for the Issues and Options Consultation. In the coming months work will be undertaken to make the necessary decision using the evidence prepared as part of the LDP Review work.
Richard	Udall		Option 1. All other options are not sustainable due to reliance on cars for transport. Rural train stations are not an options as prohibitively expensive and not usable for day to day needs such as shopping etc.	Support noted for option 1
Rosalind	Bishop		I support options 1, 2, 3. I object to option 4, 5, 6. The assessment of Site GB1 – Great Braxted is flawed and this cannot be regarded as a suitable location for growth. It is located close to, and within the setting of, Braxted Park which is the only Grade II* listed park and garden in the District and is of exceptional historical significance. Development would harm the setting of this. The Council's evidence shows that the surrounding landscape has a high sensitivity to change. Part of site GB1 is susceptible to flooding, and indeed the River Blackwater regularly floods in this area and is an important natural habitat. Development and associated hardstanding could increase the risk and prevalence of flooding. No regard has been had of the potential impact of development at GB1 on the buried remains of a Neolithic long mortuary enclosure at Appleford Farm which is a Scheduled Ancient Monument. This is not a location which is well served by public transport; and development would have a serious impact on congestion and road safety. There is no certainty that infrastructure improvements could be delivered, and when these might come forwards.	Comment noted. At the present time the Council cannot comment on whether individual settlements or sites can or cannot accommodate future growth.The LDP Review process has to plan for future growth and it will have to be accommodated within the District. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and this was one of the reasons for the Issues and Options Consultation. In the coming months work will be undertaken to make the necessary decision using the evidence prepared as part of the LDP Review work.
John	Symington		Please see Section 4 of our submitted representations for details.	There is no response to question 4 and no other response that appears connected to this question
Michael	Manning			

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 15. Which growth option do you consider to be the most appropriate for the District of Maldon?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Jack	Inglis	Kelvedon Hall	The most appropriate options are Options 1, 2 and 3 because of the existing service provision and a range of employment opportunities .a Option 6 is the worst. because it focuses on the North of the District and will lead to congestion, road safety and sustainability issues. For Options 5 and 6, strategic growth close to Tiptree and Witham there is no evidence of an unmet need arising from adjoining areas; cross-boundary issues around the impact that this would place on infrastructure, and a lack of existing services and facilities in these areas which can support growth. The assessment of Site GB1 – Great Braxted is flawed and this cannot be regarded as a suitable location for growth. It is located close to, and within the setting of, Braxted Park which is the only Grade II* listed park and garden in the District and is of exceptional historical significance. Development would harm the setting of this. The Council's evidence shows that the surrounding landscape has a high sensitivity to change. Part of site GB1 is susceptible to flooding, and indeed the River Blackwater regularly floods in this area and is an important natural habitat. Development and associated hardstanding could increase the risk and prevalence of flooding. No regard has been had of the potential impact of development at GB1 on the buried remains of a Neolithic long mortuary enclosure at Appleford Farm which is a Scheduled Ancient Monument.This is not a location which is well served by public transport; and development would have a serious impact on congestion and road safety. There is no certainty that infrastructure improvements could be delivered, and when these might come forwards.	Comment noted. At the present time the Council cannot comment on whether individual settlements can or cannot accommodate future growth.The LDP Review process has to plan for future growth and it will have to be accommodated within the District. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and this was one of the reasons for the Issues and Options Consultation. In the coming months work will be undertaken to make the necessary decision using the evidence prepared as part of the LDP Review work.
Peggy	Shields		Growth in the Northern parts of the district as there is more space for growth as it is less populated and there are better services, road links and access to railway stations. The area around South Woodham Ferrers is very populated and the roads are always very busy, especially since the building of Sainsbury's. Also not enough doctors etc. Also the traffic from Mayland is also very high	Support noted for option 6
Dawn	Adams	Catesby Estates	We welcome the recognition by the Council of the failure of the current growth strategy to deliver sufficient housing in the current plan period. In this respect, we agree that the focus on large extension to the towns has resulted in a shortfall in housing land supply and it is critical that the same mistakes are not made again. As such, we welcome the Council's recognition that there needs to be a wider range of sites to ensure a more balanced and deliverable supply of housing across the plan period. The delivery of housing on large strategic sites is an important part of any areas housing supply, but it is clear that the Council already has this base covered with the allocations in the adopted Local Development Plan that are still to be delivered. What is missing in the current growth strategy are medium sized sites in other sustainable settlements that will deliver early in the plan period and ensure the delivery of new homes is more consistent and less prone to shortages in supply should there be delays in homes coming forward on the larger sites. We therefore favour the growth options that would see more growth allocated to the most sustainable settlement below the Towns (i.e. the Large Villages) as set out below: • Options 1: Given the issues with delivery caused by the adopted growth strategy that focusses on the Towns, we do not consider retaining the growth strategy from the adopted Local Development Plan (LDP) to be appropriate. Policy S2 Strategic Growth of the adopted LDP allocates the majority of growth in large-scale extensions to Maldon, Heybridge and Burnham-on-Crouch. It also states that: "Significant infrastructure constraints exist which will strictly limit the capacity for growth in Maldon, Heybridge and Burnham-on-Crouch in excess of that set out in Policy S2. Any proposal for development in excess of the allocations set out in Policy S2 will need to demonstrate to the Council's satisfaction that: • It will not prejudice or delay the delivery of the Garden Suburbs, Strategic Allocations, or planned infrastructure improvements; and • There will be sufficient infrastructure capacity to support the development." In this context, it is clear that any growth allocated to the Towns in excess of existing commitments must be carefully considered and is probably best focused on the latter part of the plan period. There is a need for sites to come forward now that can deliver a large number of homes in the short to medium term and as such we consider that any option to focus growth on the Towns should be supported by significant growth in other sustainable settlements. • Option 2: We consider this Option 2 to be the most appropriate of the listed options. A focus on the Towns and the Large Villages combined will ensure that growth is both deliverable and located in the most sustainable locations in the District. Our only concerns with this option are regarding the level of growth proposed in the Large Villages and	Support noted for option 2
Wayne	Tilley	RTG Group Limited		

Question 15

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 15. Which growth option do you consider to be the most appropriate for the District of Maldon?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
David	Dronfield	Braxted park	locations where there are existing service provision and a range of employment opportunities and therefore minimise the need to travel. Focused growth in these locations will use existing infrastructure and will support infrastructure delivery. Option 4 – a pepper potting strategy – will inhibit the ability to deliver infrastructure, and indeed place increased pressure on existing infrastructure through growth in travel. We object to Option 6, which would overly focus development in the North of the District with implications for the deliverability of the strategy, and impacts on existing infrastructure including on congestion, road safety and sustainability given the limited public transport infrastructure serving settlements in this area. In respect of Options 5 and 6, strategic growth close to Tiptree and Witham is not justified by the evidence with no evidence that there is an unmet need arising from adjoining areas; cross-boundary issues around the impact that this would place on infrastructure, and a lack of existing services and facilities in these areas which can support growth. Such a strategy would continue to focus development in large strategic development locations. The Issues and Options document highlights the issues with such an approach in strategic terms – such sites have a long lead in-time and require significant investment in infrastructure. The last Plan has demonstrated that this approach is ineffective and will not help to maintain a five year housing land supply. It has not been shown that the infrastructure investment required to support delivery of standalone satellite growth locations can be viably delivered; and we consider that there is a high risk that such a strategy would inhibit the delivery of affordable housing. The uncertainties associated with delivery of strategic infrastructure, such as A12 junction	Support noted for option 1 2 & 3
John	Peirson			
Ron	Brown	Corporate		
Roger	HAWES		Options 1 and 2. I believe that these options are the only ones that will enable sufficient focus to be given to the infrastructure needs of the district , roads, medical facilities schools, GP surgeries etc etc	Support noted for option 1 & 2
Anne	Hull	Elmwood Equestrian Centre	Prefer pepper potting	
Matthew	Bloxham	Matt	OPTION 4: With local infrastructure already stretched and the likelihood of global economic uncertainty for the next few decades, it feels prudent to expand housing in a way that limits the burden upon any given area and shares the strain across the district as a whole. Concentrated developments so often fail to provide the necessary infrastructure upgrades, so we cannot continue targeting areas with massive housing developments and the problems that result from significant increase in traffic, and need for healthcare/schools etc.	Support noted for option 4
Julia	Morris		OPTION 4: I have no doubt that including small scale developers makes a marked improvement on visual impact of new developments, leading to new build properties that could be real asset to the Maldon district. Essex tourism thrives on our historic buildings, yet today the county has such little regard for the appeal of tomorrows housing. So many counties throughout England mange to create new build developments that retain the 'DNA' of the area (styles, layouts and materials etc). Unfortunately, large scale developers see Essex as open territory to simply build repetitive, ill conceived and bland housing. Paying some sympathy to how hundreds of houses are dropped into Essex countryside, could significantly reduce the blot on the landscape.	Support noted for option 4
Amanda	MacKenzie			

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 15. Which growth option do you consider to be the most appropriate for the District of Maldon?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Jenny	Shepherd		As part of the Maldon District Development Plan consultation I am writing to object to Purleigh being a designated area as potential development for the following reasons. 1. Purleigh has been classed as a large village. we currently have an over subscribed primary school with pupils currently travelling from as far as Tiptree, a very small convenience store with limited opening hours which is only open because the residents of the Parish formed a co-operative. I understand from the documentation which led to Purleigh being classed as a large village was the fact we have a sports centre. A run down Pavillion does not constitute a sports centre. In addition to the above there is also the lack of adequate public transport & road networks as well as infrastructure works such as mains drainage which already less to server flooding issues & electricity supply. 2. We must maintain current settlement boundaries to protect against inappropriate development. There are also inaccuracies in the description of the sites in the Parish included in the evidence, this has given an overly inflated score placing Purleigh in the large village band width. Furthermore, there are mathematical discrepancies in your spreadsheet which overinflates the total points. I would also like to put on record how difficult the public engagement documents are to follow and actually complete.	This question is about the growth options. At the present time the Council cannot comment on whether individual settlements can or cannot accommodate future growth.The LDP Review process has to plan for future growth and it will have to be accommodated within the District. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and this was one of the reasons for the Issues and Options Consultation. In the coming months work will be undertaken to make the necessary decision using the evidence prepared as part of the LDP Review work.
Jack	Ellum		I consider Option 7 to be most appropriate. It seems clear to me that Southminster needs to take the steps to becoming a Town in a planned way, rather than outgrowing its own infrastructure through minor creeping development and natural population growth. Development in Southminster should support the development of an improved community-centred high street, future secondary school and importantly employment and jobs growth. Taken from ONS2011 Southminster has significantly higher levels of unemployment at 4.9% (compared to 3% in Maldon), likely as a result of limited job and education opportunities. Its current employment land allocations is 0.58 hectares per 1000 population compared to Maldon at 2.6 and Burnham at 1.8. North Fambridge does not have the same unemployment issues with only 1.6% unemployed, likely owing to its train connection and proximity to SWF, but with no employment land allocated this drives high levels of out commuting and, like most of the district, an ageing population. The land submitted in NF presents an opportunity to ensure community facilities are provided along side employment land and housing growth. Althorn is similar but owing to the bulk of its housing being disconnected from the current train station I see less of an opportunity. This option has the additional benefit of ensuring the stainability of our remaining rail link and our culturally significant sailing community. I would also suggest that Maldon and Burnham have seen very large levels of development that have begun to 'choke' the economic functions of the areas. Particularly Maldon Town and the Lower Burnham Road need significant consideration, once current development are completed, to establish their continued viability for further growth. The other area with potential is Little Braxted, with its proximity to the A12 and Witham. Well planned Employment use (and housing) development in this area seems advantageous. Outside other these geographic areas, I feel the Council should look favourably on development that creates additional employment in rural areas to serve all the larger villages as well as encouraging rural and coastal tourism.	Support noted for option 7

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 15. Which growth option do you consider to be the most appropriate for the District of Maldon?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Bernard	Steeples		The Purleigh Development Plan is badly thought out and totally unacceptable. 1/. Why is Purleigh designated as a large Village? This is ridiculous as it clearly isn't. It may be large in terms of area but most of the Village is agricultural and not housing related. The proposal in PUR 2, and 3 would virtually triple the number of houses in the centre of the Village. 2/. Purleigh, being a village, has few facilities, for example no gas supply so we have to use heating oil or electricity. Electricity, phone, drainage and other services are also limited 3/. Access is limited by narrow village roads frequently without pavements and there are potentially dangerous junctions and sharp bends in spite of the fact we get speeding traffic through the village because other routes avoiding Purleigh have their own narrow roads and difficult access. 4/.There is no Post Office or commercial shop in the village only a small store manned by volunteers using funds raised by local residents. 5/.There is no ready access to railways or major roads. It would certainly take lot more than 15 minutes to reach a railway station at Chelmsford or SWF. 6/. Purleigh school is already over subscribed resulting in the Westerings and adjacent roads being partially or completely blocked by parents when the school is open daily made worse by the lack of buses. 7/.Bus access is difficult for the reasons already listed as is all vehicle access to Maldon, Chelmsford and SWF. 8/.Drainage for the areas of PUR2 and PUR3. is already a problem now and would be exacerbated by the plan. PUR 3 already has a pond due to the low lying land and draining problems and PUR 2 has drainage problems that frequently affect the Westerings and the nearby Chelmsford Road. 9/. Access for the proposed PUR 3 would be further compromised by the access when the houses were in place but also during the building work with building supplies etc. etc. having to gain access which as stated above is already difficult. 10/. The problems would be made even worse by the need to supplement water supply and sewage removal which would be dreadful during the construction period. overall this is the most ill thought out and stupid proposal that has been made and we think it must have been made by persons or persons who have no idea of the existing situation in our village.	This question is about the growth options. At the present time the Council cannot comment on whether individual settlements can or cannot accommodate future growth.The LDP Review process has to plan for future growth and it will have to be accommodated within the District. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and this was one of the reasons for the Issues and Options Consultation. In the coming months work will be undertaken to make the necessary decision using the evidence prepared as part of the LDP Review work.
Anna	mccomb	NHS Property Services Ltd		
Natalie	Kermath	Environment Agency		
Peter	Knights		object to Purleigh being a designated area as potential development for the following reasons. 1. Purleigh has been classed as a large village. we currently have an over subscribed primary school with pupils currently travelling from as far as Tiptree, a very small convenience store with limited opening hours which is only open because the residents of the Parish formed a co-operative. I understand from the documentation which led to Purleigh being classed as a large village was the fact we have a sports centre, a run down Pavillon does not constitute a sports centre. In addition to the above there is also the lack of adequate public transport & road networks as well as infrastructure works such as mains drainage which already less to server flooding issues & electricity supply.	This question is about the growth options. At the present time the Council cannot comment on whether individual settlements can or cannot accommodate future growth.The LDP Review process has to plan for future growth and it will have to be accommodated within the District. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and this was one of the reasons for the Issues and Options Consultation. In the coming months work will be undertaken to make the necessary decision using the evidence prepared as part of the LDP Review work.
Unknown	Unknown	Ministry of Defence		
Duncan	Clark		Options 1,2 & 3 which are sustainable. Option 4 is not sustainable as it imposes too much pressure on existing infrastructure. We object to Option 6. It is not sustainable, and puts too much pressure on existing infrastructure, especially congestion and road safety. There is almost no public transport to support. The cost benefit analysis on Options 5 and 6 do not support those options. Very little evidence is presented about unmet need arising from adjoining areas; meanwhile the cost to local heritage destruction is clear. The lack of infrastructure exarcerbates the problem. Development in local rural areas needs to address an identifiable local need which is not proven. Many of the strategies proposed seek to diversify growth which makes it more challenging to sustain – particularly where regular public transport services do not exist.	Support noted for option 1 2 & 3
Patricia	Smith			
Mick	Sargeant		Option 2 with some of Option 7 added but the split % of what goes where still needs addressing	Support noted for option 2
John	Cockerell	Hatfield Peverell Parish Council		

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 15. Which growth option do you consider to be the most appropriate for the District of Maldon?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Catherine	Williams	C/O Savills (Agent)	We support a hybrid approach between the proposed Option 3 and Option 7. Option 3 promotes growth generally focused on the towns Maldon/Heybridge and Burnham on Crouch and all the large villages of the Settlement Hierarchy. Option 7 focuses growth along the rail line to Althorne, North Fambridge and Southminster. The hybrid approach would be as follows: "Growth generally focused on the towns Maldon/ Heybridge and Burnham on Crouch and in sustainable settlements, including along the rail line to Althorne, North Fambridge and Southminster" Hybrid Approach (Option 3 and Option 7) Bellway believe that the best approach for the Council in respect of housing delivery would be a hybrid approach between Option 3 and Option 7. Both options are set out in further detail below: 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 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. 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. 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	Support noted for option 3 & 7
Tom	Kelly			
Linda	Gemmill		I was shocked by the number and scale of housing development sites being considered for Bradwell On Sea and I thoroughly reject the cases put forward that they are suitable. We are a small village with poor infrastructure and amenities, a conservation zone and rural in nature. Any one of these developments on their own would be completely inappropriate and out of character with the village and local area, representing as they do, an increase in size of nearly a third more. I am particularly concerned with BRS3 and BRS4 and the number of proposed houses. It is stated that BRS3 is to be allocated for housing in relation to the development of Bradwell B. I would question whether the LDP needs to mention Bradwell B at all in terms of related development sites when a) this would be a national infrastructure project with decisions made at national level as to what infrastructure and associated development will be allowed and where; and b) that the likelihood of this project going ahead is far from proven; and c) the developers of Bradwell B have outlined alternative land for the development of housing related to the project, rendering the earmarking of this additional land unnecessary. My concern is that once this parcel of land has been allocated within the LDP as suitable for development, it will become all too easy for development to go ahead, with or without Bradwell.	Comment noted. At the present time the Council cannot comment on whether individual settlements can or cannot accommodate future growth.The LDP Review process has to plan for future growth and it will have to be accommodated within the District. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and this was one of the reasons for the Issues and Options Consultation. In the coming months work will be undertaken to make the necessary decision using the evidence prepared as part of the LDP Review work.

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 15. Which growth option do you consider to be the most appropriate for the District of Maldon?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Linda	Gemmill		BRS3 This land differs from the land outlined by BrB for housing development associated with Bradwell B. Further more, the land area is far more extensive than required by the possible 500 houses allowed under DCO authorisation and therefore appears to be an attempt by MDC to have this land ear marked for development with no public engagement, fostering a lack of transparency, which is of course against MDC's core principles. We thoroughly reject the idea that this land should be earmarked within the LDP for development under any circumstances. Any development would effectively create a large urbanisation, completely out of character with the area, and all within a flood plane adjacent to a nature reserve. We would also question whether the LDP needs to mention Bradwell B at all in terms of related development sites when a) this would be a national infrastructure project with decisions made at national level as to what infrastructure and associated development will be allowed and where; and b) that the likely hood of this project going ahead is far from proven; and c) the developers of Bradwell B have outlined alternative land for the development of housing related to the project, rendering the earmarking of this additional land unnecessary. It is our belief that the LPD does not need to allocate land in association with Bradwell B and that the designating of any such land, leaves it open to speculative development in the future due to MDC having already set the ground for such by stipulating the land as suitable for development within the LDP. Given the extent of local opposition, we believe that MDC should remain neutral in respect to Bradwell B and should not make any statements supporting the proposals within the LPD, and as such the existing statement should be removed.	Comment noted. At the present time the Council cannot comment on whether individual settlements can or cannot accommodate future growth.The LDP Review process has to plan for future growth and it will have to be accommodated within the District. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and this was one of the reasons for the Issues and Options Consultation. In the coming months work will be undertaken to make the necessary decision using the evidence prepared as part of the LDP Review work.
Mark	Norman	Highways England	Option 6 focusing development on the north of the district could lead to detrimental impact upon the operation of the A12, even though there is a programmed scheme to widen the A12 between J19 and 25. This would need investigating and mitigating if this option were to be pursued. We do not have any strong views on the other options, although there may be issues that come to light as the transport evidence base is developed. We welcome the fact that the promotion of sustainable travel, the provision of facilities and services is promoted in your plan despite the challenges thrown up by the rural nature of the district. As this will not only help reduce CO2 emissions but also improve the health of those who choose to travel by foot or cycle. It is noted that the final local plan should state that access by sustainable modes should be provided to the current standards laid out in LTN 1 to all development.	Support noted for option 6
Thomasin	Foster		Representations to the Maldon District Local Development Plan Review Regulation 18 (Issues and Options Document) Consultation. In short we support an approach which allocates housing in small and medium villages. We have also made comments in relation to the proposed Plan Period and housing requirement. Local Plan Position MDC's existing Local Development Plan was adopted in July 2017, covering the period 2014 to 2029. Paragraph 33 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (February 2021) requires all Councils to undertake a Local Plan Review at least once every five years. The adopted Local Plan 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 any of the District's smaller settlements, which caused a number of issues including: the impact of the slow delivery of large scale developments on the 5 year housing land supply; the lack of guidance on the delivery of windfall sites; and the incompatibility of large residential allocations and small to medium employment sites. In order to inform the emerging Local Plan, the Council is asking for consideration to be given to the following housing growth options: • Option 1 – Retain the option in the LDP approved in 2017 and focus growth in the settlements of Maldon/ Heybridge and Burnham on Crouch • Option 2 – A strong focus on the towns and larger sustainable villages • Option 3 – Growth generally focused on the towns Maldon/ Heybridge and Burnham on Crouch and all the large villages of the Settlement Hierarchy • Option 4 – Pepper pot growth throughout the Settlement Hierarchy • 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 • Option 6 – Focus growth in the north of the District to link into the service and facilities available in Tiptree, Witham and Maldon/ Heybridge • Option 7 – Focus growth along the rail line to Althorne, North Fambridge and Southminster Great Totham The settlement pattern and Rural Facilities and Settlement Hierarchy Paper (Jan 2022) seeks to split Great Totham into north and south. There is a lack of justification for this aside from a general comment about geographical location. There is also a lack of clarity as what the boundary between north and south is. This needs to be addressed in future consultations. Nevertheless, it is our view that Great Totham should be viewed as one settlement and all of it should be identified as a large village. Our client owns land in Great Totham South which is identified in the HELAA as suitable for development (Ref. GTHS1) and the allocation of the site for development would be supported by our client and the site is available for development. Section 14.0 of the LDPIO recognises that it is inevitable that housing will come forward in the villages and in fact the absence of allocations and the limited nature of the settlement boundaries has resulted in insufficient flexibility for housing to come forward which has contributed to the housing supply issues currently experienced. It is considered that	Comment noted. Great Totham South and Great Totham North are separated by a large green gap and clearly are two separate places in terms of spatial planning it is therefore apprpriate that they have been assessed separately in the Rural Facilities Study. At the present time the Council cannot comment any further on whether individual settlements can or cannot accommodate future growth.The LDP Review process has to plan for future growth and it will have to be accommodated within the District. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and this was one of the reasons for the Issues and Options Consultation. In the coming months work will be undertaken to make the necessary decision using the evidence prepared as part of the LDP Review work.

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 15. Which growth option do you consider to be the most appropriate for the District of Maldon?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
*	*		This response to the Local Plan Review Issues and Options Consultation comprises firstly our review and response to the seven different strategic growth options set out in documentation, and secondly our specific comments in respect of the role of the larger village of Great Totham in meeting future housing needs. As noted in the consultation document, the adopted 2017 Local Plan was based on a strategy whereby the vast majority of new housing growth was focussed on the two Garden Suburbs at Heybridge and Maldon. Of the 3,493 new homes on sites allocated in the adopted Plan (i.e. excluding previously existing commitments, windfalls, and neighbourhood plan allocations), approximately 45% of these were at Maldon, 43% were at Heybridge, 13% were at Burnham-on-Crouch. The consultation document rightly notes that this was the correct strategy at the time (indeed it was found to be so by the Local Plan Inspector), but goes on to note that there are certain drawbacks from this approach, including the lack of smaller and medium sized allocations that would have assisted local housebuilding companies, and for which there is now an express requirement in national planning policy. As the consultation document rightly points out, a further characteristic of the largest strategic allocations is that, although they are effective in bringing forward associated strategic infrastructure, they tend to be slower at being delivered, because of the scale and complexity of the projects. The result is that, although good progress appears to be being made on both of the Garden Suburbs, these existing consents will take time to build out, meaning that there is still a substantial stock of consented development at Maldon and Heybridge that has yet to be provided. The Council's 2021 Housing Monitoring results indicate that of the Heybridge allocations, 229 homes had been constructed by April 2021, but 1,238 units still have outstanding consents. At Maldon, 269 homes had been built, but 1,159 had outstanding consent. By contrast delivery at Burnham, which had smaller allocations, is more advanced, with 267 homes having been delivered by April 2021, but with consent for only a further 213. The 'baseline' position in advance of the new Local Plan is that there is still a substantial stock of consented new homes at Heybridge and Maldon which will continue to deliver more housing well into the new Plan period. By contrast, there is a rapidly diminishing housing supply at Burnham, and essentially no supply outside of these areas, other than by windfall or as may be allocated through the Neighbourhood Plan process. We turn now to consider the seven options as presented in the document. Option 1 - Focus growth in the settlements of Maldon/Heybridge and Burnham on Crouch As discussed above, the existing Plan already makes substantial provision for new homes in Maldon and Heybridge, and there are existing consents which may be expected to deliver new homes at a steady pace for around the next decade. As the largest centre of population in the district, and with a wide range of employment and local facilities, some further growth at Maldon and Heybridge would we assume	Comment noted. At the present time the Council cannot comment on whether individual settlements can or cannot accommodate future growth.The LDP Review process has to plan for future growth and it will have to be accommodated within the District. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and this was one of the reasons for the Issues and Options Consultation. In the coming months work will be undertaken to make the necessary decision using the evidence prepared as part of the LDP Review work.
Alan	Massow		The current Local Plan concentrates growth through sustainable extensions to Maldon, Heybridge and Burnham on Crouch with no allocations in the smaller settlements beyond what had already received planning permission. This has obviously not been as successful as it could have been as it has not delivered housing growth at the expected rate triggering this review. Government now also requires 10% of housing allocations to be delivered on sites smaller than 1 hectare. Maldon also has to consider the possibility that a development consent order could be issued for the Bradwell B Nuclear Power Station during the life of the Plan, and whilst outside the decision making powers of the local authority could bring significant levels of housing growth above what is currently being proposed. The Council did a Call for Sites exercise which shows where in the District sites have been submitted for considerations. Whilst this is not up for consultation (But new sites could be submitted through this consultation), it should be noted that site GB1 – Great Braxted is partially within Braintree District near Rivenhall End. The site has been submitted for an extension of employment uses at The Commodity Centre and is about 57 ha in size. Braintree would obviously seek to be involved in any discussions regarding that site and the Maldon Local Plan cannot designate land within Braintree for any purpose. The Issues and Scoping Document sets out seven options for growth. Of the options officers are of the view that Options 1 to 3 are the most appropriate as these direct development toward the most sustainable locations within the district. Option 4 is not supported as it does not provide sufficient growth in one place to be able to support improvements to infrastructure. Option 5 is not likely to be deliverable considering the location of sites available to the Council as can be seen from their Call for Sites exercise. This option would also require significant infrastructure improvements in Braintree District if the settlement were to be adjacent to Witham and Hatfield Peverel due to the existing road connections. Option 6 - appears to be limited by a lack of available sites, meaning that the Plan may not be able to deliver its expected level of growth. This could also have a significant impact on Witham and the surrounding villages. Growth and infrastructure improvements in Witham are planned for within the draft Local Plan but any further growth which is seeking to make use of the facilities of Witham would need to provide for further significant infrastructure improvements. If this option is considered to be taken forward then this will need detailed discussion with Braintree District Council. Option 7 – Does seem to be an interesting possibility especially considering its proximity to the railway line and the high levels of commuting to London, albeit this could exacerbate the out commuting problem and associated local affordability issue. This option could be beneficial if Bradwell B were to be approved as it would concentrate infrastructure.	Comment noted. At the present time the Council cannot comment on whether individual settlements can or cannot accommodate future growth.The LDP Review process has to plan for future growth and it will have to be accommodated within the District. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and this was one of the reasons for the Issues and Options Consultation. In the coming months work will be undertaken to make the necessary decision using the evidence prepared as part of the LDP Review work.

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 15. Which growth option do you consider to be the most appropriate for the District of Maldon?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
*	*		Option 1 - retain the option in the LDP approved in 2017 - focus growth in the settlements of Maldon/Heybridge and Burnham on Crouch. Maldon/Heybridge and Burnham are evidently sustainable locations to which to focus the majority of the District's growth. As discussed above, Maldon Town is the principal settlement in the District and benefits from a range of services and facilities. It is important to recognise the benefits of focusing relatively high levels of growth in a location, in terms of the potential to deliver significant infrastructure improvements and maximise the social and economic benefits of housing delivery. It should also be recognised that there are few settlements within the District to which it would be sustainable to direct significant levels of growth, Maldon Town being one. The extent of services that Maldon Town as a principal settlement offers also makes it one of the most suitable locations for delivering new homes which will not be car reliant and which would encourage sustainable lifestyles. Maldon Town is the main focus of employment and retail in the District, and retains more of its retail expenditure than elsewhere within the District3. Focussing growth in and around Maldon Town will help ensure the economic benefits of housing development are more likely to be felt locally. The NPPF calls for planning polices to support the vitality of town centres, and recognises the role residential development has to play in this. Directing growth to locations around Maldon Town will help ensure use of the town centre's service and facilities, and the retention / enhancement of expenditure within it, supporting its vitality and vibrancy. Option 2 - A strong focus on the towns and larger sustainable villages. The LDPIO confirms that this option would also focus growth on the District's two (Maldon/Heybridge and Burnham on Crouch) but would also direct growth to its larger sustainable villages. This is considered to be represent a broadly sustainable option, and it is recognised that directing some growth to settlements beyond the District's main towns will help support their vitality. However, it is important this does not come at the expense of directing sufficient growth to Maldon Town to enable delivery of significant infrastructure improvements, meet local housing needs (including the town's affordable housing needs), and maximise the economic benefits of housing growth within the District. For Independent Living in particular, larger sustainable villages are less likely to be able to accommodate the full breadth of service and facility requirements that the residents of such schemes could require, without requiring the use of private vehicles. Maldon Retail Study 2015. Option 3 - Growth generally focused on the towns Maldon/Heybridge and Burnham on Crouch and all the large villages of the Settlement Hierarchy Our comments on Option 2 also apply to Option 3. Option 4 - Pepper pot growth throughout the Settlement Hierarchy (Spread the growth across all the sustainable settlements in the District) The LDPIO explains that this option entails growth being pepper-potted across the towns, large, medium and small villages; meaning all settlements would get some growth,	Support noted for option 1
Ian	Butt			
Sarah	Sayer		Having engaged with residents within our Parish, as well as extensive consideration and discussion, Asheldham and Dengie Parish Council would like to provide this response to the LDP Review consultation. This is offered in addition to the individual responses of residents and provided outside of the questionnaire which was not felt to enable our desired response or correctly express our views and reasoning. This letter specifically relates to the 7 options for growth in Section 12 of the Issues and Options Report, Options for growth in the review of the LDP. In addition to this, it addresses some concerns and comments regarding the potential site locations in the Call for sites map. Of primary concern to our residents is a number of sites identified on the call for sites map, in particular, the seemingly disproportionate amount of sites in the South and Southeast of the district. There are a huge number of sites identified in Bradwell-on-Sea in particular . Whilst we recognise this is in anticipation of Bradwell B power station we feel the identification of this many suitable sites in the area is too premature, given that planning permission has not yet been granted. Many residents feel that identification and acceptance may even encourage, or act as supporting evidence, of why Bradwell B should be built. Given that the majority of residents are opposed to Bradwell B, the identification of sites feels as if MDC is acting in favour of the development. In addition to this, the large number of sites in Tillingham and Bradwell will result in huge amounts of traffic through Asheldham and Dengie, from commuters and shoppers trying to reach Burnham and Southminster. Being a rural parish with large levels of agricultural traffic, this will pose a danger to both car users and the large number of vulnerable road users, such as cyclists, walkers and horse riders that we experience. Our roads are primarily one car wide and cannot take the large amount of traffic that the identified sites would generate. Furthermore, some residents expressed concern over the scale and number of sites identified as suitable in Southminster . Of the greatest concern are sites SMIN5, SMIN7, and SMIN11. This is due to the proximity to the parish and potential for increased traffic which would be detrimental for reasons a priori. Additionally, this would result in an almost doubling of the village boundaries, sprawling onto a previously rural area. Our residents felt positively that the site SMIN4, although worryingly large, would be a more suitable site as it would link up Bunrham and Southminster, and be closer to more public transport routes, making it more sustainable. Overall, residents expressed a concern at the lack of employment opportunities being created in rural areas and were adverse to large developments where large developers profit rather than local community and local businesses being involved. There was a demand for smaller sites, more evenly distributed across the district. Finally on the issue of identified sites, our residents felt there was a lack of suitable sites in the North of the district, especially the Woodham Walter, Tolleshunt D'Arcy, Tolleshunt Major, Tolleshunt Knights, Goldhanger, Beacon Hill and	Comment noted. At the present time the Council cannot comment on whether individual settlements can or cannot accommodate future growth.The LDP Review process has to plan for future growth and it will have to be accommodated within the District. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and this was one of the reasons for the Issues and Options Consultation. In the coming months work will be undertaken to make the necessary decision using the evidence prepared as part of the LDP Review work.

Question 15

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 15. Which growth option do you consider to be the most appropriate for the District of Maldon?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
*	*			

Question 16

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 16. 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.	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Jenny	Clemo	Langford & Ulting Parish Council		
Gavin	Rowsell		Just build more flexibility into the system.	The Council in reviewing the LDP is trying to build more flexibility into the Plan.
Gareth	Davies	N / A		
Jackie	Gibbs			
Mike	Hayes			
David	Sismey		See above - combo of option 4 and 7.	Comment noted
Stuart	Willsher	Persimmon Homes Essex	Persimmon Homes would endorse a Windfall policy for each settlement (on medium and small villages potentially capped to 5% - 10% of the existing population); as well as more flexible settlement boundaries around	The comment is not concerning a windfall policy but the support for it is noted.
Anthony	Fittock		It very much depends if it is simply about making growth targets or providing a better environment for residents . These are the concerns widely expressed the conditions of roads, school places , GP's and protection of geenspace and the changes being made to their choice of location by housing growth. Other options very much depend upon the above tests and how they improve the situation	The LDP has an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which was approved through its examination, infrastructure is agreed with statutory providers such as the NHS and ECC and should be to mitigate the impact of development. Infrastructure is being provided under the terms of S106 legal agreements and will be assessed further as part of the LDP Review work
Daniel	McAllister	Robert Mulholland And Company Limited	Growth should be planned across all settlements with new housing and employment providing support for improved local services and reducing out commuting. A combination of options 2 and 4 is probably the most appropriate. The focus should be balanced with more growth focused on the larger villages than previous plan. The growth must be sufficient to deliver the infrastructure and services that are absent and needed in the rural settlements. This respondent believes that settlements should provide more opportunities to live and work close together to reduce out commuting and carbon emmissions. Growth should avoid continued polarisation towards Maldon and Heybridge	Comment noted
Sarah	Sapsford		I believe all towns and villages should see some growth, small sites are no less sustainable to the community and can support some of the smaller communities. A mix or looking at the most appropriate area for growth as is needed and taking a more flexible approach would mean the council can respond more appropriately and encourage smaller local companies to build homes and businesses	Comment noted. The LDP Review will try and aim to be more flexible toward smaller developments so that this supports SME building companies.
Stephanie	Ireland		We now need to consolidate rather than grow further.	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced, therefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months.
e	e	e	Yes: please see response to Q15 for details.	Comment noted
Kevin	Lagan		as above	Comment noted
Bethany	Jones	Colchester Borough Council		
magnus	Magnusson	Parker Planning Services	The current strategy ('Option 1' in the consultation document) should be retained but other policies, i.e., those for development in the countryside (outside of defined settlement boundaries) must be reflective of national planning policy and guidance.	Comment noted
Nick	Whiteley		Potentially: A new, satellite settlement (Option 5) or a mix of Options 4 and 5.	Comment noted

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 16. 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.	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Linda	Flowers	Self Employed	If appropriate land is available the proposed satellite settlement to the north close to Witham and A12 with the least possible environmental, historical and infrastructure impact. With heavily planted woods surrounding for screening/carbon absorption. This may alleviate pressure on the north's current villages as they are already under severe pressure due to the area being both well connected and prosperous? If chosen the land should be subdivided to ensure not piecemeal built by one large developer. Council need to be proactive in master plan process putting more emphasis on landowners prior to allocating sites and triggering quick sales. New government loans enable landowners to put infrastructure in so if there are multiple options land owners may be willing to invest upfront, not leaving it all to national builders. Potential localised call for sites to create competition? Extensions to existing towns still makes sense, however, need to ensure least possible impact to existing infrastructure. Sub dividing and urbanising by-passes should be kept to a minimum. Estates should have wide through, tree lined access roads, suitable for public transport, not multiple entrances off by-passes. Adding further strategic sites should require that master plans prove all measures have been taken to ensure sites deliver the appropriate need and speed. Any new sites need high level master plans with low carbon homes and should be a mix of self build, small/medium builder, affordable homes BEFORE strategic allocation. Distribution to villages should be proportionate and conserve sense of place, history, environment and importantly commutability of location, including the railway line. Sites may need to deliver infrastructure rather than being excluded because it is lacking. Better evaluation of villages needs to be carried out with local input. All of the above should try to meet the current need for affordable housing for LOCALS first, and this should be on all sites. Strategic sites in Chelmsford as on sale now with 27% build affordability criteria. Also the housing should be suitable for the ageing population, including bungalows to release under occupied family housing. Sufficient allocation of self build and smaller sites in all locations even outside settlements. These are likely to become in higher demand with the new help to build mortgages once they establish.	Comment noted
Peter	Holmes			
Colin	Pryke		Failing 5, I would prefer7 along the railway line as Maldon has already more than enough to absorb.	Comment noted
John	Hitcham		LDPI and the Burnham Neighbourhood Plan set out a clear policy. Burnham-on-Crouch is a significant centre for employment, retail provision and community facilities in the District but its growth potential is severely limited by its relative isolation in the east of the District away from the wider road network. The Maldon District Council Emerging Local Development Plan (2014-2029) has therefore concluded that it is appropriate to limit the level of growth for Burnham-on-Crouch to meet its own needs. Burnham-on-Crouch is taking a share of the District housing needs but presently identified strategic development sites are limited to 450 as a result of constraints such as education capacity, service provision and infrastructure limitations. For whatever reason during the first phase of the implementation of LDP I, Burnham received over twice the envisaged number of extra dwellings. To mitigate this over provision (without enablyng infrastructure it's recommmended that the principle of Burnham limiting the level of growth for Burnham-on-Crouch to meet its own needs be reestablinhed as the key strategic policy.	Burnham on Crouch has quite a large population, the parish population is 7958 as at 2019. Even if the Council planned for development in line with the formation of new households this would still mean quite a high allocation for the town. It is a town and therefore with its level of services and facilities it should expect to grow either now or at some point in the near future.

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 16. 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.	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Richard	Kelly	Croudace Homes	In the context of the comments above, it is considered that a strategy that focuses development to the most sustainable locations would be the most logical. In assuming such a strategy, we would stress that it is imperative development should be focused towards settlements (within or adjacent to the District boundary) which can support development more readily reducing the costs of providing the necessary infrastructure. Subsequently, this will allow development to provide policy compliant levels of affordable housing alongside the necessary infrastructure as part of a viable new community. This is certainly the case with an urban extension to South Woodham Ferrers. Such a strategy (development spread across the District) will also disperse the effects of development, rather than focus this predominantly on a single area – which could ultimately lead to negative impacts such as traffic congestion, noise and air pollution and stretched community resources/infrastructure – for example. Dispersal will also allow a greater range of housing choice and provide the right type of homes in the right areas to meet the needs of all communities – one of the key parts of the Council's Vision. In reaching decisions about the appropriate strategy or combination of strategies to pursue, it is imperative that the Council considers the robustness of any resulting housing trajectory, so as to allow for housing needs to be met across the whole plan period. Consequently. there is merit in taking the best aspects from several of the proposed strategies. We would support, with a mixture of some growth in the District's existing main towns, sensible growth options taken in the sustainable villages, and larger-scale growth with links to highly sustainable settlements outside the District such as South Woodham Ferrers, for medium to longer term delivery.	Comments noted
Andy	Quelch		see comments in question 15	Comment noted
James	Rushton		Option 7 should be looked at as a complement to Option 1, given the better connectivity for commuting via rail. But this should as far as possible not result in anything prejudicial to the individual characteristics of the small and medium villages in that area.	Comment noted
Catherine	Champion			
Terence	Hughes	Burnham-on-Crouch constituent		
John	Tompkins		Maintaining the garden suburb policy is a way of ensuring sustainable development providing there is infrastructure investment whereas many of the rural villages are unable to fulfil the sustainable criteria	Comment noted
Jeremy	Potter	Chelmsford City Council		
Daniel	Goodman	Rochford District council		
Chris	Harvey			
Jane	Senior			
Amanda	Clack		Options for Growth should focus on Options 1, 2, 3, 5 and 6 There should also be a greater emphasis and consideration around the provision of green energy and EV charging within the District. There is clear evidence of service and facility deterioration from 2008 to 2021. Development prioritisation should therefore be concentrated to the Towns and Larger Villages (only) where these facilities can be built up to better serve all the local community. Development concentration around the Towns and Larger Villages allows a focus for access and infrastructure as well as service and facility provision, thereby enabling the quality of rural life and enjoyment for the remaining areas to the benefit of everyone. A spread and scattering of development dilutes provision and spreads wider impact to the detriment of the rural landscape. It is important to be cognisant of The National Planning Policy Framework 2012, which includes the following statements that are critical considerations for any development: • Paragraph 7: Sustainable development includes an environmental role which requires the use of natural resources prudently and that waste and pollution is minimised. • Paragraph 17: Core principles focusing on effective use of land that has been previously developed (brownfield land) provided not of high environmental quality. The role and character of different areas should be taken into account including the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside. Local authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity. • Paragraph 109: Planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local	Comment noted
Daphne	Scott		See my answer to Question 14	Comment noted
Kenny	Alexander	Thomas Gainsborough School		

Question 16

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 16. 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.	COUNCIL RESPONSE
David	Kennedy		Again I would state that private transport needs to be acknowledged as a significant mode of transport across the district now and for the foreseeable future. As such one option would be to consider development being focused in locations close to, or with easy access to, major arterial road networks, such as the A12, in essence to the north of the district as with developments to the west road transport would be constrained by the planned large development at South Woodham Ferrers and the de classification of the main road there	The Council does acknowledge that the car is the highest mode of transport around the district, that is why the 15 minute drive time to towns, employment and railway stations was incorporated into the Rural Facilities Study. However, we do also have to consider the Climate Change Emergency the Council has declared and the national drive toward reducing greenhouse gases and more sustainable modes of transport.
Mark	Behrendt	Home Builders Federation		
Matthew	Cooper		A combination of Option 3, focused growth in larger settlements, but with flexibility for pepper pot growth in response to supply and demand would be optimal.	Comment noted
Terry	Inkpen	None		
christine	collins		Ideally growth should be centred in the north of the district close to the major roads like the A12 and A130 linking maldon to colchester witham and Chelmsford where there is established infrastructure to accommodate further development	Comment noted though the consultee has preferred option 1 in the previous response, they may think the north of the District also covers Maldon/Heybridge town.
Stuart	Williams	Ace group		
Reegan	Howles		Option 4 also seems like an appropriate approach for growth. Developments should be based on a percentage proportion of the number of homes in each settlement, so larger settlements will receive more growth.	Comment noted. The amount of development for each settlement is yet to be determined in smaller settlements it could be based on a proportion of the population, depending in the land available and any other constraints.
jasbir	Singh			
Janice	Jackson		reduce housing target	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced, therefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months.
Roy A	Clare	Charities	As for my answers at 14 and 15 above.	Comment noted
Felicity	Gale			
Lindsey	Wright			
David	Hill	Dandara Ltd		
Steven	Potter		Option 6 in conjunction with option 4. With option 6 it is easier to get out of the district without having to travel through South Woodham Ferrers or Danbury, both of which are bottlenecks now and will be far worse, if not impossible, once the proposed new development in South Woodham Ferrers has taken place. However, the impact of option 6 could be mitigated to some extent by some pepper-pot growth as described in option 4, provided parish councils made a major input into which sites were chosen, which should be predominately infill sites. If individual parish councils were given an allocation of new house sites required in their parishes in the next plan period, they could draw appropriate sites to the district council's attention. New development via in-fill would then be absorbed into places where development already existed; would not be very obvious; and would not extend into the open countryside	Comments noted, sites have to be allocated they cannot be left for parish councils to bring to the District Councils attention.
Vysian	Banyard	TKPC	On grounds of carbon reduction and sustainability, housing growth should only take place in areas with an existing good public transport network, in order to cut down on any increase in the use of the private car.	Comment noted
Diane	Carter			
Luke	Garrett	Obsidian Strategic Asset Management Ltd	Do not wish to comment.	N/A
Robin	Fanshawe			
John	Brown			

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 16. 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.	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Chris	Waumsley	Inovo Consulting	The recognition that allocating the majority of housing to large SUEs has hampered the delivery of housing is welcomed as is the recognition that smaller sites provide more choice in terms of building companies and can speed up delivery. It would also provide more choice in terms of product and location in the housing market which would benefit people seeking housing. There has been a lack of choice and variety in locations where new housing has been allocated which has restricted the marketability of new housing and slowed delivery. The over reliance on large scale developments has undoubtedly contributed to supply issues within the district under greater variety of locations and size of sites would be of benefit. The recognition that a lack of rural housing in the sustainable rural villages has failed to support transport provision and rural business improvements is also welcomed the need to allow rural settlements to grow to sustain the balance and enable people to live near their families. In addition to small sites oh bless than one hectare allocations of sites between 1-5 hectares should be considered in the larger villages. A more flexible approach to windfall housing would assist but needs to be allied to a wider range of housing allocations including allocations in the larger villages. Reference to growth being "proportioned out" is not considered necessary and may lead to the most appropriate sites being constrained irrespective of existing village size. If a good site exists in an appropriate location its capacity should not be artificially restricted in this way. A distribution of 20% of the housing target to larger villages and 10% to medium villages would provide the opportunity to deliver development to support the sustainability of those settlements whilst also facilitating delivery in the shorter term.	Comment noted
Phil	Jacklin		Option 2 should be supported by Options 6 and, to a lesser extent, 4. Option 6 would provide more focus to the Northern Area where commuting is more likely to involve the mainline railway stations and the A12. Option 4 would allow all settlements to have an element of housing growth without too much impact on infrastructure. A weighted combination of Options 2, 6 and 4 would seem to be a fair compromise.	Comment noted
Robert	Jones	The University of Reading		
Robert	Stephens	N/A	Working together with other adjoining councils will provide economies of scale, joined up thinking, not disparate, and would reduce time frames for delivering new properties and services.	The Council works with ECC to try and bring forward infrastructure and ensure that development proposals impact is mitigated against.
Pete	Butcher		A combination of option 1 and 5 is possible.	Comment noted
JO	COOMBES		Explore unused existing housing Explore building smaller houses Explore more brownfield sites	If an area has a high % of empty homes and the Council had a proactive project to bring them back into use then they could be counted toward the housing requirement. Unfortunately Maldon District does not have a history of industrial uses of land and therefore only has a small amount of brownfield land to develop on and will always have to look to greenfield land to build on. However if there is brownfield land it should always be considered for allocation first.
Jonney	Aldridge			
Mark	Hurley	Selfridges	See above	Comment noted
Neil	Burke	Bradwell Power Generation Company Limited	The need for a major infrastructure policy is stated at paragraph 12.7 under "options for growth", however, all of the growth options relate to housing. It does not appear to be the most suitable part of the plan to include this policy in, as Bradwell B is supported by national policy and is not an "option for growth" but a development which the Local Plan needs to allow for in its growth forecasts. Bradwell B supports the inclusion of this policy (see comments under Question 17) in an appropriate place in the Local Plan and are interested in the detailed wording and would welcome working with the Council in relation to their proposals for this policy.	Comment noted. The Council is considering having a major projects policy to ensure that policy is in place if/when a national infrastructure project takes place in the District.
Lynne	Goodbourn		Option 6 is the only one I see as being positive	Comment noted
Christopher	Kent			
Sophie	Pryor			
c/o Agent	c/o Agent	Clarion Housing		
Stephanie	Jones	home		
Phillipa	Griffiths			
Matthew	Taylor		Either of Options 1, 2 and 3, alongside housing delivery and employment to come from Option 7 would be the most sustainable options and contribute the most to the economic vitality of the District, whilst protects it's heritage and rural landscape in the north of the district.	Comment noted
Anne	Bailey		The option is not the join any of the villages on the Dengie with the larger settlements. The Dengie needs to be preserved as a rural country space for people to enjoy and get away from the hubbub of town life.	There are no plans to coalse settlements at present.
Lucien	Taylor		Option 1 and 2.	Comment noted

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 16. 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.	COUNCIL RESPONSE
David	Baker		Growth options should be seen more in the context of the surrounding district plans, for example major developments are in development or planned in Chelmsford and South Woodham Ferrers that could be seen as satisfying local needs.	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced, therefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months.
Glenna	Wilkins		Why do we need to grow at such a vast rate?	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth, the Council has a statutory duty to ensure that the future housing and economic needs of the district are planned for and it will make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months.
Danny	Soul			
Fiona	Barkham	Private Individual	see above	Comment noted
Isabel	Adcock		With population growing and people seeking a more rural outlook we need to plan immediately	Comment noted
alan	johnson	sky broadcasting	get a rail line into Maldon then grow it, the infrastructure is very poor to grow without significant improvement (both in terms of access and in terms of services)	Obtaining a rail connection into Maldon would be beneficial in terms of an alternative transport model however, this would have to be funded by substantial growth alongside funding the cost of any additional infrastructure requirements.
Victoria	Cutmore	Endurance Estates	Endurance Estates considers that since the first four of the seven options outlined in Section 12 are finely differentiated on a spectrum of concentration to dispersal, there can be no meaningful other option. Option 7 should also be considered as part of a balanced strategy.	Comment noted
Jane	Potter	Purleigh Parish Council	16. Please see answer to question 15 above.	Comment noted
Brian	Haydon	Cold Norton Parish Council	Option 4 / Option 6 : Pepper Pot growth throughout the Settlement Hierarchy spreading the growth across all the sustainable settlements in the District but with a northern weighting in growth distribution. * Housing allocation across the settlements throughout the District will spread the extent of the perceived growth * Northern weighting would take stronger account of the advantages recognised in Option 6 particularly with regard to managing transportation routes. * Increased allocation to the north would mitigate pressure on Maldon / Heybridge and Burnham-on-Crouch in terms of overall growth and infrastructure lag. * Limited growth allocation to the south would protect the unique characteristics of the Dengie Peninsular from irreparable harm.	Comment noted
Lee	Foster		option 5 - Close to A12 and 2 line trainlines. This Keeps the natural beauty of Maldon district. location will be need major facilities which will again ease pressure on over run facilities we already have in settlements	Comment noted
Vanessa	Horner		Developing round railways and A roads will attract employment and provide and provide its own infrastructure such as healthcare and schools, etc whilst still needs to preserve green belt and farming would provide for future expansion without medium and large villages being swallowed up.	Comment noted
Brian	Howson	Pharmaceutical company	Yes, only brown field sites, if at all, which have already lost most if their wildlife habitat	Unfortunately Maldon District does not have a history of industrial uses so there is very little brownfield land. This means that most new development has to go on greenfield land though if there is brownfield land available it should be considered first in any settlement site allocations
Marion	Gunn		Option 4/Option 6 Pepper pot the growth throughout the district spreading growth amongst all the sustainable settlements within the district but with an emphasis on the north Spreading development in this way will spread the extent of the perceived growth while northern weighting will reduce the pressure on Maldon/heybridge an Burnham on Crouch in terms of infrastructure issues (education and Transport)	Comment noted
BRIAN	COLLINS			
Peter	Lampard			
Tim	Chilvers		It is considered that a blended version of Options 1, 2 and 3 may make an appropriate basis of for a development strategy.	Comment noted

Question 16

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 16. 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.	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Elliott	George			
Kate	Ellis		Unsure	N/A
Kevin	Ashman	Estates and Agency Strategic Land	Many of the options seek to disperse too loosely across the District. This makes it more challenging to achieve sustainable movement – particularly where public transport does not exist at present. The housing-led evidence finds that there is a high-level of commuting patterns, which should be supported by high levels of accessibility.	Comment noted
Jake	Nugent	Endurance Estates Ltd	A combination of Options 4 and 7 would be appropriate as described in our response to question 15 above.	Comment noted
John	Buchanan		Yes- see my answer to Question 15	Comment noted
Tim	Bradford	leadenhall	Continue to develop Maldon town but only if the roads and doctors/schools can support it.	Comment noted
Jacky	Bannerman	Woodham Walter Parish Council	Maintaining the garden suburb policy around existing towns is a sure way of ensuring sustainable development providing there is infrastructure investment.	Comment noted
Mark	Tentori	Mazdev Limited		
Peter	Ingram		I think the amount of growth being considered throughout the district is not sustainable	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced, therefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months.
Jane	Pilgrim		Possibly options 1, 2 or 3 could be combined because of the reasons in question 15.	Comment noted
Judith	Radcliffe		Carefully selected combinations of parts of 5-7 are possible, in line with above comments.	Comment noted
Christopher	Mabbutt	Burnham Primary School		
Mary	Putt		To build to the west of the district and benefit again from proximety to the A12 corridor and the benefits from neighbouring towns i.e. Danbury, Hatfield Peveral. This option would also benefit from better transport links via the new Chelmford station and/or Witham, health access to Broomfiled and remove the requirement for yet another several hundred cars to be travelling across the district daily, poluting the environment.	Comment noted
Alan	Shrimplin	N/A	OPTION 4 is the most acceptable, but parts of OPTION 5 and OPTION 6, could give leverage to larger infrastructure improvements using CIL to leverage moneys from large developers.	Comment noted
Valerie	Coleby	Berrys		
Kevin	Bruce		As above with option 5. I very loath to suggest somewhere but possibly a categorized 'Large Village' could be developed by encircling with a ring road/s which could alleviate wider traffic problems/flow for the district. The enclosed area could then be allocated to housing, possibly light industry, and an overall improvement in services to that and surrounding communities.	Comment noted
William	Shepherd			
victoria	newson	Childrens Nursery		
David	Banfield		As above combination of 6 and 4	Comment noted

Question 16

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 16. 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.	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Phillip	Wright	CALA Homes (North Home Counties) Ltd	We consider that a combination of the best aspects of the identified seven options to be sensible. This would seek to utilise the best aspects of particular options and discard the less sustainable aspects. In our opinion a combination of Options 2, 3 and 7 would represent the best strategy. We consider that Option 2 (A strong focus on the towns and larger sustainable villages) has many strengths. It is clearly more sustainable to seek to focus new housing provision on the edges of the District's largest settlements. However, it is evident that both Maldon and Heybridge are struggling to accommodate previously planned housing growth. It is also the case that not all of the District's larger villages are equally sustainable. Some have much larger populations and possess a much greater range of facilities and services than others. Option 3 (Growth generally focused on the towns Maldon/Heybridge and Burnham on Crouch and all the large villages of the Settlement Hierarchy) also, in our opinion, has a number of strengths that in many ways also reflect Option 2. However, we disagree with the suggested approach under Option 3, whereby the amount of growth will be proportioned out with the housing allocated being distributed based upon the total number of houses already present in each settlement. Consequently, we see no justification for arbitrary housing allocations in Large Villages resulting in proportionate increases across all settlements regardless of their size or the range of facilities and services that they possess. In terms of Option 7 (Focus growth along the rail line to Althorne, North Fambridge and Southminster), we strongly welcome the fact that Southminster has been identified as a large village by the updated Settlement Pattern for the District, where it is recognised as being highly sustainable in terms of its range of available facilities and services including links to public transport networks which include its own railway station. However, in focussing development at locations along the District's railway line, we have significant concerns regarding the capability of both Althorne and North Fambridge to accommodate significant amounts of residential growth. Neither of these settlements currently possess anything like the extensive range of facilities and services already prevalent in Southminster. The fact that these two villages are located on a railway line, does not by itself, mean that they are automatically capable of being very sustainable. In summary, we believe that the most suitable future development option for Maldon is one that incorporates the best aspects of Options 2, 3 and 7, but jettisons their less sustainable components. In summary, this will ensure that the location of development is focussed upon those settlements that already possess an extensive range of facilities and services that can be utilised and expanded upon. We see Southminster as playing an important role in this given its capacity to accommodate	Comment noted
.	.	SN Developments		
.	.	Cooper Property Holdings Ltd	As set out in the response to Qu.15, the selected growth option should allow for a more dispersed strategy that allows development at the medium villages, including Bradwell on Sea, to enable the delivery of housing including affordable to meet local needs of the village and to support and enhance existing services and facilities in villages.	Comment noted
Jane	Coleman	Maldon Town Council	see response to Qu 15	Comment noted
Roy	Martin	Mr Roy Martin	Option 4 is the only Option that conforms with the local Authorities key issues for growth (see my letter of 11 March 2022)	Comment noted

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 16. 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.	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Simon	Butler-Finbow	Pigeon Investment Management	It is considered that there is a hybrid approach that could be adopted based on Options 1-3 and 7. This would see most growth directed to the main towns of Maldon, Heybridge and Burnham (noting its role as a hub in the south of the District and sustainable location on the railway line and thus directing slightly increased level of total growth of c. 15% to the town), with smaller levels of growth directed to the larger, medium and small villages throughout the District, with those sites in the medium and smaller villages providing the smaller sites required. A potential breakdown of this growth could be as follows, subject to the identification of appropriate sites, capacity of existing and proposed infrastructure, and consideration of all other matters: (The following has been converted from a table format:) Settlement / Commitments / New Allocations / Provision Total Maldon (pop. c. 23.1%) / 992 / 1,608 / 2,600 (c. 35%) Heybridge (pop. c. 13.3%) / 1,238 / 562 / 1,800 (c. 25%) Burnham-on-Crouch (pop. c. 12.5%) / 99 / 1,001 / 1,100 (c. 15%) Large Villages (x 10) / 342 / 500 (50 dws x 10) / 1,892 (c. 25 %) Medium Villages (x 10) / [incl. in 342 above] / 300 (30 dws x 10) / [incl. in 1,892 above] Small Village (x 6) and Other Village (x 10) / [incl. in 342 above] / 320 (av. 20 dws x 16) [incl. in 1,892 above] Windfall / [incl. in 342 above] / 430 (425 + residual) / [incl. in 1,892 above] TOTAL / 2,671 / 4,721 / 7,392	Comment noted
sara	doran		I think that the District should be really actively promoting self build - this keeps work in the district, develops skills, and improves the economy. The district is one of the lowest in the country for self build, and this could be addressed by making it a priority for planning. Obviously this would have to come with a Green carbon neutral proviso. If the numbers for self build, or communities of self build could be promoted, I think that this would also enhance the district as good and creative place to live. It might develop green construction as a specialist skill in the area, and encourage development of a stronger eco community- which will be essential for our area over the next 20 years. .	Comment noted, the Council is already in the process of preparing a new self-build policy.
Colin	Horner	Villageretreat	Developing around the A12 and railways with a new town will attract employment and provide its own infrastructure such as healthcare, schools etc. Whilst this still needs to preserve green belt for farming it would provide for future expansion without risking linking the medium and large villages to be swallowed up by the town or city of Chelmsford	Comment noted
Robert	Scott	Lewis & Scott Retirement Living Ltd	Linked to the above.	Comment noted
Rob	Bard			
Tim	Hann		Section 10 (Meeting the housing needs for the future) Section10.2 states "National guidance requires us to take account of any unmet housing need of neighbouring authorities within the Housing Market Areas." Maldon's neighbouring areas according to this document are: District of Braintree & Chelmsford , "…At present there is no evidence of any unmet housing need in these neighbouring local authority areas…" Taking both statements together and reading through the entire Issues & Options document is there mention of the number of additional houses either neighbouring areas are prepared to build to help Maldon meet it's criteria outlined in the 2017 (LDP)	At the present time there is no evidence that the Council cannot meet its own housing requirement, being a rural authority with no green belt land there is no reason at present to ask neighbouring authorities to take the District`s Growth. Conversations with neighbouring authorities continue as part of the Duty to Co-operate.
Burnham	Town Council	Burnham on Crouch Town Council		
Justin	Barkham	Self employed		
Poppy	Vidler	Crown Consumer Ltd	.	
Stephen	Sutton		Option 5 would limit damage to one area	Comment noted

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 16. 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.	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Tim	Madelin		Yes a combination of options 3 and 7 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 Maldon/Heybridge and Burnham on Crouch; • 10% of the District's housing allocation being directed to the large villages; • 10% of the District's housing allocation being directed to the medium villages; • A windfall policy for the 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 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, excluding	Comment noted
Joanna	Jeffery	Althorne Parish Clerk		
Paul	Coppin			
Steven	Bardwell	S P Bardwell Ltd	Retain the 2017 option and concentrate on development in Maldon, Heybridge and Burnham.	Comment noted
David	Oxford	Lloyds Banking Group	Maldon would already seem a much more viable and sustainable solution based on its existing infrastructure, size and number of dwellings, facilities including shops, community centres, schools etc. Heybridge as a medium sized villabe would be a more suitable option too.	Comment noted
Stephen Francis	Dewick	Curry Farm		
George	Dixon			
Douglas	Channer	Private	I think that there must be . Perhaps it is a case that if we are in the housing market area with Chelmsford and Braintree and they like growth they may want to take some of the Maldon District's. Our District has the constraint in the South of being surrounded on three sides by water. You cannot keep squeezing a quart pot in to a pint pot.	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced, therefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months. There is no reason at the present time for neighbouring authorities to accommodate the Districts growth, Maldon DC is a rural authority with enough land to accommodate its own growth.
Lynda	Bugg		A combination that allows people to live nearer to where they work - Housing would be more sensibly located near employment locations.	Comment noted
Paul	Burgess	None	The larger villages category should be restricted to those with a critical mass to support development, currently it is too broad. Modest variation s in village settlement boundaries could be permitted with local assent to ensure that the smaller residential areas do not become moribund. The idea of a satellite development on either the western boundary near to South Woodham Ferrers or in the north with good access to the A12 has some virtue.	Comment noted
D	Cooper		Option 4 is also supported , coupled with option 3 it would maximise opportunity district wide. Option 7 together with 3 and 4 would allow other villages near to the rail line to benefit as well as encouraging the provision of more bus services. Coupled with the introduction of flexibility in the drawing of settlement boundaries, consideration of capacity for growth with reference to school and GP capacity and recognition that what is sustainable varies between rural and urban locations (ref para 105 of the NPPF) is likely to result in a natural growth across the district as a whole in an organic and sustainable way.	Comment noted
C/O Agent	C/O Agent			
Zoe	May	East of England Ambulance Service NHS Trust	All options require health commissioners to review the suitability and provision of health infrastructure to meet the needs of the local population. EEAST will work with commissioner and the local authority to deliver effective and efficient emergency ambulance services for the local community. Any CIL/S106 legal agreement should support all aspects of health - acute, community, mental health and emergency ambulance services.	Comment noted

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 16. 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.	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Roger	Woodcock		Have given up as the service from BT has now finally defeated me. I have had a failed hub for 13 days without BT even sending someone to find out the problem. They are unbelievably incompetent. Using my mobile phone connection has proved unreliable. I had given considerable thought, and answers, to many of the later questions which were lost due to internet failure and the lack of backup by your app.	The Council has undertaken a learning exercise from the experience of this consultation and will, if necessary be making changes to future consultations. However, digital consultation is the way the Government is moving in regard to engaging with the planning system. The Council will always offer ways for those without digital acccess to engage with any consultation as we did with the Issues and Options Consultation where residents could telephone in with their comments.
Braxted and Blackwater Conservation Grou	BBCG	The Braxted and Blackwater Conservation Group (BBCG)	No comment. See response to Q15.	N/A
raymond	dundas	Householder		
John	Watson		It very much depends if it is simply about making growth targets or providing a better environment for residents . These are the concerns widely expressed the conditions of roads, school places , GP's and protection of greenspace and the changes being made to their choice of location by housing growth. Other options very much depend upon the above tests and how they improve the situation	Comment noted
Josh	Plant	Gladmans		
*	*		It is considered that a blended version of Options 2, 3, 4 and 7 would make an appropriate basis for a development strategy. However, seeking to allocate percentages of housing delivery or indeed the 20% buffer to particular types of settlement within the hierarchy, fails to acknowledge the varied nature of the District, the three character areas set out in the Spatial Picture, environmental sensitivities, infrastructure opportunities and localised needs for both market and affordable housing. The strategy will need to deliver housing to meet the District's need beyond that which is already committed through the 2017 Plan. Importantly, it will need to respond to the District's need to support growth in the rural areas. One of the areas of greatest need with an acute affordable housing shortfall is Southminster. In addition, Southminster is at the top of the settlement hierarchy and has the infrastructure capability to accommodate considerable expansion. A strategy which focused growth on Southminster but also supported proportionate growth in the other rural communities would represent an appropriate alternative Option.	Comment noted.
*	Willmott			
Ivor	Watson			
*	*		It is important for any spatial strategy to be deliverable, i.e. it will requires sites that are deliverable – that are suitable, available and achievable – to realise the LDP's objectives, vision and strategy. Similarly, the spatial strategy can be informed by the availability of sustainable, deliverable sites. The ALP allocated land to the north of Heybridge for strategic growth – the North Heybridge Garden Suburbs. In doing so, the ALP confirmed that North Heybridge is a sustainable location to which to direct growth. In addition, the development of North Heybridge Garden Suburbs – and the infrastructure that will accompanying this – further enhances the sustainability of this location. The Sites would represent a logical extension to the North Heybridge Garden Suburbs, both benefiting from new infrastructure delivered through this, and contributing their own infrastructure to this location. Such benefits includes the significant additional area of open space / recreational use proposed through site LANG1. The Council has undertaken an assessment of the Sites' (GTHS12a, LANG3, GTHS11a, and LANG1 / 1a) suitability, availability and achievability for residential development through the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) (2022). As noted within the introduction to this representation, LANG1 is being promoted for open space / recreational use, rather than residential. In respect of the other three sites (GTHS12a, LANG3, and GTHS11a), the HELAA 2022 confirms they are suitable for residential development. In respect of all three sites, it confirms a lack of insurmountable constraints to their development, and their sustainability for housing in terms of accessibility by alternatives, proximity to services and facilities (and ability for future residents to access these without reliance on the private car), ability to help strengthen the local economy, and lack of environmental harm that would result from their development. The LDP is an iterative process and the LDPIO represents an initial iteration of this. As the LDP progresses, we would welcome engagement with the Council and other stakeholders regarding the Sites and their proposed development as part of a sustainable, deliverable strategy for accommodating the District's growth.	At the present time the Council cannot comment on whether individual settlements can or cannot accommodate future growth.The LDP Review process has to plan for future growth and it will have to be accommodated within the District. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and this was one of the reasons for the Issues and Options Consultation. In the coming months work will be undertaken to make the necessary decision using the evidence prepared as part of the LDP Review work.
*	*			
*	*		It is considered that a blended version of Options 2 and 4 may make an appropriate basis for a development strategy.	Comment noted
*	*		It is considered that a blended version of Options 2 and 4 may make an appropriate basis for a development strategy.	Comment noted
*	*		It is considered that a blended version of Options 2 and 4 may make an appropriate basis for a development strategy.	Comment noted

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 16. 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.	COUNCIL RESPONSE
*	*		It is considered that a blended version of Options 2 and 4 may make an appropriate basis for a development strategy.	Comment noted
*	*			
Ben	Binder	University of Adelaide		
Lorraine	Bailey	Wickham Bishops Parish Council		
Ali	Aldis		See comments above. Allow small back garden build/granny annex planning applications of 5m x4m for the use of family members.	How extensions are designed and approved would mainly fall within the design policy which is being updated.
David	Smye	The Maldon Society		
Stewart	Newlands	Fambridge Lake		
Stewart	Newlands	Fambridge Lake		
Paula	Stanbury			
Sonia	Whiskin	Financial Services		
Geoffrey	Charge	n/a		
Robert	Collins			
Ben	Thornett			
Matthew	Wood	Phase 2 Planning		
Tim	Aves		The council should allow no more significant housing developments until the district has the schools, GP and dental surgeries, roads sewerage and other vital infrastructure to support all the people who have moved or are moving into the hundreds of homes already built in the past five years! No exceptions. It's time to say enough is enough. I have no problem with building houses per se. We desperately need more homes in this country and they have to go somewhere. However, I do not accept that any planning system worthy of the name should allow so much housing to be built without the infrastructure to support it. Developers should be legally obliged to pay much, much more from the vast profits they rake in from these sites and this should be channeled directly into infrastructure to support that housing. That's what sensible, responsible planning looks like. Anything less amounts to a dereliction of its duty as a local planning authority. It is time for the council to stop making excuses and take a bold stance on behalf of the people of the district. It should publicly state it will no longer capitulate to pressure from major developers or central government to allow further housing until adequate infrastructure is not only funded, but actually in place. It should then be prepared, if necessary, to mount a robust legal defence of this	The LDP has an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which was approved through its examination, infrastructure is agreed with statutory providers such as the NHS and ECC and should be to mitigate the impact of development. Infrastructure is being provided under the terms of S106 legal agreements and will be assessed further as part of the LDP Review work.
Helen	James		Build along the existing rail links	Comment noted
Kathy	Day			
Peter	Wakling			
Sara	Howarth			
Eissa	Leo			
Michele	Williams			
Tara	Strydom			
Jenny	Ball		As commented above - on balance, I think Option 1 is the most appropriate, although there may be some scope for Options 6 and 7 to spread the load on infrastructure outside the District.	Comment noted
Cliff	Baron			
Gill	Winsor	Tesco	I have explained my thoughts above.	Comment noted
Emily	Benham	Servoca complex care and nursing		
Laura	Cannon			
Shaneen	Illanes			
Merryl	Quilter			
Bear	Keen			
Jessica	Cox		A combination of option 1 and option 6 would ensure that development is located where existing infrastructure can sustain the housing requirements.	Comment noted
Robert	Burton		Use existing used land to redevelopment	The district does not have a history of industrial land use so there is limited brownfield land opportunities or opportunities to build within settlement boundaries. Therefore it is inevitable that greenfield sites will be required to accommodate future growth. When carrying out site allocations, brownfield land should be prioritised in the settlements chosen for growth.
Yvonne	Wade			
Louise	Bywaters-Smith	Hospitality		
Brooke	Roberts-Morgan			
Patricia	Bunkle			

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 16. 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.	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Marc	Rawinsky	M R Sovereign Services Ltd		
Roger	Tiffn		do not know	N/A
Kathryn	Beighton	Publishing	5 - continuing to extend along the southern fringe of Maldon on the other side of the relief road would make far more sense than ruining a whole new area of nice countryside up by the cemetery. There might also be a case for a new garden village in other areas if the location was chosen carefully, perhaps up towards Tiptree.	Comment noted.
Roy	Warren	Sport England		
STUART	SOWTER		see question 14 More focus should be given to putting housing in areas where current infrastructure is in existence, Chelmsford/Witham. Burnham and Althorne cannot cope with the housing you have approved thus far.	At the present time the Council cannot comment on whether individual settlements can or cannot accommodate future growth.The LDP Review process has to plan for future growth and it will have to be accommodated within the District. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and this was one of the reasons for the Issues and Options Consultation. In the coming months work will be undertaken to make the necessary decision using the evidence prepared as part of the LDP Review work.
Mark	Raffray			
April	Rowley			
Bill	Withers			
joanna	jeffery			
John	Mitchell		Focus a new settlement on Southminster	Comment noted
Peter	Layley			
Rex	Davenport		I am against the other options suggested for the following primary reasons: 1. Options 2 and 3 - i. The phrase "larger, more sustainable villages that have more facilities" is pretty meaningless. Firstly, how is "more sustainable" measured and evidenced? Secondly, is there a definition of the minimum level of facilities which are required to make a village appropriate for development? ii. By focusing development on larger villages, there is the potential to increase the number of car journey miles into the towns for employment, onward transport, retail and accessing facilities that the villages don't have – and can't sustain. In the light of climate change, this is totally inappropriate iii. It would miss the opportunity to further support town High Streets and existing facilities e.g., libraries. It would also make it less viable to adopt clean public transport i.e., electric buses compared with increased housing on the outskirts of existing towns where energy used per passenger mile is likely to be less iv. A number of villages in the District which lie on the coast have only have one or two roads for access, thus a development in these villages disproportionately increases the quantity of traffic per road mile than those settlements with three or more access roads. Some of these access roads are inadequate to safely take an increase in traffic, particularly HGVs and buses v. Housing development in larger villages does not just increase traffic into and out of the village, residents from a new development will also drive into the village centre for various reasons. Many of the villages do not have adequate safe parking in the centre, nor the opportunity to increase available parking. Whilst more use by residents of cycles and walking is to be hoped for, it is unlikely to happen when residents are food shopping, have small children or disabilities vi. Existing infrastructure in larger villages is often at or above capacity because of a number of relatively small developments which have taken place over the past 20 years. These include schools, primary care health (GP) services, surface water drainage systems, sewerage farms, public transport services. An increase in housing without a developer requirement to fully pay to bring up the local infrastructure capacity will lead to services and environment suffering. For proposed developments attached to larger villages, this cost would make the proposed development unviable 2. Option 4 - i. As I understand it, scattering growth across the whole District could potentially lead to adhoc developments with no associated infrastructure development to support the additional population. For example, where a local primary school is at capacity, the addition of small development may mean that some children will have to travel outside the settlement, leading to division within the settlement and obviously more car usage ii. Scattering developments may lead to numerous small developments, and that may potentially reduce the number of affordable houses which developers are required to provide iii. Smaller developments will	Comment noted.
Lesley	Mitchelmore	Danbury Parish Council		
Karen	Neath	Tolleshunt Major Parish Council	We support option 7 because we believe that, in order to marry with the objectives around carbon reduction and sustainability, future housing growth should be focussed along the railway line. Any substantial future growth around Maldon will only result in increased car journeys. However, we would also support option 4 and a policy around pepper-potting across the district for some, but not all, the required future growth. We would also ask the Council to look at including a policy about bringing empty homes and unused business or retail units back into use as housing	Comment noted. The concept of a policy supporting the reuse of empty retail or business units is a positive one some redevelopment can occur at present under permitted development rights.
N	DA			

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 16. 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.	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Dorreen	Linton	our group consists of adults, playschool and brownies group		
John	Wileman			
Richard	Courtney	University Of East London	There are loads of options for sustainable development across the district. My preference is as above for Option 4, as this can also be achieved through incorporating elements of Options 1,2, and 3. Option 6 may be attractive for those that do not live in the north of the district!	Comment noted
sue	Rawlinson	Evolve		
Douglas	Milsted	Heybridge Basin Conservation Society		
Alan	Outlaw	Self Emplyed		
Lindsey	Squire	North Fambridge Parish Council		
K	Jeffries			
John	Lakin	?	Place i up North to assist with regneration up there.	Comment noted and support for option 5
Samantha	Weeks		Options 1 & 6 combined.	Comment noted
Carlie	Mayes			
Richard	Martin	Scott Properties	Options 1, 2 and 3 are based on the same core premise and look to be compatible with one another.	Comment noted
Mike	Spurgeon	Phase 2 Planning and Development		
C/O Agent Mike	Spurgeon	Phase 2 Planning & Development		
Amanda	Mickelsen			
Samuel	Newton	Anglo European School		
Mary-Ann	Munford			
Jo	Harvey			
Terry	Fleming			
Philip	Davies			
Susan	Cumming	not applicable		
Ronald	Edge	Construction Industry		
Gordon	Mussett	Little Braxted Parish Council	How about creating a unified growth area with Braintree and Colchester ?	At the present time Maldon District has enough land to accommodate its own growth and there is no reason to instigate the Essex wide policy of sharing growth and have discussions with neighbouring authorities.
Ronnie	Tongue	state school		
Sue	Dobson	Essex Bridleways Association		
David	Webb			
Andrew	Marsh	Historic England		
Brian	Haydon			
Hazel	Notley		Option 4: in combination with option 5 would allow gradual rather than sudden growth within village	Comment noted
Jean	Brown		Make towns like Chelmsford bigger and leave the villages alone.	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced or that the growth cannot be accommodated within the District, therefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months.
Joanne	McGinity			
Stuart	Dedman	Nil		
Kerry	McKenna			
Penny	McCauley	Tiptree dental	As above	Comment noted
Jane	Phillips	Solicitors	Focusing on Options 1 and 2.	Comment noted
David	Rees			
Darren	Weeks			
Phil	Manning			

Question 16

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 16. 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.	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Peter	Clack		Options for Growth should focus on Options 1, 2, 3, 5 and 6. We OBJECT TO OPTION 7. There should also be a greater emphasis and consideration around the provision of green energy and EV charging within the District. There is clear evidence of service and facility deterioration from 2008 to 2021. Development prioritisation should therefore be concentrated to the Towns and Larger Villages (only) where these facilities can be built up to better serve all the local community. Development concentration around the Towns and Larger Villages allows a focus for access and infrastructure as well as service and facility provision, thereby enabling the quality of rural life and enjoyment for the remaining areas to the benefit of everyone. A spread and scattering of development dilutes provision and spreads wider impact to the detriment of the rural landscape.	Comment noted
Doug	Lockwood	National Grid	If infrastructure is implemented along with appropriate support services such as doctors surgeries that can cope with the volume.	Comment noted
Sally	George			
Vara	Szajkowski			
Bob	Calver			
Tessa	Lambert	Natural England		
Dawn	Howles			
natasha	frith			
Anthony	Bates		I am concerned that any major development/s will have a major detrimental effect on the natural beauty of the area and wildlife	There will be policies in the LDP Review to give protection to the environment and biodiversity in the District.
Russell	Howles	WSP		
Gillian	Hollamby		Option 1, 2 & 6	Comment noted
Brian	Townsend			
Malcolm	Finch			
Peter	Taylor	Retired		
Chris	Melbourne		Guaranteed specific infrastructure development, not empty promises and made within agreed timescales. eg roads / schools/ doctors / dentists / hospitals / amenities - no village will survive as a wholly residential estate	Comment noted. The LDP has an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which was approved through its examination, infrastructure is agreed with statutory providers such as the NHS and ECC and should be to mitigate the impact of development. Infrastructure is being provided under the terms of S106 legal agreements and will be assessed further as part of the LDP Review work.
Robert	Hollamby		Option 2	Comment noted
Kate	Priest	Purleigh Community Primary School		
Gary	SPICER		Options 4 or 6 are better suited for the LDP with possible focus on the current housing developments namely in Maldon, Burnham & Southminster as they would surely have the infra-structure to sustain the growth required rather than agree on pocket satellite developments where that infra-structure does not exist	Comment noted
Helen	Bridge		A combination of Options 5 & 6 would be acceptable. A new settlement in the north of the district would manage growth without adding much pressure or destroying the character of existing settlements.	Comment noted
Melanie	Allen	Government	Use the Empty Second homes in the area, use the empty commercial building. Use companies that are thorough checked - eg the Directors are not linked to a number of dissolved companies. Do not use Companies linked to Russia	If an area has a high % of empty homes and the Council had a proactive project to bring them back into use then they could be counted toward the housing requirement.
Adam	Medlycott		Option 6 - focusing on the north as it is closer to infrastructure that can support expansion and Chelmsford	Comment noted
Joanne	Maloney			
Portia	Roelofs			
Lisa	Singh	Direct Call Centres Ltd		

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 16. 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.	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Kevin	Head		Growth under "OPTION 4 - Pepper pot growth throughout the Settlement Hierarchy (Spread the growth across all the sustainable settlements in the District)" would also be generally logical when combined with the growth principles in Option 2 and would help to increase the number of small and medium sized site being brought forward across all the district's villages. This kind of growth will uplift the district as a whole and bridge the identified sustainability divide between the district's urban and rural areas. Aforementioned, more housing and employment growth should be allocated across the district's Large Villages where they can be supported by existing services or have the ability to bring forward new services as part of mixed-use schemes. Option 2 proposes that 10% of housing need be delivered in the Large Villages, but we suggest this could be increased to 20%-30% following an assessment of environmental capacity of the larger villages in order to better reduce rural isolation and to help ease the identified affordability pressures in the district's rural areas. Please refer also to response Q15 with regards to the promotion of Grange Farm, Mayland as a potential growth extension to Mayland.	Comment noted
Elizabeth	Sawyer Bayliss			
Michael	Partridge			
Kenneth	Northfield			
Jerry	Petts			
Frederick	McMahon		Digital hubs for new business	This does not relate to the question being asked.
Tracey	Merritt	Dengie Hounds and Horses		
Jo	Crump	Servoca Secure Soutions		
Susan	ARCHER			
Winifred	Sutherland			
Chris	clark		Lack of a hospital, Doctors Schools and roads give us a major problem . So no more building until this is all done. Keep to large towns when this is done or build a brand new village miles away from everyone where we have the infrastructure good luck with that in the Maldon District.	Comment noted
Jeremy	Richardson		Focus growth in Maldon and Burnham otherwise our countryside will be destroyed But I would also support growth along the train line (Southminster, North Fambridge) to encourage use of the trains	Comment noted
Cheryl	Carter	Education		
Susan	Mason			
Melad	Kamlow		Train services, bus services and roads all need to be improved exponentially to accommodate the proposed increases in housing. The enormous pressure that these added houses will put on the communities is not being carefully considered. The prioritisation of income from these developments is taking precedent over anything else.	The LDP has an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which was approved through its examination, infrastructure is agreed with statutory providers such as the NHS and ECC and should be to mitigate the impact of development. Infrastructure is being provided under the terms of S106 legal agreements and will be assessed further as part of the LDP Review work.
Dave	Draper	The Hartford Insurance Group	Apart from option 4, option 6 would direct the current heavy traffic volumes we have coming in and out of South Woodham away … It can often take 40 minutes to get to Wickford from Cold Norton and this is only going to get worse	Comment noted though Option 6 is unlikely to alter present traffic volumes entering South Woodham Ferrers.
Kevin	Cooper			
Katherine	Whitehouse			
Linda	Soul			
Robert	Wilson			
Sarah-Jayne	Hunt	SJ Aesthetics LTD		
Jonathan	Hunt			
Deborah	de Boltz	Farleigh Hospice		
Tim	Murphy			
Claire	McGrane			
Tracey	Munford	NA		
Rowan	Rampersad		Towns that already have the facilities to support the number of houses proposed	Comment noted
LUKE	MACFARLANE	S A RAVEN	see question 15	Comment noted
Anna	Wombwell	Morris Farm		
Ronald	Owen	Not applicable		
Elizabeth	Johns			
Colin	Day			
Natalie	Bradford			
Harriet	Hurst-Smith			
Tony	Vanner			
Josie	Vanner			

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 16. 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.	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Tracy	Carroll			
Ian	Roberts	N/A		
Tony	Ashton	none		
mandy	SHORT		any garden siberia on edge of maldon.	Comment noted
Kevin	Money	St. Lawrence Parish Council		
Claire	Udall	1	Possibly 1 & 6, although option 6 is the best option as above	Comment noted
Linda	Raffray			
John	Cooper			
Leah	Jewiss			
Elaine	Ketley	South Woodham Ferrers Town Council	More consideration should be given to appropriate areas to the North of the district adjacent to the A12.	Comment noted
Ruth	Bull	The Othona Communty		
Mark	Jackson	Mark Jackson Planning		
ann	cutting			
Sharon	Cushen		Perhaps...but generally option 4 is the most considerate to the hierarchy of the settlements.	Comment noted
Ian	Tooley			
Sally	Tokeley		Option 7 is worth considering for the train line transport, however I do not believe that additional housing in this area would lead to less road use due to trains. However this could be useful for the future plans of Bradwell	Comment noted
Christina	Chan			
Tim.	Holdsworth			
Graham	Snow			
Sarah	Packard			
Martin	Cook		The 7 current options are sufficient.	Comment noted
Clifford	Brown		See responses under Question 15.	Comment noted
Steve	Gallant	Crouch Valley Defence Group		
Lesley	Woodley			
Kirsty	Rowsell			
Philip	Wakeling			
David	Brock		Adjacent to Stow Road/The Street in middle of Stow Maries there is a cleared brown field site (ex farm buildings) owned by Pennies Building Company - I would guess big enough for 10 or so large houses but I did'nt see it marked on LDP ? How many other building company land bank sites are missing? Perhaps it would be a good idea to discuss with local building companies and the councils own planning dept. to establish WIP that would mature inside time frame before randomly marking up clearly unsuitable sites all over the place and calling it a plan. I note each 'possible' building site on plan has the same generic description saying how its considered to be suitable - you are not really fooling anyone with that, its not very helpful	The Council did a call for sites exercise in 2021 and presently has a call for sites open. Sites have to be put forward by their owner because they must demonstrate that they are deliverable. Sites cannot just be chosen by the council where there is no willing landowner and the Council does not have the resources to look for land when there actually is suffient land being brought forward willingly.
Niki	Halls			
Stewart	Geden			
Anita	Thomas	Bank		
Andrew	Ashworth			
michael	smith			
Simon	Priest			
Philippa	Marshall			
Lewis	Cook	Form Architecture Ltd.		
EDWARD	GITTINS	Edward Gittins & Associates	We submitted representations as an input to the Adopted Maldon District Local which envisaged focusing major growth in Maldon and Heybridge but supplemented by significant growth being directed towards a concentric ring of satellite villages. The Maldon/Heybridge urban area is unchallenged as the District's major focus for higher tier services and facilities and therefore growth in its immediate rural hinterland would be well-placed to benefit in terms of accessibility. Thus we envisaged Maldon/Heybridge as the axis of a wheel with spokes leading to those villages nearest to the urban area which could be linked to Maldon and Heybridge and perhaps to each other by short haul and improved bus services. We envisaged the sustainable growth settlements forming the concentric ring would be Great Totham, Goldhanger, Mundon, Purleigh, Woodham Mortimer, Woodham Walter and Langford. We now suggest that this model could be refined by sub-dividing the District into 3 Growth Sectors, namely:- INNER CORE : Maldon & Heybridge OUTER CORE : Incorporating the ring of satellite villages nearest to Maldon & Heybridge OUTER FRINGE : Burnham-on-Crouch and the rest of the District. The distribution of growth and the appropriate scale of development would be tailored to reflect the degree of accessibility to the higher tier services in the Inner Core whilst still allowing scope for pepper-potting growth around the District as a whole.	Comment noted. Also this comment sets out an alternative view of the distribution of growth which will be noted.
Steve	Williamson		Option 6 is also valid for the same reasons as Option 1 with existing and available transport infrastructure, schools, shops and medical facilities.	Comment noted
James	Cowell	E & B R Cowell	A combination of Options 2, 3, and 4	Comment noted
Colin	Hawkes			

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 16. 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.	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Ronald	PIPER			
John	McLarty		The settlement of Great Braxted has the ability to take the additional house growth to meet the needs of the rural community. The settlement of Braxted currently does not have a village envelope/settlement boundary. There has been recent development to the southeast of the village on Tiptree Road. This was effectively enabling development to fund much needed improvements to Braxted Park Estate Listed wall as part of Conservation Management for the Estate. It is considered that now is the time for this small village to be given a settlement boundary with the potential for some further infill housing which could be smaller starter units or retirement accommodation and Almshousing. The Estate has extensive landholdings around Great Braxted and there will be the opportunity to again, work with the village and the District Council to identify suitable locations for small scale growth. The ability to provide starter homes and/or retirement accommodation for the over 55s in the rural community is something that should be encouraged by the District Council. A starting point for this would be the identification of the settlement boundary for	At the present time the Council cannot comment on whether individual settlements can or cannot accommodate future growth.The LDP Review process has to plan for future growth and it will have to be accommodated within the District. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and this was one of the reasons for the Issues and Options Consultation. In the coming months work will be undertaken to make the necessary decision using the evidence prepared as part of the LDP Review work.
John	McLarty		Looking at growth and the existing facilities of Ernest Doe & Sons Ltd would allow an existing business, the ability to develop in a sustainable way while allowing residential development to be brought forward in a sustainable location with supporting facilities.	Comment noted
Norman	Branch	N/A		
John	McLarty		The settlement of Bradwell-on-Sea has the ability to take the additional house growth to meet the needs of the rural community. Land to the south of East End Road has been identified as a suitable location for growth in the 2021 Maldon District Council Call for Sites. We acknowledge while this does not allocate the land it identifies its suitability through a series of identified criteria by the Local Authority. The field to the south is a natural extension to the settlement of Bradwell-on-Sea and is defined by two main highways north and east containing the site. The southern boundary consists of a mature hedgerow and ditch network, while the western boundary abuts existing residential properties. The site has the ability to deliver significant meaningful open space while providing much needed local housing to sustain the local school and meet the needs of this village.	At the present time the Council cannot comment on whether individual settlements can or cannot accommodate future growth.The LDP Review process has to plan for future growth and it will have to be accommodated within the District. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and this was one of the reasons for the Issues and Options Consultation. In the coming months work will be undertaken to make the necessary decision using the evidence prepared as part of the LDP Review work.
James	Clarke			
David	Stilwell			
Ann	Thomas			
michael	harris			
Geoffrey	Cox			
John	McLarty		The settlement of Latchingdon has the ability to take the additional house growth to meet the needs of the rural community. Land to the north of Cold Norton Road has not been put forward at the Call for Sites stage. There is an opportunity to bring forward this parcel of land for much needed local housing comprising market, retired and affordable homes as well as other supporting uses. The scale of the site would allow for 50+ dwellings. The site is closely associated with the existing village conurbation and within easy walking distance of local amenities including the school and local shops and services.	At the present time the Council cannot comment on whether individual settlements can or cannot accommodate future growth.The LDP Review process has to plan for future growth and it will have to be accommodated within the District. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and this was one of the reasons for the Issues and Options Consultation. In the coming months work will be undertaken to make the necessary decision using the evidence prepared as part of the LDP Review work.
Barrington	Thomas			
Richard	Edwards			
Robyn	Woloszczuk			
Lesley	Speller			
Nicola	O'Dean	Balgores Motors		
Alexander	Romang			
Hayley	Holgate	ECC	With two adult children both fully employed but living at home because they cannot afford to enter the housing market even on assisted schemes, affordable housing is what is most needed. This is not prioritised, but should be.	At the present time affordable housing is a priority for the Council and the amount requested from developers is set at the highest level in terms of what the Council can ask for and still approve viable development. This will have to be reconsidered in the LDP Review.
Eirlys	Parry	N/A		
Michael	Unwin	N/A		
Tony	Barber			
Nick	Mason	ECOClassics		
Melanie	Osborne	Motor Trade		
Stuart	Turner	Essex search and rescue		

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 16. 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.	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Mike	Carpenter	CODE Development Planners Ltd		
ian	wilson	cm36pt		
c/o Agent	c/o Agent			
kelly	tilley			
Catherine	Bicknell	Mid and South Essex Health and Care Partnership		
N	Baseley	IBA Planning Ltd		
Sue	White		I disagree with the settlement boundaries to determine growth, as there are sustainable options which may be on the outside of a boundary, but very close to amenities. Housing in rural areas should be within 2km of village centres. I accept using unmade roads which are quiet and residential (Cold Norton in Purleigh ward springs to mind as there are several including the Parish Council road), though I do not accept unmade roads which lead onto busy or main roads. A lot of the smaller villages welcome pepper potting or windfall, as they believe they can keep the character and vitality of their villages and want to encourage young families to settle and use local schools and facilities. They do not want large developments near to them. The larger villages and towns can take larger developments, but green areas must be provided, not just a few trees around the fringes. MDC must provide for horse riders and not just walkers and cyclists. Maldon is a rural District and horse riding has always been a part of the District. However, developers and MDC do not push this issue, in spite of members raising them.	Comment noted, though settlement boundaries would not be the rationale for determining growth.
Sarah	Yates		Option 6 - focusing growth to north of district, away from villages which have insufficient infrastructure for any developments, noting the large scale development being built in south woodland ferrets, which is already going to have a hugely detrimental impact to the nearby villages and roads so there is a distinct lack of infrastructure	Comment noted
Leonard	Lewis		Option 6. is still the preferred option especially if larger development sites can be sub-divided to enable smaller builders to tender for the offered contracts to enable a speedier building programme to fulfil ' time ' requirements of the LDP. I think most first -time buyers are young and prefer to be close to good transport links for work and entertainment and good facilities which are mostly available jn the larger towns and their future development. Option 1. would be next preferred option. With possibly small enlargement of settlement boundaries of villages. Option 2. This would be the third option	Comment noted
R	Minney			
Tim	Grant	Evolution Town Planning		
ANNE	OSBORN	Purleigh Community Shop		
Stephen	Hodgkinson		Growth under "OPTION 4 - Pepper pot growth throughout the Settlement Hierarchy (Spread the growth across all the sustainable settlements in the District)" would also be generally logical when combined with the growth principles in Option 2 and would help to increase the number of small and medium sized site being brought forward across all the district's villages. This kind of growth will uplift the district as a whole and bridge the identified sustainability divide between the district's urban and rural areas. Aforementioned, more housing and employment growth should be allocated across the district's Large Villages where they can be supported by existing services or has the ability to bring forward new services as part of mixed-use schemes. Option 2 proposes that 10% of housing need be delivered in the Large Villages, but we suggest this could be increased to 20%-30% following an assessment of environmental capacity of the larger villages in order to better reduce rural isolation and to help ease the identified affordability pressures in the district's rural areas.	
c/o Agent	c/o Agent	Maldon Wick Limited		
ZOE	HOSTY			
S	Swain			
Kevin	Coleman	Phase 2 Planning		
John	Lawrence		A combination of Options 2, 3, and 4	Comment noted
Diane	Wallace			
Jonathan	Aldis	Good life Countryside Services	Allow small buildings of 5m x4m to be built in gardens to aid family growth as the rise in housing costs mean many young people are unable to afford places of their own.	Comment noted, however under permitted development rights small outbuildings can already be built in gardens and used as ancillary living accommodation.
Grace	Godwin		You need to spread the housing developments out more. Why are you not building further outside of the Dengie? Stop dropping all the housing developments on Maldon, Burnham and Heybridge. It's a joke.	Maldon/Heybridge and Burnham on Crouch are considered to be towns and therefore they should expect growth because they have the level of services and facilities to accommodate and the economie of scale to accommodate further development.
Sue	Hillman			
michael	carr	NHS		

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 16. 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.	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Simon	Plater	Plater+Claiborne		
Mark	Anderson			
Karen	Wellum			
Emma	Wright			
Linda	Coom			
Caitlin	Soul			
Michelle	Curtis	Tollesbury Parish Council		
Mary	Hammond			
Ian	Drinkwater			
john	hand	N/A	Options 1 2 4 and 6.	Comment noted
Emma	Smith	Bradwell on Sea Parish Council		
Tim	Dixon		Option 4 pepper pot growth across the district, with additional growth to be focused close to existing major road networks which give access to A12 & /or A414 . The south of the district is restricted by very limited public bus services and car journeys from the Dengie area towards Southend, Basildon, A13, A127 etc, being forced to use the only available route heading west along the single lane B1012.	Comment noted
Nicola	Taylor	Elixirr		
Graham	Johnson	graham v johnson		
Chris	Yates		Option 6 - focusing growth to north of district, away from villages which have insufficient infrastructure for any developments, noting the large scale development being built in south woodland ferrets, which is already going to have a hugely detrimental impact to the nearby villages and roads so there is a distinct lack of infrastructure.	Comment noted
Sally	Everritt	Community360		
Mark	Garrett		How about creating a unified growth area with Braintree and Colchester ?	Comment noted
Paul	Vidler			
Victoria	Long			
Victor	Staines			
Jayne	Moore	Essex County Fire and Rescue Service		
Kevin	Bennett			
Nicholas	Matthams		Need to retain the differentiation between Towns and villages and avoid an urban sprawl which would eventually merge into each other.	Comment noted
Christian	van Stolk	RAND Europe		
Nicholas	Jepson		1 and 2 with strong support for the provision of facilities in some of the larger villages and enablement of those in smaller villages and hamlets to safely walk or cycle to them.	Comment noted
Pamela	Lacey			
Chloe	Soul			
carole	kirk		as previously mentioned to the north of the district	Comment noted
Sharon	Jackson			
RICHARD	GROUT			
Charles	Bishop			
Paul	Jewiss	Self Employed		
Deborah	Anderson	NHS		
John	Pilgrim	Self employed	Ribbon development.	Comment noted
Gloria	Gold	London Design and Engineering UTC		
Linda	Curry		Option 4 In addition to or instead of option 6 Spreading the growth across all the settlement allows for a more organic development of the area. Gives smaller builders more opportunity where the development may be within their capacity. Likely to support more local builders.	Comment noted
Lucy	Waterhouse			
Jon	Mayhew			
James	Goody	James Goody refurbishments		
Johanna	Dale		I think option 7 is particularly unsuitable. As stated in my answer to Q13, the railway does not connect residents to local and regional amenities and therefore is not as sustainable as it might first appear. Development at Burnham has already greatly increased traffic on the Burnham Road, that runs pretty much parallel to the railway line, demonstrating that car remains by far the most common form of transport along the Crouch valley. Secondly, the shoreline management plan proposes managed retreat along the north shore of the River Crouch, which will hugely alter the spatial portrait of this area.	Comment noted
Tracy	Kinnane			
Carlos	Rodriguez			
Rebecca	Tucker			

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 16. 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.	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Mark	Faraway		Option 6 also allows for new garden village style development again close to major roads	Comment noted
T	Ketteley		The suggestion in Option 4 of pepperpotting but with a stronger focus on the north of the district due to the connectivity issues identified in Option 6 would seem to be a better option for growth than the 7 proposed.	Comment noted
Elizabeth	Weston			
Jacky	Barber			
Ursula	Benjafield			
Paul	Mitchell			
Kristian	Tokeley	CTC Construction Ltd		
Ziyad	Thomas	Churchill Retirement Living / McCarthy Stone		
James	Campbell	HMPPS		
William	Moss			
Simon	Mackenzie Smith			
Richard	Udall			
Rosalind	Bishop			
John	Symington			
Michael	Manning			
Jack	Inglis	Kelvedon Hall		
Peggy	Shields		Burnham on Crouch, Southminster areas as they have railway links, however road links could be a major issue if the Bradwell Power Station project goes ahead as the roads would not be able to cope	Comment noted
Dawn	Adams	Catesby Estates	Yes. As set out above, we broadly support Options 2 and 3, but consider that several changes are required to ensure the most appropriate and justified strategy. We set out these changes in our amended wording for Option 2 below. 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 large villages. The amount of growth in the Large Villages will be proportioned out with the housing allocated being proportional to the level of service provision in each settlement. 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; • 55% to the Towns (2,500 dwellings minimum) • 35% to the Large Villages (1,600 dwellings minimum) • 10% to other settlements to support rural services and facilities (450 dwellings minimum) • 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 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	Comment noted, the suggestion by the consultee has merit though it is not clear how you would measure the amount of development proportional to the level of service provision and how the % has been reached, having arbitary % allocations would not be backed up by any evidencial calcuation and therefore may not be sound.
Wayne	Tilley	RTG Group Limited	i believe that there is the right amount of building going on in the cities, cities like Chelmsford and Colchester should be developed to their maximum before villages and towns are allowed to develop brown and green land. people move to smaller towns and villages for a reason and that's not so all the land around them can be developed	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth. The Housing Requirement is established by using the standard methodology as set out by the Government. The Council does not have any evidence that this figure should be reduced or that the growth cannot be accommodated within the District, therefore the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months
David	Dronfield	Braxted park		
John	Peirson			
Ron	Brown	Corporate		

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 16. 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.	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Roger	HAWES		Option 5 is an alternative as it would again permit sufficient focus on infrastructure needs. However it will need a replacement bypass to be built to allow access out of the Dengie westwards.	Comment noted
Anne	Hull	Elmwood Equestrian Centre		
Matthew	Bloxham	Matt		
Julia	Morris			
Amanda	MacKenzie			
Jenny	Shepherd			
Jack	Ellum			
Bernard	Steeples			
Anna	mccomb	NHS Property Services Ltd		
Natalie	Kermath	Environment Agency	There is a large area of the district currently susceptible to flood risk, and this must be a primary consideration when siting new development. An updated Strategic Flood Risk Assessment is in the process of being commissioned; this will be required to ensure that the Local Plan is found sound and to determine areas of flood risk. Flood risk is likely to increase in future due to the impacts of climate change on sea level rise, storm intensities and rainfall and peak river/stream flows. We therefore recommend new policies to state: • how a sequential risk-based approach will be taken to the location of development to avoid flood risk from all sources, • how the sequential test will be applied to development sites that were not considered as part of the local plan site allocations, • how the exception test will be applied and what the council sees as important considerations to help meet parts (a) and (b) of the Exception Test and • what the important considerations are for managing residual flood risks in developments located behind defences (access and escape routes, requirements for safe refuge above potential flood levels, development level flood emergency response plans, flood resistant and resilient construction to ensure rapid recovery and re-inhabitation following a flood). already lies within recognised flood risk areas (most of this in coastal/tidal risk areas). Flood defences protect the day-to-day way of life in many settlements close to the Blackwater and Crouch estuaries and keep the current land uses sustainable in terms of managing the potential causes and impacts of flooding to those communities and existing land uses. Flood risk will increase considerably as a direct consequence of climate change. It is clearly justifiable as to why the Local Plan should place considerable weight on the issues of flood risk and climate change and infrastructure needed to help manage the impacts. Paragraph's 152, 153 and 154 of the NPPF support the need for policies that support the future resilience of communities and infrastructure to the impacts of climate change. The existing LDP policy D5 and its supporting text should be reviewed in the light of recent changes to the NPPF which advocate a sequential approach to all sources of flood risk, place more emphasis on green infrastructure and natural flood management techniques and flood resistant and resilience measures to make developments quickly recoverable following a flood. We recommend you engage with the Lead Local Flood Authority to consider a bespoke policy on drainage requirements and SuDS.	The Council will conform with national planning policy in regards to flood risk.
Peter	Knights			
Unknown	Unknown	Ministry of Defence		
Duncan	Clark		Options 1,2 & 3 which are sustainable. Option 4 is not sustainable as it imposes too much pressure on existing infrastructure. We object to Option 6. It is not sustainable, and puts too much pressure on existing infrastructure, especially congestion and road safety. There is almost no public transport to support. The cost benefit analysis on Options 5 and 6 do not support those options. Very little evidence is presented about unmet need arising from adjoining areas; meanwhile the cost to local heritage destruction is clear. The lack of infrastructure exarcerbates the problem. Development in local rural areas needs to address an identifiable local need which is not proven. Many of the strategies proposed seek to diversify growth which makes it more challenging to sustain – particularly where regular public transport services do not exist	Comment noted
Patricia	Smith			
Mick	Sargeant		All villages can take some development without detriment and this should be resolved as part of the % splits above	Comment noted
John	Cockerell	Hatfield Peverell Parish Council		
Catherine	Williams	C/O Savills (Agent)		
Tom	Kelly			
Linda	Gemmill			
Linda	Gemmill			
Mark	Norman	Highways England		
Thomasin	Foster			
*	*			
Alan	Massow			
*	*			
Ian	Butt			
Sarah	Sayer			

Question 16

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 16. 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.	COUNCIL RESPONSE
*	*			

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 17. 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?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Jenny	Clemo	Langford & Ulting Parish Council		
Gavin	Rowsell		It would be completely remiss not to have a general policy on major projects, especially as Bradwell is already on the agenda.	Support noted
Gareth	Davies	N / A	The construction phase (and probably the operations phase) will seriously impact local roads and housing supply. These externalities must be costed and covered by the sponsors of the Bradwell B project.	If Bradwell B does come forward then via the NSIP process the developer will have to mitigate the impacts of the development.
Jackie	Gibbs			
Mike	Hayes			
David	Sismey			
Stuart	Willsher	Persimmon Homes Essex		
Anthony	Fittock		consideration is prudent. There is however no consideration to possibly land supply requirements that will arise by the supply chain as established at Hinkley Point.	The major infrastructure policy would not be connected to the delivery of housing other than as a statutory accompanyment to an NSIP where the amount of housing is limited.
Daniel	McAllister	Robert Mulholland And Company Limited	The project is of such scale that the LDP would require review.	Comment noted, but Maldon District is not the decision maker for Bradwell B and therefore this policy would only be activated in decision making if the major infrastructure project came forward, other than that it would not be needed. The decision to review the plan would be taken if it was felt necessary if the power station came forward.
Sarah	Sapsford		As I feel that nuclear energy is a total white elephant I probably can't comment. However the population of the Dengie is not in favour of it and more should be done to look at other options. It will not create the number of jobs in the long term and so like it's predecessor is not sustainable. With flooding being an issue it is not sustainable. With the cost and impact on environment, it's not sustainable. If you want to create jobs look at other options. Large infrastructure projects like health is needed.	Bradwell B site is a nationally allocated site for energy and therefore the Council is not the decision maker with regard to it, it will be determined via an NSIP.
Stephanie	Ireland			
e	e	e	Yes, and I think the policy should be flexible enough to accommodate any major infrastructure project, not only Bradwell B.	Support noted
Kevin	Lagan		It would be a disaster for the area if the Power station was built but it would not be right not to have a plan if the worst case scenario happens.	This policy would only be activated in decision making if the major infrastructure project came forward, other than that it would not be needed.
Bethany	Jones	Colchester Borough Council	Yes, although as noted in response to Question 14, a mechanism for Plan Review in the event that the Bradwell B Nuclear Power Station is granted should also be included. Response is subject to call in until 15 March.	Comment noted, but Maldon District is not the decision maker for Bradwell B and therefore this policy would only be activated in decision making if the major infrastructure project came forward, other than that it would not be needed. The decision to review the plan would be taken if it was felt necessary if the power station came forward.
magnus	Magnusson	Parker Planning Services		
Nick	Whiteley		Better to plan for the potential inclusion of the station in the future.	Support noted
Linda	Flowers	Self Employed	A with and without scenario needs to be considered. If it is permitted although localised housing may be required for workers it may reduce desirability of area as a whole reducing need?	The Council is considering having a major infrastructure projects policy because there are a number of national strategic projects which cover the District and the Council should be able to set out in policy terms its approach to these. Some of them like Bradwell B may not happen in the life of the Plan but then again they might so instead of spreading the policy throughout the plan it will be contained in one place only to be activiated in decision making if needed.
Peter	Holmes			
Colin	Pryke		Bradwell B is dominant in Options for Growth - but now it seems unlikely that it will proceed. Nevertheless until the project is definitely cancelled , it must be included. Not appropriate to plan for hypothetical projects eg A tidal barrier across the Blackwater Estuary from Bradwell to Tollesbury or a Nuclear submarines based in Burnham rather than Faslane.,	The Council is considering having a major infrastructure projects policy because there are a number of national strategic projects which cover the District and the Council should be able to set out in policy terms its approach to these. Some of them like Bradwell B may not happen in the life of the Plan but then again they might so instead of spreading the policy throughout the plan it will be contained in one place only to be activiated in decision making if needed.
John	Hitcham		If misplanned and managed the addition of this type of mega project with cause major problems to Bradwell and all feeder routes	The Council is considering having a major infrastructure projects policy because there are a number of national strategic projects which cover the District and the Council should be able to set out in policy terms its approach to these. Some of them like Bradwell B may not happen in the life of the Plan but then again they might so instead of spreading the policy throughout the plan it will be contained in one place only to be activiated in decision making if needed.
Richard	Kelly	Croudace Homes		
Andy	Quelch		the Bradwell plan has not to my knowledge been approved and may well not so we should not plan housing on the basis of it being approved, as this may lead to helping the approval of the application	The Council is not planning its housing requirement on the premise that Bradwell B is going to come forward.
James	Rushton		Yes - subject to proper cross-boundary co-operation and planning.	Support noted
Catherine	Champion			
Terence	Hughes	Burnham-on-Crouch constituent	As it will take decades to build and maybe 10 years before a decision to be made leave it open that a revision will have to be made if implemented. When the old nuclear power station was built the government had to improve the roads and infrastructure. This will probably be the same.	The Council is considering having a major infrastructure projects policy because there are a number of national strategic projects which cover the District and the Council should be able to set out in policy terms its approach to these. Some of them like Bradwell B may not happen in the life of the Plan but then again they might so instead of spreading the policy throughout the plan it will be contained in one place only to be activiated in decision making if needed. The Council is not the decision maker in regards to Bradwell B site.
John	Tompkins		SIt would avoid a free-for-all. Consideration of such major projects and the formulation of appropriate policies is essential as such large projects will influence labour supply and the broadest infrastructure requirements - highways, healthcare, education.	Support noted
Jeremy	Potter	Chelmsford City Council		

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 17. 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?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Daniel	Goodman	Rochford District council	The Council recognises the challenges in reflecting the uncertain impacts of the Bradwell B nationally significant infrastructure project on the plan's strategy. However, given the potential for Bradwell B to have a fundamental impact on a range of matters including housing need, economic need and infrastructure need, the Council would support appropriate measures being taken within Maldon's Local Plan to ensure the plan can be responsive to these potential impacts, potentially through policy review mechanisms. The Council would further support the continuation and extension, where appropriate, of existing pan-authority mechanisms for considering the potential impacts of Bradwell B across Essex should it come forward.	Support noted
Chris	Harvey		Of course, although I fervently hope Bradwell B never comes to fruition.	Support noted
Jane	Senior			
Amanda	Clack		Bradwell B is a major blight on the District and should be considered against the ability to provide green energy provision such as off-shore wind or solar. The Dengie cannot sustain the provision and the wider impacts that this brings with it. It should be resisted at all costs. The District Council also needs to be more proactive in the increasing air traffic associated with planes flying low over our Towns and Villages, particularly Burnham-on-Crouch and those in the vicinity.	The Council is considering having a major infrastructure projects policy because there are a number of national strategic projects which cover the District and the Council should be able to set out in policy terms its approach to these. Some of them like Bradwell B may not happen in the life of the Plan but then again they might so instead of spreading the policy throughout the plan it will be contained in one place only to be activiated in decision making if needed.
Daphne	Scott		The Government has stated that it will be seeking to reduce its dependence on Russian oil as quickly as possible and to drive forward on renewable energy, however, the current renewables are heavily dependant on weather conditions and therefore it is necessary to have some form of energy that can 'fill the gap' when renewables are unable to and nuclear energy (although controversial) can do this without any increase in CO2.	Support noted
Kenny	Alexander	Thomas Gainsborough School		
David	Kennedy		Any development of Bradwell B will result in a massive increase in heavy lorry traffic over the many years of the development, again raod infrastructure needs to be considered both for construction and operational traffic	The Council is considering having a major infrastructure projects policy because there are a number of national strategic projects which cover the District and the Council should be able to set out in policy terms its approach to these. Some of them like Bradwell B may not happen in the life of the Plan but then again they might so instead of spreading the policy throughout the plan it will be contained in one place only to be activiated in decision making if needed. The Council is not the decision maker in regards to Bradwell B site.
Mark	Behrendt	Home Builders Federation	It would appear to be a sensible approach in order to consider the impact on the area of such a significant scheme. The project may well have impacts for the economy and for housing needs that will need to be fully considered.	Support noted
Matthew	Cooper			
Terry	Inkpen	None	The possibility of Bradwell B coming to fruition must be recognised, and at some stage infrastructure developed for Bradwell B could facilitate and change options considered for the LDP in future.	Support noted
christine	collins		how can you not consider it ?	Support noted
Stuart	Williams	Ace group		
Reegan	Howles		Any policy should lie dormant unless the power station proceeds under the NSIP process. Development should not consider this major infrastructure project within the main LDP.	The policy will lie dormant until it is needed and this could be any NSIP that covers or impacts the District.
jasbir	Singh			
Janice	Jackson		the infrastructure cannot cope at the moment	The Council is considering having a major infrastructure projects policy because there are a number of national strategic projects which cover the District and the Council should be able to set out in policy terms its approach to these. Some of them like Bradwell B may not happen in the life of the Plan but then again they might so instead of spreading the policy throughout the plan it will be contained in one place only to be activiated in decision making if needed.
Roy A	Clare	Charities	Nuclear and renewable energy should be included.	The Council is considering having a major infrastructure projects policy because there are a number of national strategic projects which cover the District and the Council should be able to set out in policy terms its approach to these. Some of them like Bradwell B may not happen in the life of the Plan but then again they might so instead of spreading the policy throughout the plan it will be contained in one place only to be activiated in decision making if needed.
Felicity	Gale		It amazes me that this question is asked - surely you should be looking at the current infrastructure that is in place and assessing whether it can cope with major projects - it cannot! we have roads that are falling apart, that do not get fixed!	The Council is considering having a major infrastructure projects policy because there are a number of national strategic projects which cover the District and the Council should be able to set out in policy terms its approach to these. Some of them like Bradwell B may not happen in the life of the Plan but then again they might so instead of spreading the policy throughout the plan it will be contained in one place only to be activiated in decision making if needed.
Lindsey	Wright		NO to Bradwell	The Council is considering having a major infrastructure projects policy because there are a number of national strategic projects which cover the District and the Council should be able to set out in policy terms its approach to these. Some of them like Bradwell B may not happen in the life of the Plan but then again they might so instead of spreading the policy throughout the plan it will be contained in one place only to be activiated in decision making if needed.
David	Hill	Dandara Ltd		
Steven	Potter			
Vysian	Banyard	TKPC		
Diane	Carter			
Luke	Garrett	Obsidian Strategic Asset Management Ltd	Do not wish to comment.	
Robin	Fanshawe			
John	Brown			
Chris	Waumsley	Inovo Consulting		

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 17. 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?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Phil	Jacklin		The impact of the Bradwell B project has not been fully investigated or appreciated.	The Council is considering having a major infrastructure projects policy because there are a number of national strategic projects which cover the District and the Council should be able to set out in policy terms its approach to these. Some of them like Bradwell B may not happen in the life of the Plan but then again they might so instead of spreading the policy throughout the plan it will be contained in one place only to be activiated in decision making if needed.
Robert	Jones	The University of Reading	It is now increasingly unlikely that Bradwell B will come forward as a development proposal under its current 'ownership'. The Chinese involvement is now more-or-less dead in the water and, given the problems that the government is encountering if securing sufficient finance for Sizewell C, any new arrangements to finance a major nuclear power station at Bradwell will take a considerable time to secure - if ever. The most likely proposal with any serious prospect of success would be for a Small Modular Reaction - of the type being developed by Rolls Royce - and this would have a far lower impact upon the local communities and infrastructure.	The Council is considering having a major infrastructure projects policy because there are a number of national strategic projects which cover the District and the Council should be able to set out in policy terms its approach to these. Some of them like Bradwell B may not happen in the life of the Plan but then again they might so instead of spreading the policy throughout the plan it will be contained in one place only to be activiated in decision making if needed.
Robert	Stephens	N/A		
Pete	Butcher		Agree	Support noted
JO	COOMBES			
Jonney	Aldridge		Yes of course we must think about this possibility. However now that we have had the Bradwell B public consultation we know the kind of size of the development. It is very important to know exactly how this will affect the District. The development will include something like a third of the land of the parish of Bradwell. Bradwell will no longer be a medium size village, it would be lost completely in this development. The increase in housing that is indicated in the public consultation document would mean a huge increase in infrastructure, including schools, shops, doctor's surgeries and the like. I should imagine the whole of the region from Bradwell to Southminster would no longer be rural. I feel this would destroy the only 'good' feature of the area. I know it is not in the MDC remit but I would encourage the Council to do what ever it can to discoutage this massively destructive project and encourage more suitable schemes (possibly even renewable energy projects), and certainly ones that would pollute our air and water less.	The Council is considering having a major infrastructure projects policy because there are a number of national strategic projects which cover the District and the Council should be able to set out in policy terms its approach to these. Some of them like Bradwell B may not happen in the life of the Plan but then again they might so instead of spreading the policy throughout the plan it will be contained in one place only to be activiated in decision making if needed. The Council is not he decision maker with regard to Bradwell B development.
Mark	Hurley	Selfridges	Many people are concerned, especially if this facility is built by anotehr country. Recent Ukraine issues show the risks.	The Council is considering having a major infrastructure projects policy because there are a number of national strategic projects which cover the District and the Council should be able to set out in policy terms its approach to these. Some of them like Bradwell B may not happen in the life of the Plan but then again they might so instead of spreading the policy throughout the plan it will be contained in one place only to be activiated in decision making if needed. The Council is not he decision maker with regard to Bradwell B development.
Neil	Burke	Bradwell Power Generation Company Limited	As noted above, Bradwell B supports recognition of the new nuclear power station, and indeed other major infrastructure projects, however, it is important that the Local Plan does not set out policy for the determination of Bradwell B itself. As the Issues and Options consultation notes, it is an NSIP which will be determined in accordance with national policy. The approach to acknowledging Bradwell B and including a policy which would deal with any locally determined development that may arise as a result of growth, for instance in relation to housing and supply chain opportunities generated by Bradwell B, is supported. Bradwell B are interested in the detailed wording of any policy on major infrastructure and would welcome working with the Council in relation to their proposals for this policy. It is considered that such as policy could include recognition of the important role such projects have to play in tackling the climate emergency.	Support noted
Lynne	Goodbourn		But without pre emptying any decision which could still be many years in the making and may well Never happen	Support noted
Christopher	Kent		If it effects the area then it needs to accessed.	The Council is considering having a major infrastructure projects policy because there are a number of national strategic projects which cover the District and the Council should be able to set out in policy terms its approach to these. Some of them like Bradwell B may not happen in the life of the Plan but then again they might so instead of spreading the policy throughout the plan it will be contained in one place only to be activiated in decision making if needed.
Sophie	Pryor		Yes it is appropriate. The project would have a significant impact on the District and wider area and careful consideration is needed in order to plan for the associated development. This will include a requirement to consider short and long term jobs and housing during the construction and operation phases of the power station. The location of the associated infrastructure will be key to reducing the impact of the development on the wider area.	Support noted
c/o Agent	c/o Agent	Clarion Housing		
Stephanie	Jones	home		
Phillipa	Griffiths			
Matthew	Taylor			
Anne	Bailey		Bradwell B is not to be considered. with climate change and rising seas it is not in a suitable position. We should be considering other ways of supplying electricity. The Dengie is renound to the amount of sunshine we have and the constant winds.	The Council is considering having a major infrastructure projects policy because there are a number of national strategic projects which cover the District and the Council should be able to set out in policy terms its approach to these. Some of them like Bradwell B may not happen in the life of the Plan but then again they might so instead of spreading the policy throughout the plan it will be contained in one place only to be activiated in decision making if needed. The Council is not the decision maker in regards to Bradwell B site.
Lucien	Taylor			

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 17. 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?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
David	Baker		The district council should be resisting any new major infrastructure projects, including the proposed Bradwell B Power Station until it six clear how the existing infrastructure can support them.	The Council is considering having a major infrastructure projects policy because there are a number of national strategic projects which cover the District and the Council should be able to set out in policy terms its approach to these. Some of them like Bradwell B may not happen in the life of the Plan but then again they might so instead of spreading the policy throughout the plan it will be contained in one place only to be activiated in decision making if needed. The Council is not the decision maker in regards to Bradwell B site.
Glenna	Wilkins			
Danny	Soul			
Fiona	Barkham	Private Individual	Yes the development of further nuclear power (whilst I support) does need to be a matter and planning matter for the community as a whole	Support noted
Isabel	Adcock		All areas of work, leisure, education, transport, shopping need to be covered	The Council is considering having a major infrastructure projects policy because there are a number of national strategic projects which cover the District and the Council should be able to set out in policy terms its approach to these. Some of them like Bradwell B may not happen in the life of the Plan but then again they might so instead of spreading the policy throughout the plan it will be contained in one place only to be activiated in decision making if needed. The Council is not the decision maker in regards to Bradwell B site.
alan	johnson	sky broadcasting	but I'd prefer you try to encourage the type of development which is more sustainable and will not result in huge electricity proces - more wind farms for example	The Council is considering having a major infrastructure projects policy because there are a number of national strategic projects which cover the District and the Council should be able to set out in policy terms its approach to these. Some of them like Bradwell B may not happen in the life of the Plan but then again they might so instead of spreading the policy throughout the plan it will be contained in one place only to be activiated in decision making if needed. The Council is not the decision maker in regards to Bradwell B site.
Victoria	Cutmore	Endurance Estates		
Jane	Potter	Purleigh Parish Council		
Brian	Haydon	Cold Norton Parish Council	Whilst CNPC has contributed to Bradwell B consultations with a recommendation to refuse approval based on major environmental and transportation infrastructure concerns we believe that policy should be determined as part of the LDP process.	The Council is considering having a major infrastructure projects policy because there are a number of national strategic projects which cover the District and the Council should be able to set out in policy terms its approach to these. Some of them like Bradwell B may not happen in the life of the Plan but then again they might so instead of spreading the policy throughout the plan it will be contained in one place only to be activiated in decision making if needed. The Council is not the decision maker in regards to Bradwell B site.
Lee	Foster			
Vanessa	Horner			
Brian	Howson	Pharmaceutical company		
Marion	Gunn			
BRIAN	COLLINS			
Peter	Lampard		With reservations.	Support noted
Tim	Chilvers			
Elliott	George		Yes. However, paragraph 73a of the NPPF sets out that local authorities, through plan making, should "consider the opportunities presented by existing or planned investment in infrastructure..." Accordingly, the emerging Local Plan should include a review mechanism to address additional housing needs generated by such a project.	The Council is considering having a major infrastructure projects policy because there are a number of national strategic projects which cover the District and the Council should be able to set out in policy terms its approach to these. Some of them like Bradwell B may not happen in the life of the Plan but then again they might so instead of spreading the policy throughout the plan it will be contained in one place only to be activiated in decision making if needed. The Council is not the decision maker in regards to Bradwell B site. The amount of permanent housing which can come forward linked to an NSIP is limited by the NSIP policies.
Kate	Ellis			
Kevin	Ashman	Estates and Agency Strategic Land	The prospect of a nuclear power station development is so significant to Maldon District Council, the region and indeed the country that contingency and flexibility should be included in the policy. Any development at Bradwell B will have significant implications and, as such, should be embedded in planning policy. Such matters should include transport; short-term accommodation; construction related matters and environmental implications.	Support noted
Jake	Nugent	Endurance Estates Ltd		
John	Buchanan		Yes but the policy should basically say that if there is a major project then a review of what may need to change must take place. Do not spend a lot of time now considering the details of hypotheticals.	The Council is considering having a major infrastructure projects policy because there are a number of national strategic projects which cover the District and the Council should be able to set out in policy terms its approach to these. Some of them like Bradwell B may not happen in the life of the Plan but then again they might so instead of spreading the policy throughout the plan it will be contained in one place only to be activiated in decision making if needed. The Council is not the decision maker in regards to Bradwell B site.
Tim	Bradford	leadenhall	Nuclear Power is just a separate topic.	The Council is considering having a major infrastructure projects policy because there are a number of national strategic projects which cover the District and the Council should be able to set out in policy terms its approach to these. Some of them like Bradwell B may not happen in the life of the Plan but then again they might so instead of spreading the policy throughout the plan it will be contained in one place only to be activiated in decision making if needed. The Council is not the decision maker in regards to Bradwell B site.
Jacky	Bannerman	Woodham Walter Parish Council	It would avoid a free-for-all. Consideration of such major projects and the formulation of appropriate policies is essential as such large projects will influence labour supply and the broadest infrastructure requirements - highways, healthcare, education.	Support noted

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 17. 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?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Mark	Tentori	Mazdev Limited		
Peter	Ingram		Definitely	Support noted
Jane	Pilgrim			
Judith	Radcliffe		Think a policy should be included to anticipate BRB provided always that it does not assume approval. It might even have the knock on benefit of making more evident the full horror of the proposal and scale of very disturbance to us all. All construction traffic should be directed to the A130 for example, and not use the Maldon approaches as suggested by the company in their own consultation document. Please note that it is a complete fallacy and grossly misleading, not to say dishonest, to suggest as the current draft policy wording does that because there's been a nuclear station there once it's perfectly ok to have another! The local employment situation was very different then, and whatever advantages might conceivably accrue locally are more than outweighed by the disbenefits. For example, construction traffic disturbance over many years blocking already inadequate infrastructure out to the peninsula, the damage to the freshly appreciated maritime and rural environment appreciated across the district and beyond - essential to many types of employment including tourism - and risking our unique heritage at Bradwell Bay airfield and St Peter chapel. The BRB station itself bears no resemblance to the former one in terms of the scale of the site itself and the scale of electric power produced requiring much more extensive power distribution networks such as pylons. The current Ukraine crisis involving enemy action at two nuclear plants should revive fears that the nuclear power station nearest the London population would be most at risk. The risk of sabotage can no longer be regarded as fanciful.	The Council is considering having a major infrastructure projects policy because there are a number of national strategic projects which cover the District and the Council should be able to set out in policy terms its approach to these. Some of them like Bradwell B may not happen in the life of the Plan but then again they might so instead of spreading the policy throughout the plan it will be contained in one place only to be activiated in decision making if needed. The Council is not the decision maker in regards to Bradwell B site.
Christopher	Mabbutt	Burnham Primary School		
Mary	Putt		I do not think that the area could absorb Bradwell B and have made my feelings known in a separate consultation - the infrastructure required for that project along would lose 50% of the natural habitats in the south of the district	The Council is considering having a major infrastructure projects policy because there are a number of national strategic projects which cover the District and the Council should be able to set out in policy terms its approach to these. Some of them like Bradwell B may not happen in the life of the Plan but then again they might so instead of spreading the policy throughout the plan it will be contained in one place only to be activiated in decision making if needed. The Council is not the decision maker in regards to Bradwell B site.
Alan	Shrimplin	N/A	Yes as this will/can have major effects on all of the MDC district, more so for transport South and south east.	Support noted
Valerie	Coleby	Berrys		
Kevin	Bruce		Yes but only if the worst was to happen. The current proposals for Bradwell B are far too large and damaging to the Dengie Peninsula. Environmental destruction both in Bradwell and especially for the whole area if the alternative road access route to the south were adopted. It would be folly to allow the Chinese to be involved. Smaller units such as the Rolls Royce ones would be far better and could probably be accommodated on the old airfield with far less destruction to the village. It accommodated Bradwell A OK.	The Council is considering having a major infrastructure projects policy because there are a number of national strategic projects which cover the District and the Council should be able to set out in policy terms its approach to these. Some of them like Bradwell B may not happen in the life of the Plan but then again they might so instead of spreading the policy throughout the plan it will be contained in one place only to be activiated in decision making if needed. The Council is not the decision maker in regards to Bradwell B site.
William	Shepherd			
victoria	newson	Childrens Nursery		
David	Banfield		Because if there is a plan to go ahead with the power station which is not meant to be going ahead that leaves the obvious option to be Option 7 which seems a little unfair on that part of the area though it is not as picturesque as the north side of the Dengie.	The Council is considering having a major infrastructure projects policy because there are a number of national strategic projects which cover the District and the Council should be able to set out in policy terms its approach to these. Some of them like Bradwell B may not happen in the life of the Plan but then again they might so instead of spreading the policy throughout the plan it will be contained in one place only to be activiated in decision making if needed. The Council is not the decision maker in regards to Bradwell B site.
Phillip	Wright	CALA Homes (North Home Counties) Ltd	We do consider that it would be appropriate to include in the LDP Review a policy dealing with major infrastructure projects, in particular, Bradwell B Nuclear Power Station, which would be activated should this project be approved. Bradwell will generate a considerable amount of new employment both directly and indirectly, and in terms of both its construction and subsequent operation. It is important that the Plan makes adequate provision for this if the scheme goes ahead. An appropriate policy needs to be in place, ready for implementation, in order to facilitate this should the Power Station go ahead. We consider that the construction of a new Power Station at Bradwell would have important implications for Southminster given its general proximity to the site, particularly in terms of meeting the range of overall needs that would have to be satisfied (e.g. housing, employment, retail, sport and leisure facilities etc.)	Support noted
.	.	SN Developments		
.	.	Cooper Property Holdings Ltd		
Jane	Coleman	Maldon Town Council		

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 17. 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?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Roy	Martin	Mr Roy Martin	No, we should be moving ahead with policies based on current needs and not relying on monies or subsidies from future projects which may or may not now come about, it stands otherwise to inhibit and delay planning for the necessary road and rail infrastructure improvements already long overdue.	The Council is considering having a major infrastructure projects policy because there are a number of national strategic projects which cover the District and the Council should be able to set out in policy terms its approach to these. Some of them like Bradwell B may not happen in the life of the Plan but then again they might so instead of spreading the policy throughout the plan it will be contained in one place only to be activiated in decision making if needed. The Council is not the decision maker in regards to Bradwell B site.
Simon	Butler-Finbow	Pigeon Investment Management		
sara	doran		I think if the bradwell power station infrastructure project is developed, then this should inform the decision to develop a separate settlement, using the new road infrastructure that will be required to link to services. if the option to build a separate settlement was not the number 1 priorty to deliver housing need prior to this decision - a decision to build bradwell should change the priority of this option and ensure that it becomes the primary option for development in our district.	The Council is considering having a major infrastructure projects policy because there are a number of national strategic projects which cover the District and the Council should be able to set out in policy terms its approach to these. Some of them like Bradwell B may not happen in the life of the Plan but then again they might so instead of spreading the policy throughout the plan it will be contained in one place only to be activiated in decision making if needed. The Council is not the decision maker in regards to Bradwell B site.
Colin	Horner	Villageretreat		
Robert	Scott	Lewis & Scott Retirement Living Ltd		
Rob	Bard			
Tim	Hann		I do not think it is appropriate to include, I believe an additional alternative document should run alongside, that would come into effect upon approval. Estimated time-line 5-7 year consultation period with 9-12 year construction period. With inevitable delays (currently paused Jan 2021) we are looking at 25 years minimum (2047) before coming online. The majority of the construction workers as outlined by "Bradwell Power Generation Co, Ltd 2020" will be housed in temporary accommodation (Bradwell B Stage One - Consultation Summary Document Section 5 page 14). This will not fall into the remit of the LDP Review	Comment noted, a major infrastructures policy would affect the same outcome as having a separate document.
Burnham	Town Council	Burnham on Crouch Town Council	Although as previously stated, Bradwell B is not wanted.	Support noted
Justin	Barkham	Self employed	An expansion in Nuclear Energy (which I support) is a major issue for the local population and should be dealt as a separate entity entirely to allow full consultation	The Council is considering having a major infrastructure projects policy because there are a number of national strategic projects which cover the District and the Council should be able to set out in policy terms its approach to these. Some of them like Bradwell B may not happen in the life of the Plan but then again they might so instead of spreading the policy throughout the plan it will be contained in one place only to be activiated in decision making if needed. The Council is not the decision maker in regards to Bradwell B site.
Poppy	Vidler	Crown Consumer Ltd	Nuclear is not the answer, it is not a green energy and should have no place in our future.	The Council is considering having a major infrastructure projects policy because there are a number of national strategic projects which cover the District and the Council should be able to set out in policy terms its approach to these. Some of them like Bradwell B may not happen in the life of the Plan but then again they might so instead of spreading the policy throughout the plan it will be contained in one place only to be activiated in decision making if needed. The Council is not the decision maker in regards to Bradwell B site.
Stephen	Sutton			
Tim	Madelin			
Joanna	Jeffery	Althorne Parish Clerk	The possibility of Bradwell B coming to fruition must be recognised, and at some stage infrastructure developed for Bradwell B could facilitate and change options considered for the LDP in future.	The Council is considering having a major infrastructure projects policy because there are a number of national strategic projects which cover the District and the Council should be able to set out in policy terms its approach to these. Some of them like Bradwell B may not happen in the life of the Plan but then again they might so instead of spreading the policy throughout the plan it will be contained in one place only to be activiated in decision making if needed. The Council is not the decision maker in regards to Bradwell B site.
Paul	Coppin		Bradwell B will have sigificant negative implications for the area	The Council is considering having a major infrastructure projects policy because there are a number of national strategic projects which cover the District and the Council should be able to set out in policy terms its approach to these. Some of them like Bradwell B may not happen in the life of the Plan but then again they might so instead of spreading the policy throughout the plan it will be contained in one place only to be activiated in decision making if needed. The Council is not the decision maker in regards to Bradwell B site.
Steven	Bardwell	S P Bardwell Ltd		
David	Oxford	Lloyds Banking Group		
Stephen Francis	Dewick	Curry Farm	This is far too premature. For example if CGN were to pull out a much smaller power plant could be proposed and this huge development is totally unecessary and would completely overwhelm the existing village. Destroying its natural heritage	The Council is considering having a major infrastructure projects policy because there are a number of national strategic projects which cover the District and the Council should be able to set out in policy terms its approach to these. Some of them like Bradwell B may not happen in the life of the Plan but then again they might so instead of spreading the policy throughout the plan it will be contained in one place only to be activiated in decision making if needed. The Council is not the decision maker in regards to Bradwell B site.
George	Dixon			
Douglas	Channer	Private	By doing that you will be looking to primarily think of work force housing and long term housing employed at the Station . That may slant thinking that all should be placed in the South of the District which is already dealing with forcing a quart pot in to a pint pot development wise. It may influence the outcome of the Issues and Options and other things in a negative way by applying what may be considered to be in my opinion unfair considerations /weighting.	The Council is considering having a major infrastructure projects policy because there are a number of national strategic projects which cover the District and the Council should be able to set out in policy terms its approach to these. Some of them like Bradwell B may not happen in the life of the Plan but then again they might so instead of spreading the policy throughout the plan it will be contained in one place only to be activiated in decision making if needed. The Council is not the decision maker in regards to Bradwell B site.

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 17. 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?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Lynda	Bugg		Yes, it's very important.	Support noted
Paul	Burgess	None		
D	Cooper			
C/O Agent	C/O Agent			
Zoe	May	East of England Ambulance Service NHS Trust	Health commissioners and EEAST will work with the local authority in responding to major infrastructure projects and Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects such as Bradwell B.	Support noted
Roger	Woodcock			
Braxted and Blackwater Conservation Grou	BBCG	The Braxted and Blackwater Conservation Group (BBCG)	The prospect of a nuclear power station development is so significant to Maldon District Council, that contingency and flexibility should be included in the policy. Any development at Bradwell B will have significant implications and, as such, should be embedded in planning policy. Such matters should include transport; short-term accommodation; construction related matters and environmental implications.	The Council is considering having a major infrastructure projects policy because there are a number of national strategic projects which cover the District and the Council should be able to set out in policy terms its approach to these. Some of them like Bradwell B may not happen in the life of the Plan but then again they might so instead of spreading the policy throughout the plan it will be contained in one place only to be activiated in decision making if needed. The Council is not the decision maker in regards to Bradwell B site.
raymond	dundas	Householder	If Bradwell B becomes a reality your LDP will need to b e re-written. So do you need two on without Bradwell B and one with Bradwell B.	The Council is considering having a major infrastructure projects policy because there are a number of national strategic projects which cover the District and the Council should be able to set out in policy terms its approach to these. Some of them like Bradwell B may not happen in the life of the Plan but then again they might so instead of spreading the policy throughout the plan it will be contained in one place only to be activiated in decision making if needed. The Council is not the decision maker in regards to Bradwell B site, it will not be necessary to rewrite the LDP because we have built in this policy.
John	Watson		Consideration is prudent. There is however no consideration to possibly land supply requirements that will arise by the supply chain as established at Hinkley Point.	The Council is considering having a major infrastructure projects policy because there are a number of national strategic projects which cover the District and the Council should be able to set out in policy terms its approach to these. Some of them like Bradwell B may not happen in the life of the Plan but then again they might so instead of spreading the policy throughout the plan it will be contained in one place only to be activiated in decision making if needed. The Council is not the decision maker in regards to Bradwell B site.
Josh	Plant	Gladmans		
*	*			
*	Willmott			
Ivor	Watson			
*	*			
*	*			
*	*			
*	*			
*	*			
*	*			
*	*			
Ben	Binder	University of Adelaide		
Lorraine	Bailey	Wickham Bishops Parish Council		
Ali	Aldis			
David	Smye	The Maldon Society		
Stewart	Newlands	Fambridge Lake		
Stewart	Newlands	Fambridge Lake		
Paula	Stanbury			
Sonia	Whiskin	Financial Services		
Geoffrey	Charge	n/a		
Robert	Collins			
Ben	Thornett			
Matthew	Wood	Phase 2 Planning		
Tim	Aves			
Helen	James		You cannot ignore the disruption and huge traffic increase that Bradwell B will trigger, should this project ever go ahead.	The Council is considering having a major infrastructure projects policy because there are a number of national strategic projects which cover the District and the Council should be able to set out in policy terms its approach to these. Some of them like Bradwell B may not happen in the life of the Plan but then again they might so instead of spreading the policy throughout the plan it will be contained in one place only to be activiated in decision making if needed. The Council is not the decision maker in regards to Bradwell B site.
Kathy	Day			
Peter	Wakling			
Sara	Howarth			
Eissa	Leo			
Michele	Williams			
Tara	Strydom			

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 17. 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?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Jenny	Ball		Any major infrastructure project needs to be firmly on the radar of the LDP. The disruption caused by the Bradwell B project, if it goes ahead, will be devastating for the whole District. 700 - 900 lorry movements a day during construction, associated new housing, the scale and disruption of the buildings themselves and the loss of the large area of historical and environmental landscape it will occupy will have negative repercussions for the whole district - and neighbouring districts too. If the scale of the proposed nuclear development was more in line with the existing original Power Station, I think many might be more receptive to it. But the colossal scale of the station itself and what will be involved to build it are beyond staggering and deeply concerning.	The Council is considering having a major infrastructure projects policy because there are a number of national strategic projects which cover the District and the Council should be able to set out in policy terms its approach to these. Some of them like Bradwell B may not happen in the life of the Plan but then again they might so instead of spreading the policy throughout the plan it will be contained in one place only to be activiated in decision making if needed. The Council is not the decision maker in regards to Bradwell B site.
Cliff	Baron			
Gill	Winsor	Tesco	Bradwell should not go ahead roads are not suitable too many lives will be ruined and by the time it's built it will be out of date. It would not be environmentally friendly and if built will be one of the biggest mistakes MDC have allowed. Wildlife and the coastline will be under threat. It is a beauty spot at the moment so peaceful and a beautiful place to walk in the summer plus families locally go there for the day in the summer on the beach. Building Bradwell B will totally ruin it	The Council is considering having a major infrastructure projects policy because there are a number of national strategic projects which cover the District and the Council should be able to set out in policy terms its approach to these. Some of them like Bradwell B may not happen in the life of the Plan but then again they might so instead of spreading the policy throughout the plan it will be contained in one place only to be activiated in decision making if needed. The Council is not the decision maker in regards to Bradwell B site.
Emily	Benham	Servoca complex care and nursing		
Laura	Cannon			
Shaneen	Illanes			
Merryl	Quilter			
Bear	Keen			
Jessica	Cox			
Robert	Burton		The building of a power station is short term and will not require many new houses after completion	The Council is considering having a major infrastructure projects policy because there are a number of national strategic projects which cover the District and the Council should be able to set out in policy terms its approach to these. Some of them like Bradwell B may not happen in the life of the Plan but then again they might so instead of spreading the policy throughout the plan it will be contained in one place only to be activiated in decision making if needed. The Council is not the decision maker in regards to Bradwell B site.
Yvonne	Wade			
Louise	Bywaters-Smith	Hospitality		
Brooke	Roberts-Morgan			
Patricia	Bunkle			
Marc	Rawinsky	M R Sovereign Services Ltd		
Roger	Tiffn			
Kathryn	Beighton	Publishing	It's unlikely to happen	The Council is considering having a major infrastructure projects policy because there are a number of national strategic projects which cover the District and the Council should be able to set out in policy terms its approach to these. Some of them like Bradwell B may not happen in the life of the Plan but then again they might so instead of spreading the policy throughout the plan it will be contained in one place only to be activiated in decision making if needed. The Council is not the decision maker in regards to Bradwell B site.
Roy	Warren	Sport England		
STUART	SOWTER		The current infrastructure cannot cope by adding a power station to this area you will be making a grave problem much worse so of course it should be included.	The Council is considering having a major infrastructure projects policy because there are a number of national strategic projects which cover the District and the Council should be able to set out in policy terms its approach to these. Some of them like Bradwell B may not happen in the life of the Plan but then again they might so instead of spreading the policy throughout the plan it will be contained in one place only to be activiated in decision making if needed. The Council is not the decision maker in regards to Bradwell B site.
Mark	Raffray		That would depend whether realistic alternate scenarios for a new facility at Bradwell B could be defined, together with potential timescales. See also response to Q.14.	The Council is considering having a major infrastructure projects policy because there are a number of national strategic projects which cover the District and the Council should be able to set out in policy terms its approach to these. Some of them like Bradwell B may not happen in the life of the Plan but then again they might so instead of spreading the policy throughout the plan it will be contained in one place only to be activiated in decision making if needed. The Council is not the decision maker in regards to Bradwell B site.
April	Rowley			
Bill	Withers			
joanna	jeffery			
John	Mitchell		Bradwell B will be a huge economic benefit for the District and the Country and a major contributor to any Green aspirations the Council is unsuccessfully trying to spell out in its vision for the District. It will need to be planned for. It would be ridiculous to ignore it. We are also accustomed to having a nuclear power station at Bradwell.	Support noted
Peter	Layley			
Rex	Davenport			
Lesley	Mitchelmore	Danbury Parish Council		
Karen	Neath	Tolleshunt Major Parish Council		
N	DA		The NDA and Magnox would not object to such a policy review and would facilitate such a policy where necessary, given the proximity of the Bradwell site to Bradwell B.	Support noted

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 17. 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?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Dorreen	Linton	our group consists of adults, playschool and brownies group		
John	Wileman			
Richard	Courtney	University Of East London	Bradwell B would be an enormous benefit to the area and the country. It should be planned into the LDP as a means to improve the skills base, local economy, and overall well being of the population. Nuclear energy is not a scary prospect!	Support noted
sue	Rawlinson	Evolve	I said yes but I don't think this will go ahead as global warming will make the risk of flood too great in that area. Also the technology they are discussing will be out of date and too expensive to run, plus the Chinese are creating an alliance with Russia and who know what the future will bring should the Chinese bee involved in a project like that in this Country.	Support noted
Douglas	Milsted	Heybridge Basin Conservation Society		
Alan	Outlaw	Self Emplyed	Whatever does or does not happen with Bradwell B should not hamper the LDP reaching a quick and measures conclusion.	Support noted
Lindsey	Squire	North Fambridge Parish Council		
K	Jeffries			
John	Lakin	?		
Samantha	Weeks			
Carlie	Mayes			
Richard	Martin	Scott Properties		
Mike	Spurgeon	Phase 2 Planning and Development		
C/O Agent Mike	Spurgeon	Phase 2 Planning & Development		
Amanda	Mickelsen			
Samuel	Newton	Anglo European School		
Mary-Ann	Munford			
Jo	Harvey			
Terry	Fleming			
Philip	Davies			
Susan	Cumming	not applicable		
Ronald	Edge	Construction Industry		
Gordon	Mussett	Little Braxted Parish Council		
Ronnie	Tongue	state school		
Sue	Dobson	Essex Bridleways Association		
David	Webb			
Andrew	Marsh	Historic England		
Brian	Haydon			
Hazel	Notley			
Jean	Brown		Nobody wants Bradwell Power Station to be developed into another nuclear facility as far as I know. If there was ever a problem with a radiation leak then Tollesbury would not be able to evacuate quickly enough.	The Council is considering having a major infrastructure projects policy because there are a number of national strategic projects which cover the District and the Council should be able to set out in policy terms its approach to these. Some of them like Bradwell B may not happen in the life of the Plan but then again they might so instead of spreading the policy throughout the plan it will be contained in one place only to be activiated in decision making if needed. The Council is not the decision maker in regards to Bradwell B site.
Joanne	McGinity			
Stuart	Dedman	Nil		
Kerry	McKenna			
Penny	McCauley	Tiptree dental		
Jane	Phillips	Solicitors		
David	Rees			
Darren	Weeks			
Phil	Manning			
Peter	Clack		Bradwell B is a major blight on the District and should be considered against the ability to provide green energy provision such as off-shore wind or solar. The Dengie cannot sustain the provision and the wider impacts that this brings with it. It should be resisted at all costs. The District Council also needs to be more proactive in the increasing air traffic associated with planes flying low over our Towns and Villages, particularly Burnham-on-Crouch and those in the vicinity.	The Council is considering having a major infrastructure projects policy because there are a number of national strategic projects which cover the District and the Council should be able to set out in policy terms its approach to these. Some of them like Bradwell B may not happen in the life of the Plan but then again they might so instead of spreading the policy throughout the plan it will be contained in one place only to be activiated in decision making if needed. The Council is not the decision maker in regards to Bradwell B site.
Doug	Lockwood	National Grid		
Sally	George			
Vara	Szajkowski			
Bob	Calver			
Tessa	Lambert	Natural England		
Dawn	Howles			

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 17. 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?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
natasha	frith		If the Bradwell B plan is approved the larger impact on this will put unsuportable pressure on local roads/infrastructure and will mean that we will be unable to retain the identity of our villages.	The Council is considering having a major infrastructure projects policy because there are a number of national strategic projects which cover the District and the Council should be able to set out in policy terms its approach to these. Some of them like Bradwell B may not happen in the life of the Plan but then again they might so instead of spreading the policy throughout the plan it will be contained in one place only to be activiated in decision making if needed. The Council is not the decision maker in regards to Bradwell B site.
Anthony	Bates			
Russell	Howles	WSP		
Gillian	Hollamby			
Brian	Townsend			
Malcolm	Finch			
Peter	Taylor	Retired		
Chris	Melbourne		this should be a separate entity and if it comes to pass be managed by central government with provision/compensation for the residents of MDC	The Council is considering having a major infrastructure projects policy because there are a number of national strategic projects which cover the District and the Council should be able to set out in policy terms its approach to these. Some of them like Bradwell B may not happen in the life of the Plan but then again they might so instead of spreading the policy throughout the plan it will be contained in one place only to be activiated in decision making if needed. The Council is not the decision maker in regards to Bradwell B site.
Robert	Hollamby		The Bradwell B power station project should include provision to upgrade roads connecting through to major arterial roads such as A12, A130, A13. With upgraded roads, development of housing and associated development could be considered beyond existing road infrastructure, always subject to public transport availability and pedestrian access to facilities such as shops and schools etc.	Support noted
Kate	Priest	Purleigh Community Primary School		
Gary	SPICER			
Helen	Bridge			
Melanie	Allen	Government		
Adam	Medlycott			
Joanne	Maloney			
Portia	Roelofs		I oppose the building of a new nuclear power station (Bradwell B) in Bradwell-on-Sea. Climate change will cause various forms of volatility and instability in the coming years, this amplifies the risks of nuclear power making it untenable. Moreover, the plans threaten the unique countryside and habitats of the Dengie Peninsula. It threatens the Othona Community of which I am a member going back 25 years.	The Council is considering having a major infrastructure projects policy because there are a number of national strategic projects which cover the District and the Council should be able to set out in policy terms its approach to these. Some of them like Bradwell B may not happen in the life of the Plan but then again they might so instead of spreading the policy throughout the plan it will be contained in one place only to be activiated in decision making if needed. The Council is not the decision maker in regards to Bradwell B site.
Lisa	Singh	Direct Call Centres Ltd		
Kevin	Head		For reasons set out in 12.5 - 12.8.	Support noted
Elizabeth	Sawyer Bayliss		What should be stated here in the LDP is that the development of the power station will be resisted since it will undermine the intentions of the Council in all regards.	The Council is considering having a major infrastructure projects policy because there are a number of national strategic projects which cover the District and the Council should be able to set out in policy terms its approach to these. Some of them like Bradwell B may not happen in the life of the Plan but then again they might so instead of spreading the policy throughout the plan it will be contained in one place only to be activiated in decision making if needed. The Council is not the decision maker in regards to Bradwell B site.
Michael	Partridge			
Kenneth	Northfield			
Jerry	Petts			
Frederick	McMahon			
Tracey	Merritt	Dengie Hounds and Horses		
Jo	Crump	Servoca Secure Soutions		
Susan	ARCHER			
Winifred	Sutherland		Houses would decrease in value and tourists would not visit anywhere around Bradwell and surrounding areas including Maldon. It would also completely ruin this part of our county and many I am sure would want to leave. There is also the small possibility of a leak. The whole infrastructure to develop this would just decimate the whole area for miles around.	The Council is considering having a major infrastructure projects policy because there are a number of national strategic projects which cover the District and the Council should be able to set out in policy terms its approach to these. Some of them like Bradwell B may not happen in the life of the Plan but then again they might so instead of spreading the policy throughout the plan it will be contained in one place only to be activiated in decision making if needed. The Council is not the decision maker in regards to Bradwell B site.
Chris	clark			
Jeremy	Richardson			
Cheryl	Carter	Education		
Susan	Mason			
Melad	Kamlow			
Dave	Draper	The Hartford Insurance Group		
Kevin	Cooper			
Katherine	Whitehouse			
Linda	Soul			

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 17. 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?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Robert	Wilson		including such a major infrastructure project will involve considerably more work and at best only guesses at what is required. The plan shoud be reviewd only when such a major project is actually aproved.	The Council is considering having a major infrastructure projects policy because there are a number of national strategic projects which cover the District and the Council should be able to set out in policy terms its approach to these. Some of them like Bradwell B may not happen in the life of the Plan but then again they might so instead of spreading the policy throughout the plan it will be contained in one place only to be activiated in decision making if needed. The Council is not the decision maker in regards to Bradwell B site.
Sarah-Jayne	Hunt	SJ Aesthetics LTD		
Jonathan	Hunt			
Deborah	de Boltz	Farleigh Hospice		
Tim	Murphy			
Claire	McGrane			
Tracey	Munford	NA		
Rowan	Rampersad			
LUKE	MACFARLANE	S A RAVEN		
Anna	Wombwell	Morris Farm		
Ronald	Owen	Not applicable	Oppose development of Bradwell B Nuclear Power Station. No allowance should be made for its future activation.	The Council is considering having a major infrastructure projects policy because there are a number of national strategic projects which cover the District and the Council should be able to set out in policy terms its approach to these. Some of them like Bradwell B may not happen in the life of the Plan but then again they might so instead of spreading the policy throughout the plan it will be contained in one place only to be activiated in decision making if needed. The Council is not the decision maker in regards to Bradwell B site.
Elizabeth	Johns			
Colin	Day			
Natalie	Bradford			
Harriet	Hurst-Smith			
Tony	Vanner			
Josie	Vanner			
Tracy	Carroll			
Ian	Roberts	N/A		
Tony	Ashton	none		
mandy	SHORT			
Kevin	Money	St. Lawrence Parish Council		
Claire	Udall	1		
Linda	Raffray			
John	Cooper			
Leah	Jewiss			
Elaine	Ketley	South Woodham Ferrers Town Council		
Ruth	Bull	The Othona Communty	As the LDP can play a crucial role in helping inform the Local Impact Report on the paused Development Consent Order for Bradwell B, we use this platform of consultation to state that Bradwell B will have a very serious impact on the Othona Community. It will impact tranquillity, big skies and uninterrupted views, natural wildlife habitats which Othona now enhances, and associated mental wellbeing. It will encroach on our land. It goes against the principles of the LDP in sustainability and preservation of village life in Bradwell on Sea, and will possibly have a terminal impact on Othona's long-term contribution to local tourism due to the unacceptability of this nuclear development, including the noise and disruption over many years of construction. Bradwell on Sea is a unique area of saltmarsh and marine conservation importance, in a District with weather conditions ideal for the production of wind and solar energy generation. We submit that Bradwell B will disrupt tourism, the building of it will not be carbon neutral (concrete, commuting, construction), it will disrupt local views and local tourism, including the Othona Community and Bradwell on Sea.	The Council is considering having a major infrastructure projects policy because there are a number of national strategic projects which cover the District and the Council should be able to set out in policy terms its approach to these. Some of them like Bradwell B may not happen in the life of the Plan but then again they might so instead of spreading the policy throughout the plan it will be contained in one place only to be activiated in decision making if needed. The Council is not the decision maker in regards to Bradwell B site.
Mark	Jackson	Mark Jackson Planning	From experience elsewhere in the region, it will be fundamental to address infrastructure requirements for the Power Station and importantly ensure the accommodation requirements for the construction workers and operatives are met within the District.	The Council is considering having a major infrastructure projects policy because there are a number of national strategic projects which cover the District and the Council should be able to set out in policy terms its approach to these. Some of them like Bradwell B may not happen in the life of the Plan but then again they might so instead of spreading the policy throughout the plan it will be contained in one place only to be activiated in decision making if needed. The Council is not the decision maker in regards to Bradwell B site.
ann	cutting			
Sharon	Cushen			
Ian	Tooley			
Sally	Tokeley			
Christina	Chan		Specifically transport and support of additional migration of workers and families associated with the facility.	The Council is considering having a major infrastructure projects policy because there are a number of national strategic projects which cover the District and the Council should be able to set out in policy terms its approach to these. Some of them like Bradwell B may not happen in the life of the Plan but then again they might so instead of spreading the policy throughout the plan it will be contained in one place only to be activiated in decision making if needed. The Council is not the decision maker in regards to Bradwell B site.
Tim.	Holdsworth			
Graham	Snow			
Sarah	Packard			

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 17. 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?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Martin	Cook			
Clifford	Brown			
Steve	Gallant	Crouch Valley Defence Group		
Lesley	Woodley			
Kirsty	Rowsell			
Philip	Wakeling		Yes because the sheer scale of what is proposed at Bradwell will significantly and adversely impact the District	Support noted
David	Brock		Local plan should be strongly objecting to China involvement and indeed any other unfriendly state involvement in Nuclear on our door step. Among other things the LDP needs to considering big impact on housing needs if such a plant arrives - the workers and families would have to live somewhere practically close to Bradwell. This means all best intentions of any LDP not taking this into account would be throw out of window as the impact on the local area would be huge.	The Council is considering having a major infrastructure projects policy because there are a number of national strategic projects which cover the District and the Council should be able to set out in policy terms its approach to these. Some of them like Bradwell B may not happen in the life of the Plan but then again they might so instead of spreading the policy throughout the plan it will be contained in one place only to be activiated in decision making if needed. The Council is not the decision maker in regards to Bradwell B site.
Niki	Halls			
Stewart	Geden			
Anita	Thomas	Bank		
Andrew	Ashworth			
michael	smith			
Simon	Priest			
Philippa	Marshall			
Lewis	Cook	Form Architecture Ltd.		
EDWARD	GITTINS	Edward Gittins & Associates		
Steve	Williamson			
James	Cowell	E & B R Cowell		
Colin	Hawkes			
Ronald	PIPER			
John	McLarty			
John	McLarty			
Norman	Branch	N/A		
John	McLarty			
James	Clarke			
David	Stilwell			
Ann	Thomas			
michael	harris			
Geoffrey	Cox			
John	McLarty			
Barrington	Thomas			
Richard	Edwards		If the Bradwell project goes ahead the all options are off as it will completely change the character of the Dengie, partiularly with regard to transport inrstructure, and hence its development potential	The Council is considering having a major infrastructure projects policy because there are a number of national strategic projects which cover the District and the Council should be able to set out in policy terms its approach to these. Some of them like Bradwell B may not happen in the life of the Plan but then again they might so instead of spreading the policy throughout the plan it will be contained in one place only to be activiated in decision making if needed. The Council is not the decision maker in regards to Bradwell B site.
Robyn	Woloszczuk			
Lesley	Speller			
Nicola	O'Dean	Balgores Motors		
Alexander	Romang			
Hayley	Holgate	ECC	These will have a huge effect on our already inadequate transport system. New roads should be built to ease congestion but are rarely included in the schemes. The South woodham ferrers development is a prime example of this, expecting traffic to use an road already gridlocked now.	The Council is considering having a major infrastructure projects policy because there are a number of national strategic projects which cover the District and the Council should be able to set out in policy terms its approach to these. Some of them like Bradwell B may not happen in the life of the Plan but then again they might so instead of spreading the policy throughout the plan it will be contained in one place only to be activiated in decision making if needed. The Council is not the decision maker in regards to Bradwell B site.
Eirlys	Parry	N/A		
Michael	Unwin	N/A		
Tony	Barber			
Nick	Mason	ECOClassics		
Melanie	Osborne	Motor Trade		
Stuart	Turner	Essex search and rescue		
Mike	Carpenter	CODE Development Planners Ltd		
ian	wilson	cm36pt		
c/o Agent	c/o Agent			
kelly	tilley			
Catherine	Bicknell	Mid and South Essex Health and Care Partnership		
N	Baseley	IBA Planning Ltd		

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 17. 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?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Sue	White		From the road infrastructure, it is vital that this is considered, particularly on the Lower Burnham Road, as this is already a bottleneck and with the new developments in SWF is going to be a disaster. We must mitigate and push for this now. From a residential planning point, I dont think that there is any need to include this in the LDP, as this will be decided at Government level and the District has little say.	The Council is considering having a major infrastructure projects policy because there are a number of national strategic projects which cover the District and the Council should be able to set out in policy terms its approach to these. Some of them like Bradwell B may not happen in the life of the Plan but then again they might so instead of spreading the policy throughout the plan it will be contained in one place only to be activiated in decision making if needed. The Council is not the decision maker in regards to Bradwell B site.
Sarah	Yates		The bradwell b should not be going ahead full stop. The impact to the local environment, the fact that the local roads are not built for this purpose to sustain the building of such a mammoth project and the negative impact to neighbouring villages, towns is unacceptable.	The Council is considering having a major infrastructure projects policy because there are a number of national strategic projects which cover the District and the Council should be able to set out in policy terms its approach to these. Some of them like Bradwell B may not happen in the life of the Plan but then again they might so instead of spreading the policy throughout the plan it will be contained in one place only to be activiated in decision making if needed. The Council is not the decision maker in regards to Bradwell B site.
Leonard	Lewis		The amount of proposed housing to do with the Bradwell power station and its surrounding area must be counted in the total amount of housing requirements for the Maldon District in the LDP.	Housing in connection with Bradwell B if it goes ahead could be over the housing requirement presently set out for the District, the Council would look at this matter at the time.
R	Minney			
Tim	Grant	Evolution Town Planning		
ANNE	OSBORN	Purleigh Community Shop		
Stephen	Hodgkinson		For reasons set out in 12.5 - 12.8.	Support noted
c/o Agent	c/o Agent	Maldon Wick Limited		
ZOE	HOSTY			
S	Swain			
Kevin	Coleman	Phase 2 Planning		
John	Lawrence			
Diane	Wallace			
Jonathan	Aldis	Good life Countryside Services		
Grace	Godwin			
Sue	Hillman			
michael	carr	NHS		
Simon	Plater	Plater+Claiborne		
Mark	Anderson			
Karen	Wellum			
Emma	Wright			
Linda	Coom		As there's a risk it could be forced on us, I don't believe we have any choice other than to have a contingency plan.	Support noted
Caitlin	Soul			
Michelle	Curtis	Tollesbury Parish Council		
Mary	Hammond			
Ian	Drinkwater			
john	hand	N/A		
Emma	Smith	Bradwell on Sea Parish Council	We are aware that not all sites identified in the 'Call for Sites' interactive map are required to be incorporated within the Local Development Plan immediately, in order to meet the short term target for new houses. We also recognise that the draft document states that the land in Bradwell on Sea (BRS3) is not to be considered unless it is needed by the Bradwell B Power Station. The current world situation makes the Chinese CGN/BRB plan unlikely, however, as you point out this has been a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project and Bradwell is still considered to be a suitable site for nuclear development. We would also question the amount of land set aside for the proposed Bradwell B power station – 154 hectares. If as you say this development would only be implemented if the Chinese Nuclear plant were to go ahead, this is far in excess of the land needed for 'up to 500 permanent homes' leaving it open to speculation and development at a further time. We therefore suggest that to include BRS3 in this plan is very much unnecessary and premature.	At the present time the Council cannot comment on whether individual settlements or sites can or cannot accommodate future growth.The LDP Review process has to plan for future growth and it will have to be accommodated within the District. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and this was one of the reasons for the Issues and Options Consultation. In the coming months work will be undertaken to make the necessary decision using the evidence prepared as part of the LDP Review work. The Council is considering having a major infrastructure projects policy because there are a number of national strategic projects which cover the District and the Council should be able to set out in policy terms its approach to these. Some of them like Bradwell B may not happen in the life of the Plan but then again they might so instead of spreading the policy throughout the plan it will be contained in one place only to be activiated in decision making if needed. The Council is not the decision maker in regards to Bradwell B site.
Tim	Dixon		I strongly oppose the Bradwell B Nuclear Power Station proposed development, but while that development remains a possibility the LDP Review must surely take into account all the major infrastructure that such a project would demand, particularly the new roads that would be required to transport all the construction traffic and the associated large workforce.	The Council is considering having a major infrastructure projects policy because there are a number of national strategic projects which cover the District and the Council should be able to set out in policy terms its approach to these. Some of them like Bradwell B may not happen in the life of the Plan but then again they might so instead of spreading the policy throughout the plan it will be contained in one place only to be activiated in decision making if needed. The Council is not the decision maker in regards to Bradwell B site.
Nicola	Taylor	Elixirr	any local development plan needs to ensure all development needs across the distract to ensure a holistic approach and avoid duplications of cost and effort.	The Council is considering having a major infrastructure projects policy because there are a number of national strategic projects which cover the District and the Council should be able to set out in policy terms its approach to these. Some of them like Bradwell B may not happen in the life of the Plan but then again they might so instead of spreading the policy throughout the plan it will be contained in one place only to be activiated in decision making if needed. The Council is not the decision maker in regards to Bradwell B site.
Graham	Johnson	graham v johnson		

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 17. 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?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Chris	Yates		The bradwell b should not be going ahead full stop. The impact to the local environment, the fact that the local roads are not built for this purpose to sustain the building of such a mammoth project and the negative impact to neighbouring villages, towns is unacceptable.	The Council is considering having a major infrastructure projects policy because there are a number of national strategic projects which cover the District and the Council should be able to set out in policy terms its approach to these. Some of them like Bradwell B may not happen in the life of the Plan but then again they might so instead of spreading the policy throughout the plan it will be contained in one place only to be activiated in decision making if needed. The Council is not the decision maker in regards to Bradwell B site.
Sally	Everritt	Community360		
Mark	Garrett			
Paul	Vidler			
Victoria	Long			
Victor	Staines			
Jayne	Moore	Essex County Fire and Rescue Service		
Kevin	Bennett			
Nicholas	Matthams		There would need to be a complete re-evaluation of the LDP should this go forward.	The Council is considering having a major infrastructure projects policy because there are a number of national strategic projects which cover the District and the Council should be able to set out in policy terms its approach to these. Some of them like Bradwell B may not happen in the life of the Plan but then again they might so instead of spreading the policy throughout the plan it will be contained in one place only to be activiated in decision making if needed. The Council is not the decision maker in regards to Bradwell B site. This is so the Plan would not need to be reviewed.
Christian	van Stolk	RAND Europe		
Nicholas	Jepson			
Pamela	Lacey			
Chloe	Soul			
carole	kirk			
Sharon	Jackson			
RICHARD	GROUT			
Charles	Bishop			
Paul	Jewiss	Self Employed		
Deborah	Anderson	NHS		
John	Pilgrim	Self employed	It is necessary to have plans in place in case this development happens.	Support noted
Gloria	Gold	London Design and Engineering UTC		
Linda	Curry		Although I am against the project, it is sensible to be prepared for the impact this build would have on the area.	Support noted
Lucy	Waterhouse			
Jon	Mayhew			
James	Goody	James Goody refurbishments		
Johanna	Dale		I think, however, that the council should also re-state its opposition to Bradwell B within the plan, while making clear that should it go ahead the council will work hard to maximise benefits and minimise the undoubted harm the project would do to the district.	The Council is considering having a major infrastructure projects policy because there are a number of national strategic projects which cover the District and the Council should be able to set out in policy terms its approach to these. Some of them like Bradwell B may not happen in the life of the Plan but then again they might so instead of spreading the policy throughout the plan it will be contained in one place only to be activiated in decision making if needed. The Council is not the decision maker in regards to Bradwell B site. The Council should not state its opposition to the Bradwell B site this could prejudice the Council if we had to negoitate for mitigation in the future, it is better to take a neutral stance in policy terms in the Plan.
Tracy	Kinnane			
Carlos	Rodriguez			
Rebecca	Tucker			
Mark	Faraway			
T	Ketteley			
Elizabeth	Weston			
Jacky	Barber			
Ursula	Benjafield			
Paul	Mitchell			
Kristian	Tokeley	CTC Construction Ltd		
Ziyad	Thomas	Churchill Retirement Living / McCarthy Stone		
James	Campbell	HMPPS	I do not know of anybody who wants the Bradwell B plant to move forward as it could be significantly detrimental to the local area in ways of traffic/pollution and further influx of people looking to move to the area whilst building it and therefore rising prices further. I think it would be good to have more scrutiny of these major developments in our area.	The Council is considering having a major infrastructure projects policy because there are a number of national strategic projects which cover the District and the Council should be able to set out in policy terms its approach to these. Some of them like Bradwell B may not happen in the life of the Plan but then again they might so instead of spreading the policy throughout the plan it will be contained in one place only to be activiated in decision making if needed. The Council is not the decision maker in regards to Bradwell B site.
William	Moss			
Simon	Mackenzie Smith		keep nuclear considerations separate, particularly given recent issues with Russia	Comment noted.
Richard	Udall			
Rosalind	Bishop			

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 17. 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?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
John	Symington			
Michael	Manning			
Jack	Inglis	Kelvedon Hall		
Peggy	Shields		This would cause major road link issues even on the proposed road links	The Council is considering having a major infrastructure projects policy because there are a number of national strategic projects which cover the District and the Council should be able to set out in policy terms its approach to these. Some of them like Bradwell B may not happen in the life of the Plan but then again they might so instead of spreading the policy throughout the plan it will be contained in one place only to be activiated in decision making if needed. The Council is not the decision maker in regards to Bradwell B site.
Dawn	Adams	Catesby Estates		
Wayne	Tilley	RTG Group Limited	It's all well and good to keep developing on the Dengie but the nearest A&E is Broomfield. We need infrastructure in place before we keep building houses ie Hospitals, Schools, rail links, Doctors & Dentists	The Council is considering having a major infrastructure projects policy because there are a number of national strategic projects which cover the District and the Council should be able to set out in policy terms its approach to these. Some of them like Bradwell B may not happen in the life of the Plan but then again they might so instead of spreading the policy throughout the plan it will be contained in one place only to be activiated in decision making if needed. The Council is not the decision maker in regards to Bradwell B site.
David	Dronfield	Braxted park		
John	Peirson			
Ron	Brown	Corporate		
Roger	HAWES			
Anne	Hull	Elmwood Equestrian Centre		
Matthew	Bloxham	Matt		
Julia	Morris			
Amanda	MacKenzie			
Jenny	Shepherd			
Jack	Ellum		yes of course	Support noted
Bernard	Steeples			
Anna	mccomb	NHS Property Services Ltd		
Natalie	Kermath	Environment Agency		
Peter	Knights			
Unknown	Unknown	Ministry of Defence		
Duncan	Clark		Yes. It’s obviously a huge issue locally but needs to address infrastructural and environmental concerns.	Support noted
Patricia	Smith			
Mick	Sargeant			
John	Cockerell	Hatfield Peverell Parish Council		
Catherine	Williams	C/O Savills (Agent)		
Tom	Kelly			
Linda	Gemmill			
Linda	Gemmill			
Mark	Norman	Highways England		
Thomasin	Foster			
*	*			
Alan	Massow			
*	*			
Ian	Butt			
Sarah	Sayer			
*	*			

Question 18

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 18. 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?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Jenny	Clemo	Langford & Ulting Parish Council	Very often these sites are distant from facilities and in unsustainable locations which require a motor car to access services, schools, jobs etc.	Comment noted and agreed, it is unlikely that the Council would support housing in areas where there is no access to services or facilities either by walking or public transport.
Gavin	Rowsell		All options should always be considered and reviewed individually, as it is the existing narrow-minded policies that have unnecessarily restricted small/local progress, yet allowed the industrial scale housing estates being built by multi-national companies.	The review of the LDP will have to include at a minimum 10% of housing growth on smaller sites of less than 1.0 hectare this should provide choice in the market and also allow for SME building companies to operate more fully in the District.
Gareth	Davies	N / A	In some cases this will be appropriate and enhance the local areas. However, formed sites of economic activity and local employment should primarily be repurposed for small business / commercial use to protect local jobs.	Comment noted and agreed, it is unlikely that the Council would support housing or employment in areas where there is no access to services or facilities either by walking or public transport. The re-purposing of sustainable disused agricultural buildings can assist in the boosting the local rural economy.
Jackie	Gibbs		Each plot needs to be reviewed on its impact on the people & landscape surrounding the area.	If the Council supported the reuse of agricultural buildings or derelict land they would have a policy against them and this would look to mitigate impact.
Mike	Hayes		Redevelopment of disused agricultural property adjacent to settlements can provide homes in sustainable locations whilst also enhancing the setting of the settlement itself. Greenfield sites adjacent to large villages must be considered for medium-size development to allow these service centres to grow and flourish. The site we are promoting on behalf of our client was considered in the recent Maldon Call for Sites under reference LD2. The site adjoins the village of Latchingdon. The conclusions were notably positive and the site is deliverable within 3 years for up to 31 dwellings in a sustainable location, just minutes from local services on foot.	The Council cannot respond on site specifics at this stage of LDP Review. Work on site allocations will be undertaken in the coming months with a Preferred Options consultation being carried out at the end of this period.
David	Sismey			
Stuart	Willsher	Persimmon Homes Essex	Persimmon Homes would endorse this approach – it is clear that to meet its housing targets that greenfield sites, which may include redundant agricultural sites and derelict sites, will need to be allocated for residential development.	Support noted
Anthony	Fittock		Not as a policy choice such development should be assessed against the policy	If the Council supported the reuse of agricultural buildings or derelict land they would have a policy against them and this would look to mitigate impact.
Daniel	McAllister	Robert Mulholland And Company Limited	It is unlikely that there are many locations where disused agricultural buildings are well located to rural settlements but where that situation occurs it would be reasonable to allow them to be developed for housing and employment. The amount of derelict land in suitable locations is likely to be vanishingly small so the likely contribution to meeting housing need may be limited.	Support and comment noted
Sarah	Sapsford		Brownfield sites should always be a first option as is looking at businesses that no longer trade. Flats or starter homes on the quest site instead of the costa. Farm buildings should be looked at on their merit, often they are remote or support wildlife. Whereas business needs change. Large developers are not interested in anything other than greenfield sites though	If the Council supported the reuse of agricultural buildings or derelict land they would have a policy against them and this would look to mitigate impact. Brownfield land is always the type of land looked at first when considering site allocations.
Stephanie	Ireland			
e	e	e	Re DISUSED AGRICULTURAL BUILDINGS: - It is better to use these than a fully green field site but most such buildings are not in sustainable locations, and I think that's the most important factor to consider - Converting agricultural buildings to holiday homes can contribute to the economy, although the building should be protected in some way from then becoming a permanent residence - Converting agricultural buildings to commercial use such as food processing or small office space would be better than conversion to a permanent residence - I would want to see a way to prevent a new "agricultural" building from being swiftly converted to residential use. It needs to have been genuinely used for agriculture for perhaps at least 20 years first, and there needs to be evidence that it has become genuinely unsuitable for that purpose. - Possibly agricultural buildings that are converted should remain tied to the farm to which they belong, and not sold off separately. Re DERELICT LAND (ie a brownfield site): Yes, provided the new homes would be connected appropriately to the adjacent settlement.	If the Council supported the reuse of agricultural buildings or derelict land they would have a policy against them and this would look to mitigate impact. Brownfield land is always the type of land looked at first when considering site allocations but only where they are in appropriate places in terms of connection to a settlement. At the present time the LDP does not set out clearly what the criteria is for the loss of anything, this will be rectified in the LDP review.
Kevin	Lagan			
Bethany	Jones	Colchester Borough Council	In principle small scale housing developments may be appropriate on areas of land where there are disused agricultural buildings or derelict land, however a blanket approach for villages of all sizes, may not be appropriate. Criteria based policies for the different village sizes and different levels of services and infrastructure available may be appropriate or an assessment on an individual village basis. Response is subject to call in until 15 March.	Support and comment noted
magnus	Magnusson	Parker Planning Services	All disused agricultural buildings in the district close to sustainable settlements could be considered for redevelopment for housing.	Support noted
Nick	Whiteley		Trying to keep in stead with housing from 50+ years ago is not ideal for future growth, provided the buildings aren't bright pink in the middle of a field, reducing the qualifiers for housing in small and medium villages. Keeping buildings in the same vein as the older buildings that exist in the district doesn't mesh with the idea of improving carbon efficiency and increasing green initiatives, these are new concepts.	Comments noted, carbon zero buildings do tend to be of a more modern design but that does not mean that local characteristics cannot be built into buildings its about picking up key colours, textures and massing.
Linda	Flowers	Self Employed	So long as people don't deliberately allow land to become 'derelict' for this purpose. Disused agricultural buildings are already covered by permitted development laws but these could maybe expanded to smaller plots?	Support and comment noted
Peter	Holmes		Yes but they would need to be small to avoid spoiling the rural nature of the village.	If the Council supported the reuse of agricultural buildings or derelict land they would have a policy against them and this would look to mitigate impact.
Colin	Pryke			
John	Hitcham			

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 18. 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?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Richard	Kelly	Croudace Homes	Whilst we consider housing is appropriate on areas of land where there are disused agricultural buildings, or derelict land in or adjacent to large, medium and small villages – there are two substantial points to consider. 1. Given the location of the agricultural buildings / agricultural land, they are often not sustainably located and would require substantial investment in respect of the provision of infrastructure etc to make development sustainable; and 2. In consideration of the high costs of providing the necessary infrastructure alongside undertaking the necessary remediation for example, this will inevitably impact the provision of affordable housing / social infrastructure. Development should therefore be focused on greenfield land adjacent to main settlements which are recognised as being "the most sustainable as they have the most functions and the best services and facilities including transport links and employment opportunities" that can support development more readily reducing the costs of providing the necessary infrastructure that supports communities. Subsequently, this will allow development to provide policy compliant levels of affordable housing alongside the necessary infrastructure as part of a viable new community. This is certainly the case with an urban extension to South Woodham Ferrers	If the Council supported the reuse of agricultural buildings or derelict land they would have a policy against them and this would look to mitigate impact. Brownfield land is always the type of land looked at first when considering site allocations, though the district does not have alot of brownfield land. The Council cannot respond on site specifics at this stage of LDP Review. Work on site allocations will be undertaken in the coming months with a Preferred Options consultation being carried out at the end of this period.
Andy	Quelch			
James	Rushton		This is clearly a sensitive issue. Subject to Maldon District Council maintaining its Objective to "ensure the protection of strategic gaps between development areas and settlements to safeguard their unique character and wider natural landscape setting", and subject to new builds in this scenario not taking place outside the defined settlement area of rural medium and small villages, it seems logical to consider this.	If the Council supported the reuse of agricultural buildings or derelict land they would have a policy against them and this would look to mitigate impact. There are no proposals to fill in strategic gaps between settlements these are considered important in terms settlement identity.
Catherine	Champion			
Terence	Hughes	Burnham-on-Crouch constituent	Change of usage to housing would be detrimental to future industrial or agricultural purposes. With the increase in population this is important.	Comment noted though some agricultural buildings can already be converted under permitted development rights.
John	Tompkins		Not withstanding central government policy related to COUPA applications, isolated, defunct agricultural buildings should be reused but only where there is a sustainable infrastructure available to support development and where the landscape views will not become scarred by carparking and other domestic paraphernalia. Developments have taken place under these rules often place an added burden onto the infrastructure of the small villages that cannot really be justified or accommodated. There is little or no control over design and layout that is sometimes incompatible with the site or its environs. Increasing density is never a satisfactory way of dealing the quantum issue. There is a danger that developments will fall into the 'back-to-back' classification or worse still go for medium rise developments. Neither of these are suitable for rural nor semi-rural areas. Residents should be able to expect a quality of life that the District can offer. Design becomes an important factor in this scenario to avoid potential 'ghettos' especially as a result of political, social, legal, environmental or economic pressure. High densities will increase the urbanisation of what was rural/semi-rural landscape. In terms of density, a sensible mix of housing and density is essential to ensure a balanced environment and community. Design and end-user requirements should dictate density and the mix of units. High density housing in small villages would be totally out of character and destroy what small amount of rural life remains. The District would lose its identity and become just another urban area as indeed some areas of Maldon are becoming. The policy of brownfield sites first is sound but it should not preclude the development of brownfield land for housing. As in all cases a measured approach would be effective for existing residents.	If the Council supported the reuse of agricultural buildings or derelict land they would have a policy against them and this would look to mitigate impact. Brownfield land is always the type of land looked at first when considering site allocations but only where they are in appropriate places in terms of connection to a settlement. Agricultural buildings are normally grouped quite close together so their conversion provides an opportunity for a higher density development which already could fit into the existing settlement.
Jeremy	Potter	Chelmsford City Council		
Daniel	Goodman	Rochford District council		
Chris	Harvey		This would seem to be a practicable way forward.	Support noted
Jane	Senior			
Amanda	Clack		It is important to be cognisant of The National Planning Policy Framework 2012, which includes the following statements that are critical considerations for any development: • Paragraph 17: Core principles focusing on effective use of land that has been previously developed (brownfield land) provided not of high environmental quality. The role and character of different areas should be taken into account including the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside. Local authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity. • Paragraph 109: Planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by protecting and enhancing local landscapes.	If the Council supported the reuse of agricultural buildings or derelict land they would have a policy against them and this would look to mitigate impact. Brownfield land is always the type of land looked at first when considering site allocations but only where they are in appropriate places in terms of connection to a settlement.
Daphne	Scott			
Kenny	Alexander	Thomas Gainsborough School	Due to to impact on environmental and infrastructure	If the Council supported the reuse of agricultural buildings or derelict land they would have a policy against them and this would look to mitigate impact. Brownfield land is always the type of land looked at first when considering site allocations but only where they are in appropriate places in terms of connection to a settlement.
David	Kennedy		It would be dependent upon where the land was and the accessibility to it	If the Council supported the reuse of agricultural buildings or derelict land they would have a policy against them and this would look to mitigate impact. Brownfield land is always the type of land looked at first when considering site allocations but only where they are in appropriate places in terms of connection to a settlement.

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 18. 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?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Mark	Behrendt	Home Builders Federation	If these are in appropriate locations and are considered to be developable then the Council should consider allocating such sites in the local plan.	If the Council supported the reuse of agricultural buildings or derelict land they would have a policy against them and this would look to mitigate impact. Brownfield land is always the type of land looked at first when considering site allocations but only where they are in appropriate places in terms of connection to a settlement.
Matthew	Cooper			
Terry	Inkpen	None	Each case should be subject to consultation with local villages.	Consultation is part of the LDP process.
christine	collins		it is sensible to assess brownfield site applications favourably rather than destroying more of the contryside	Support noted
Stuart	Williams	Ace group		
Reegan	Howles		Housing would be appropriate where there are disused agricultural buildings as these buildings have an existing volume which could be used to justify the scale of future developments and their visual impact. Derelict land adjacent to villages is not appropriate for housing unless it is considered unsightly or is a brownfield site.	If the Council supported the reuse of agricultural buildings or derelict land they would have a policy against them and this would look to mitigate impact. Brownfield land is always the type of land looked at first when considering site allocations but only where they are in appropriate places in terms of connection to a settlement.
jasbir	Singh		The development of land for housing in small villages makes very little sense. The infrastructure in villages such as Althorne is very poor and could not sustain the additional homes proposed.	Support noted though the Council cannot comment on individual settlements at this time.
Janice	Jackson			
Roy A	Clare	Charities	A blanket permission would encourage ad-hoc-ery … and lead to creeping urbanisation across the District, without supporting infrastructure.	If the Council supported the reuse of agricultural buildings or derelict land they would have a policy against them and this would look to mitigate impact. Brownfield land is always the type of land looked at first when considering site allocations but only where they are in appropriate places in terms of connection to a settlement.
Felicity	Gale			
Lindsey	Wright			
David	Hill	Dandara Ltd		
Steven	Potter		This is all right within villages, but disused agricultural buildings are rarely within or adjacent to villages and to redevelop them would in effect create small housing estates in the open countryside. Redundant agricultural buildings are far better suited to light industrial use.	If the Council supported the reuse of agricultural buildings or derelict land they would have a policy against them and this would look to mitigate impact. Brownfield land is always the type of land looked at first when considering site allocations but only where they are in appropriate places in terms of connection to a settlement.
Vysian	Banyard	TKPC	If this is the case the size of any development should be capped in order to protect the unique rural character of the Maldon District.	If the Council supported the reuse of agricultural buildings or derelict land they would have a policy against them and this would look to mitigate impact. It would not be possible to cap the numbers on this type of development as each site would have to be judged on its own merits. Brownfield land is always the type of land looked at first when considering site allocations but only where they are in appropriate places in terms of connection to a settlement.
Diane	Carter			
Luke	Garrett	Obsidian Strategic Asset Management Ltd	Do not wish to comment.	N/A
Robin	Fanshawe		I can only deal with my particular concerns which solely relate to the proposals for the overwhelming new development in Purleigh - listed as a 'large' village, which it is not, in any way even by the erroneous and flawed scoring criteria employed	At the present time the Council cannot comment on whether individual settlements can or cannot accommodate future growth.The LDP Review process has to plan for future growth and it will have to be accommodated within the District. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and this was one of the reasons for the Issues and Options Consultation. In the coming months work will be undertaken to make the necessary decision using the evidence prepared as part of the LDP Review work.
John	Brown			
Chris	Waumsley	Inovo Consulting		
Phil	Jacklin		This would need to be decided on a case by case basis rather than having a blanket policy.	If the Council supported the reuse of agricultural buildings or derelict land they would have a policy against them and this would look to mitigate impact. Brownfield land is always the type of land looked at first when considering site allocations but only where they are in appropriate places in terms of connection to a settlement.
Robert	Jones	The University of Reading		
Robert	Stephens	N/A	Effective use of land must also be compliant with NPPF. Delivering houses which become holiday lets, or second weekend homes should either be priced out of the market or a threshold should be set for the District Brownfield Site in Tollesbury, 62 New Road planning application 21/00343 is still lying fallow. The sporting phrase 'use it or lose' should be part of the new LDP policies. Such a policy could be used to disincentive land promotors banking land until such time as there are significant price increases in both land and properties.	If the Council supported the reuse of agricultural buildings or derelict land they would have a policy against them and this would look to mitigate impact. Brownfield land is always the type of land looked at first when considering site allocations but only where they are in appropriate places in terms of connection to a settlement.
Pete	Butcher		Agree	Support noted
JO	COOMBES			
Jonney	Aldridge		I don't like the term 'derelict land', abandoned and naturalised or naturalised brownfield sites are better but they can be some of the best for wildlife as much of farmland is becoming toxic to wildlife. So, non regenerative farmland can be used but not the best examples of regenerative farmland or woodland, hedgerows etc.	If the Council supported the reuse of agricultural buildings or derelict land they would have a policy against them and this would look to mitigate impact. Brownfield land is always the type of land looked at first when considering site allocations but only where they are in appropriate places in terms of connection to a settlement. However there comes a point when a site is so disused it has gone back to nature and it then actually becomes again a greenfield site.
Mark	Hurley	Selfridges	Statement too bland. Essex needs lots of new houses but these SHOUDL NOT be appended to existing towns or villages in large numbers, for all the reasons I've stated previously. To facilitate the new houses then the existing use of land will need to be changed, so yes I agree some farm land will need to be re-allocated.	Comment noted, yes it will not be possible to allocate the housing requirement on brownfield land so greenfield land will have to be used.

Question 18

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 18. 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?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Neil	Burke	Bradwell Power Generation Company Limited	Bradwell B do not have any specific comments to make on this question, but note that any allocation of housing land should take account of national policy which supports the development of a new nuclear power station at Bradwell B.	Comment noted, though the housing requirement cannot take into account a matter which is not being demonstrated that it is coming forward, we can have a specific policy but this will lie dormant until needed.
Lynne	Goodbourn			
Christopher	Kent		As long as the merit of each case is considered individually.	If the Council supported the reuse of agricultural buildings or derelict land they would have a policy against them and this would look to mitigate impact. Brownfield land is always the type of land looked at first when considering site allocations but only where they are in appropriate places in terms of connection to a settlement.
Sophie	Pryor		Yes the Council should seek to make use of these types of sites to create a robust housing delivery pipeline.	Support noted
c/o Agent	c/o Agent	Clarion Housing		
Stephanie	Jones	home		
Phillipa	Griffiths		See previous comments about building on green/brownfield sites	Comment noted
Matthew	Taylor		Each site would need to be assessed on it's merits as to how sustainable housing development would be in each location, and the impact that it may have on landscape, heritage, ecology and biodiversity. Access to and provision of services, amenities and local jobs is essential if we are to reduce the dependency placed upon the motor car, and take effective steps to tackle the climate change emergency	If the Council supported the reuse of agricultural buildings or derelict land they would have a policy against them and this would look to mitigate impact. Brownfield land is always the type of land looked at first when considering site allocations but only where they are in appropriate places in terms of connection to a settlement.
Anne	Bailey		No houses should be built on any land that can rightly be used for agruculture. Otherwise we would find our selves with a food shortage for humans and animals and have to pay vast amounts to import.	The district does not have a history of industrial land use so there is limited brownfield land opportunities or opportunities to build within settlement boundaries. Therefore it is inevitable that greenfield sites will be required to accommodate future growth. When carrying out site allocations, brownfield land should be prioritised in the settlements chosen for growth.
Lucien	Taylor			
David	Baker		The plan should prioritise the re development off brownfield sites and the potential to redevelop town centres before looking at village developments. Its is abundantly clear that shopping needs have altered forever and that consumers will choose online shopping over High Streets. To regenerate redundant high streets the district plan should consider how they could support domestic dwelling rather than attempt to reverse time and hope that consumers will return.	The district does not have a history of industrial land use so there is limited brownfield land opportunities or opportunities to build within settlement boundaries. Therefore it is inevitable that greenfield sites will be required to accommodate future growth. When carrying out site allocations, brownfield land should be prioritised in the settlements chosen for growth. The Council will as part of the LDP process be examining the size of the High Streets in the district and the policies connected with them.
Glenna	Wilkins			
Danny	Soul		This depends entirely on the definition of derelict land/disused buildings. What guarantees would there be that disused buildings would not be used as an excuse for planners to over-develop the surrounding area outside of the immediate vicinity of the buildings/derelict land?	If the Council supported the reuse of agricultural buildings or derelict land they would have a policy against them and this would look to mitigate impact. Brownfield land is always the type of land looked at first when considering site allocations but only where they are in appropriate places in terms of connection to a settlement.
Fiona	Barkham	Private Individual	Provided that the full range of considerations, sustainability, public transport, facilities and of course environmental considerations are considered as part of any planning application	If the Council supported the reuse of agricultural buildings or derelict land they would have a policy against them and this would look to mitigate impact. Brownfield land is always the type of land looked at first when considering site allocations but only where they are in appropriate places in terms of connection to a settlement.
Isabel	Adcock		Depending on proper access. All rural roads are busy now. There needs to be a realistic attitude to transport -2 car households are the minimum. If you want to keep young people in these areas then planning must include parking that is realistic. Many children get driving lessons as a necessity on their 17 birthdays then cars. Public transport gets them to school and home but not for a social life or for work. From my village you need a car if your job can't let you get to a bus stop by 17.45 - which most don't.	If the Council supported the reuse of agricultural buildings or derelict land they would have a policy against them and this would look to mitigate impact. Brownfield land is always the type of land looked at first when considering site allocations but only where they are in appropriate places in terms of connection to a settlement.
alan	johnson	sky broadcasting	if you do it will encourage use of existing green fields as agricultural buildings so they can be then moved to housing	If the Council supported the reuse of agricultural buildings or derelict land they would have a policy against them and this would look to mitigate impact. Brownfield land is always the type of land looked at first when considering site allocations but only where they are in appropriate places in terms of connection to a settlement.
Victoria	Cutmore	Endurance Estates	The general point to be made about questions 18 to 23 is that Section 13 to which they relate contains so little to respond to. Nevertheless, they are important questions. In respect of Question 18, the possibility of such provision should be approached on a case by case basis, by means of criterion-based policies. Any benefits of environmental improvement should not override the requirements for sustainable development.	If the Council supported the reuse of agricultural buildings or derelict land they would have a policy against them and this would look to mitigate impact. Brownfield land is always the type of land looked at first when considering site allocations but only where they are in appropriate places in terms of connection to a settlement.
Jane	Potter	Purleigh Parish Council	18. The proposal to consider the delivery of housing where there are disused agricultural buildings, or derelict land in or adjacent to large, medium and small villages is appropriate within villages. Disused agricultural buildings are rarely within or adjacent to villages however and to redevelop them would in effect create small housing estates in the open countryside. Redundant agricultural buildings are far better suited to light industrial use.	If the Council supported the reuse of agricultural buildings or derelict land they would have a policy against them and this would look to mitigate impact. Brownfield land is always the type of land looked at first when considering site allocations but only where they are in appropriate places in terms of connection to a settlement. This may not necessarily be limited to housing.
Brian	Haydon	Cold Norton Parish Council	In instances where such development results in improvement to the physical and visual environment of the settlement. Consideration must be made of available infrastructure for health and education.	If the Council supported the reuse of agricultural buildings or derelict land they would have a policy against them and this would look to mitigate impact. Brownfield land is always the type of land looked at first when considering site allocations but only where they are in appropriate places in terms of connection to a settlement. .
Lee	Foster			

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 18. 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?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Vanessa	Horner		Provided it's small and does not impact on residents the immediate facility. Don't agree with derelict land if it could be used for farming but hasn't due to grants. Green spaces within villages be preserved.	If the Council supported the reuse of agricultural buildings or derelict land they would have a policy against them and this would look to mitigate impact. Brownfield land is always the type of land looked at first when considering site allocations but only where they are in appropriate places in terms of connection to a settlement. .Agreed that green spaces in a village should be protected and by being more flexible to allow expansion in some terms adjacent to a village this should help to do that.
Brian	Howson	Pharmaceutical company	No to any development	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth, the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months.
Marion	Gunn		Appropriate where such development improves physical and visual environment of the settlement but due consideration MUST also be given to local infrastructue (schools/healthcare/Transport	If the Council supported the reuse of agricultural buildings or derelict land they would have a policy against them and this would look to mitigate impact. Brownfield land is always the type of land looked at first when considering site allocations but only where they are in appropriate places in terms of connection to a settlement.
BRIAN	COLLINS		subject to an improvement to infrastructure	If the Council supported the reuse of agricultural buildings or derelict land they would have a policy against them and this would look to mitigate impact. Brownfield land is always the type of land looked at first when considering site allocations but only where they are in appropriate places in terms of connection to a settlement.
Peter	Lampard		Do not need to develop any more in Purleigh.	At the present time the Council cannot comment on whether individual settlements can or cannot accommodate future growth.The LDP Review process has to plan for future growth and it will have to be accommodated within the District. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and this was one of the reasons for the Issues and Options Consultation. In the coming months work will be undertaken to make the necessary decision using the evidence prepared as part of the LDP Review work.
Tim	Chilvers			
Elliott	George		Yes. However, the Council freely admit a paragraph 13.1 of the emerging Local Plan that it is inevitable that development of greenfield sites it going to be required due to the limited contribution brownfield sites can make towards supply across the District, a position we agree with.	Support noted.
Kate	Ellis		Incorrect classification of areas means it is hard to establish the reality of the potential plan. High quality lifestyle is outlined in the LDP - people have chosen to live in their current area and do not necessarily want further housing, they want a village lifestyle Purleigh is not a large village and definitely does not have the infrastructure or facilities to support further development as do many other areas on the list.	At the present time the Council cannot comment on whether individual settlements can or cannot accommodate future growth.The LDP Review process has to plan for future growth and it will have to be accommodated within the District. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and this was one of the reasons for the Issues and Options Consultation. In the coming months work will be undertaken to make the necessary decision using the evidence prepared as part of the LDP Review work.
Kevin	Ashman	Estates and Agency Strategic Land	There are a range of wider considerations which need to be taken into account, including the sustainability of the location (including access to public transport and services/facilities), environmental impacts (including on ecology), landscape and heritage impacts (where applicable) etc.	If the Council supported the reuse of agricultural buildings or derelict land they would have a policy against them and this would look to mitigate impact. Brownfield land is always the type of land looked at first when considering site allocations but only where they are in appropriate places in terms of connection to a settlement.
Jake	Nugent	Endurance Estates Ltd		
John	Buchanan			
Tim	Bradford	leadenhall	depends on location	If the Council supported the reuse of agricultural buildings or derelict land they would have a policy against them and this would look to mitigate impact. Brownfield land is always the type of land looked at first when considering site allocations but only where they are in appropriate places in terms of connection to a settlement.
Jacky	Bannerman	Woodham Walter Parish Council	Not withstanding central government policy related to COUPA applications, isolated, defunct agricultural buildings should be reused but only where there is a sustainable infrastructure available to support development and where the landscape views will not become scarred by carparking and other domestic paraphernalia. Developments have taken place under these rules often place an added burden onto the infrastructure of the small villages that cannot really be justified or accommodated. There is little or no control over design and layout that is sometimes incompatible with the site or its environs. Increasing density is never a satisfactory way of dealing the quantum issue. There is a danger that developments will fall into the 'back-to-back' classification or worse still go for medium rise developments. Neither of these are suitable for rural nor semi-rural areas. Residents should be able to expect a quality of life that the District can offer. Design becomes an important factor in this scenario to avoid potential 'ghettos' especially as a result of political, social, legal, environmental or economic pressure. High densities will increase the urbanisation of what was rural/semi-rural landscape. In terms of density, a sensible mix of housing and density is essential to ensure a balanced environment and community. Design and end-user requirements should dictate density and the mix of units. High density housing in small villages would be totally out of character and destroy what small amount of rural life remains. The District would lose its identity and become just another urban area as indeed some areas of Maldon are becoming. The policy of brownfield sites first is sound but it should not preclude the development of brownfield land for housing. As in all cases a measured approach would be effective for existing residents.	If the Council supported the reuse of agricultural buildings or derelict land they would have a policy against them and this would look to mitigate impact. Brownfield land is always the type of land looked at first when considering site allocations but only where they are in appropriate places in terms of connection to a settlement. Agricultural buildings are normally grouped quite close together so their conversion provides an opportunity for a higher density development which already could fit into the existing settlement.
Mark	Tentori	Mazdev Limited		
Peter	Ingram		Definitely	Support noted

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 18. 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?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Jane	Pilgrim			
Judith	Radcliffe		All existing structures of traditional build to be sensitively reused for housing where at all possible .	If the Council supported the reuse of agricultural buildings or derelict land they would have a policy against them and this would look to mitigate impact. Brownfield land is always the type of land looked at first when considering site allocations but only where they are in appropriate places in terms of connection to a settlement.
Christopher	Mabbutt	Burnham Primary School		
Mary	Putt		The density of housing in across the countryside areas is already too high. Any derilict buildings should be removed and the land offered to the vineyards to farm.	Unfortunately the planning system does not allow for this kind of action.
Alan	Shrimplin	N/A	Adopting OPTION 4 would help this happen, the other option would not	Comment noted and agreed it could assist.
Valerie	Coleby	Berrys		
Kevin	Bruce		Definitely - keep destroying agricultural land to as little as possible	Support noted
William	Shepherd			
victoria	newson	Childrens Nursery		
David	Banfield		If Essex does not have Brownfield sites possibly we are being unfairly pressured to have housing which is going to use Greenbelt which was meant to be protected. The laws are beingf changed it seems. Perhaps we should be trying to fight that. If we have to have the houses then finding derelict land is or previously used built on land is a sensible idea.	The district does not have a history of industrial land use so there is limited brownfield land opportunities or opportunities to build within settlement boundaries. Therefore it is inevitable that greenfield sites will be required to accommodate future growth. When carrying out site allocations, brownfield land should be prioritised in the settlements chosen for growth.
Phillip	Wright	CALA Homes (North Home Counties) Ltd		
.	.	SN Developments		
.	.	Cooper Property Holdings Ltd	See response to Qu.23 about the reuse of previously developed and derelict land.	The consultee supported in question 23 the redevelopment of brownfield land, therefore their support is noted.
Jane	Coleman	Maldon Town Council		
Roy	Martin	Mr Roy Martin	Yes, if done sympathetically to surroundings	If the Council supported the reuse of agricultural buildings or derelict land they would have a policy against them and this would look to mitigate impact. Brownfield land is always the type of land looked at first when considering site allocations but only where they are in appropriate places in terms of connection to a settlement.
Simon	Butler-Finbow	Pigeon Investment Management	As with the lack of brownfield sites in the District, there is also a lack of sustainable sites which currently occupy an existing disused agricultural building. MDC needs to ensure a balance is maintained in the plan period, and so it would not be unreasonable for a policy to be included to support the reuse of such sites, so long as this does not affect the allocation of sites sufficient to meet the full objectively assessed need, plus a buffer, but is potentially instead used as an addition to the windfall allowance.	If the Council supported the reuse of agricultural buildings or derelict land they would have a policy against them and this would look to mitigate impact. Brownfield land is always the type of land looked at first when considering site allocations but only where they are in appropriate places in terms of connection to a settlement.
sara	doran		i think yes if adjacent to large and medium villages, but I am not so keen on the changes to small villages - though if the need can be identified, and perhaps if the option to explore other employment or economic options have been exhausted. For example, I am very concerned that potential development of commercial space and industrial complex at great braxted - which if it goes ahead should inform the link to the new widened a12 without impact on the local c road network. This development should NOT at any point have a change of planning to include housing - as this need should e met elsewhere and this site is entirely inappropriate for housing. (there are already rumours of a plan to start commercial development and then possiblty switch planning to residential development of may hundreds of houses - this would be wholly inappropriate with poor accessibilty to local amenities and connection, and also have the issue of the pollution from the a12 (noise, air etc)	Support noted. Where the policy would apply, if brought in has yet to be determined. If the Council supported the reuse of agricultural buildings or derelict land they would have a policy against them and this would look to mitigate impact. Brownfield land is always the type of land looked at first when considering site allocations but only where they are in appropriate places in terms of connection to a settlement.
Colin	Horner	Villageretreat	Provided that it is small and does not impact on the residents in the immediate area. I don't agree agree with the use of derelict land if it could be used for farming but has not been due to allocation of grants. Green spaces within the villages should be preserved.	If the Council supported the reuse of agricultural buildings or derelict land they would have a policy against them and this would look to mitigate impact. Brownfield land is always the type of land looked at first when considering site allocations but only where they are in appropriate places in terms of connection to a settlement. .Agreed that green spaces in a village should be protected and by being more flexible to allow expansion in some terms adjacent to a village this should help to do that.
Robert	Scott	Lewis & Scott Retirement Living Ltd	Yes, however we need to consider the cost of infrastructure and how the development of brownfield land affects the delivery of affordable housing.	The thresholds for affordable land would be the same as greenfield land but sometimes the viability of developing brownfield land precludes affordable housing, however this does need to be wieghed against land that can be causing a blight to a surrounding area.
Rob	Bard			
Tim	Hann		I would consider this, but only on a small scale and it would be totally dependent on whether the existing settlement could sustain any propose development. Certainly nothing over single figure dwellings .	If the Council supported the reuse of agricultural buildings or derelict land they would have a policy against them and this would look to mitigate impact. It would not be possible to limit the developement to one dwelling because each site would be judged on its own merits. Brownfield land is always the type of land looked at first when considering site allocations but only where they are in appropriate places in terms of connection to a settlement.
Burnham	Town Council	Burnham on Crouch Town Council		
Justin	Barkham	Self employed	Provided that the full range of considerations, sustainability, public transport, facilities and of course environmental considerations are considered as part of any planning application	If the Council supported the reuse of agricultural buildings or derelict land they would have a policy against them and this would look to mitigate impact. Brownfield land is always the type of land looked at first when considering site allocations but only where they are in appropriate places in terms of connection to a settlement.

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 18. 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?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Poppy	Vidler	Crown Consumer Ltd	Whilst I am appalled to hear that in my life-time greenfield sites are now under consideration for building I accept residential development where appropriate so long as the locations are sympathetically developed whilst considering the beauty and tranquility of the local area and where appropriate services are made available and the identity of the villages retained.	The district does not have a history of industrial land use so there is limited brownfield land opportunities or opportunities to build within settlement boundaries. Therefore it is inevitable that greenfield sites will be required to accommodate future growth. When carrying out site allocations, brownfield land should be prioritised in the settlements chosen for growth and policy would be created to mitigate impact on these types of development.
Stephen	Sutton			
Tim	Madelin		For previously developed land ie not green field	Support noted
Joanna	Jeffery	Althorne Parish Clerk	Each case should be subject to consultation with local villages.	Each case would be consulted on if planning permission was required.
Paul	Coppin		There must be consideration made to the wider concerns of sustainability of that specific location of services and public transport, and its impact on heritage and the ;landscape.	If the Council supported the reuse of agricultural buildings or derelict land they would have a policy against them and this would look to mitigate impact. Brownfield land is always the type of land looked at first when considering site allocations but only where they are in appropriate places in terms of connection to a settlement. .
Steven	Bardwell	S P Bardwell Ltd		
David	Oxford	Lloyds Banking Group	Old agricultural buildings form part of the natural and heritage landscape. Meeting green sustainabilty, lanscape protection and reducing carbon footprint are critical to the protection of beautiful natural areas, local community and rare Bristish wildlife	If the Council supported the reuse of agricultural buildings or derelict land they would have a policy against them and this would look to mitigate impact. Brownfield land is always the type of land looked at first when considering site allocations but only where they are in appropriate places in terms of connection to a settlement. .
Stephen Francis	Dewick	Curry Farm	You should not assume every disused agricultural building or land would be a suitable site for development	If the Council supported the reuse of agricultural buildings or derelict land they would have a policy against them and this would look to mitigate impact. Brownfield land is always the type of land looked at first when considering site allocations but only where they are in appropriate places in terms of connection to a settlement. .
George	Dixon			
Douglas	Channer	Private	I do not know because I am not sure what may be derelict in the areas and think a study should have been done to help respond to this question ie: give an idea of where underused and derelict farm buildings may be .	If the Council supported the reuse of agricultural buildings or derelict land they would have a policy against them and this would look to mitigate impact. Brownfield land is always the type of land looked at first when considering site allocations but only where they are in appropriate places in terms of connection to a settlement. .
Lynda	Bugg		Only where and if appropriate for the place and necessary.	If the Council supported the reuse of agricultural buildings or derelict land they would have a policy against them and this would look to mitigate impact. Brownfield land is always the type of land looked at first when considering site allocations but only where they are in appropriate places in terms of connection to a settlement. .
Paul	Burgess	None		
D	Cooper		Entirely. This also applied to underutilised land which sits adjacent to existing built form and which contributes little to the wider landscape.	Support noted
C/O Agent	C/O Agent			
Zoe	May	East of England Ambulance Service NHS Trust	Any new housing development requires assessment on the suitability of existing stations, with potential to reduce, redevelop or extend and in certain instances relocate to a more suitable location. In addition to reviewing the suitability of premises, EEAST, also needs to consider the age, number and type of ambulance response vehicles and provision of latest medical equipment required to manage any increase in population growth. Additional ambulances and ambulance station response posts will be required in the area to support this additional population growth.	This may not always be possible, permitted development rights allows for some housing already and the LDP has to be flexible enough to adapt to changing circumstances and allow choice in both the housing and economic market.
Roger	Woodcock			
Braxted and Blackwater Conservation Grou	BBCG	The Braxted and Blackwater Conservation Group (BBCG)	There are a range of wider considerations which need to be taken into account, including the sustainability of the location (including access to public transport and services/facilities), environmental impacts (including on ecology), landscape and heritage impacts (where applicable) etc.	If the Council supported the reuse of agricultural buildings or derelict land they would have a policy against them and this would look to mitigate impact. Brownfield land is always the type of land looked at first when considering site allocations but only where they are in appropriate places in terms of connection to a settlement.
raymond	dundas	Householder	As long as any development was well designed and finished to a high standard including all necessary features to reduce carbon emissions.	If the Council supported the reuse of agricultural buildings or derelict land they would have a policy against them and this would look to mitigate impact. Brownfield land is always the type of land looked at first when considering site allocations but only where they are in appropriate places in terms of connection to a settlement. .
John	Watson		Not as a policy choice. Such development should be assessed against the policy	If the Council supported the reuse of agricultural buildings or derelict land they would have a policy against them and this would look to mitigate impact. Brownfield land is always the type of land looked at first when considering site allocations but only where they are in appropriate places in terms of connection to a settlement.
Josh	Plant	Gladmans		
*	*			
*	Willmott			
Ivor	Watson			
*	*			
*	*			
*	*			
*	*			
*	*			
*	*			

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 18. 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?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
*	*		Although the two parcels of land are not considered derelict areas or land that includes disused agricultural buildings, BDW Eastern would still highlight that the provision of housing adjacent to villages is appropriate provided that they are sustainable. The two Parcels of land, adjacent to the existing North Fambridge settlement, provide the perfect opportunity for the Council to achieve sustainable growth in proximity to the railway station.	The Council cannot respond on site specifics at this stage of LDP Review. Work on site allocations will be undertaken in the coming months with a Preferred Options consultation being carried out at the end of this period.
Ben	Binder	University of Adelaide		
Lorraine	Bailey	Wickham Bishops Parish Council		
Ali	Aldis		Yes but using a calculation to use the same square footage of the footprint of the original building with no exceptions that a development could be expanded at any further stage in the future.	If the Council supported the reuse of agricultural buildings or derelict land they would have a policy against them and this would look to mitigate impact. It would not be possible cap the amount of development because each site would be judged on its own merits. Brownfield land is always the type of land looked at first when considering site allocations but only where they are in appropriate places in terms of connection to a settlement.
David	Smye	The Maldon Society	Brownfield sites should be the first to be considered for redevelopment, not automatically just for housing.	Support noted and they could be considered for other uses such as employment.
Stewart	Newlands	Fambridge Lake		
Stewart	Newlands	Fambridge Lake		
Paula	Stanbury			
Sonia	Whiskin	Financial Services		
Geoffrey	Charge	n/a		
Robert	Collins			
Ben	Thornett			
Matthew	Wood	Phase 2 Planning		
Tim	Aves		The council should allow no more significant housing developments until the district has the schools, GP and dental surgeries, roads sewerage and other vital infrastructure to support all the people who have moved or are moving into the hundreds of homes already built in the past five years! No exceptions. It's time to say enough is enough. I have no problem with building houses per se. We desperately need more homes in this country and they have to go somewhere. However, I do not accept that any planning system worthy of the name should allow so much housing to be built without the infrastructure to support it. Developers should be legally obliged to pay much, much more from the vast profits they rake in from these sites and this should be channeled directly into infrastructure to suppo	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth, the Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months.
Helen	James		Only if the required infrastructure is built. You cannot build houses without dealing with doctors, dentists, schools and roads. The rail link from Maldon to the East Coast main line will never be reinstated and it's removal was a huge mistake	If the Council supported the reuse of agricultural buildings or derelict land they would have a policy against them and this would look to mitigate impact. Brownfield land is always the type of land looked at first when considering site allocations but only where they are in appropriate places in terms of connection to a settlement.
Kathy	Day			
Peter	Wakling			
Sara	Howarth			
Eissa	Leo			
Michele	Williams		Definitely this makes complete sense and village boundaries are irrational	Support noted
Tara	Strydom			
Jenny	Ball		It will depend on the settlement and the proposed building project(s). Its not possible to answer this question in blanket terms for the whole district.	If the Council supported the reuse of agricultural buildings or derelict land they would have a policy against them and this would look to mitigate impact. It would not be possible cap the amount of development because each site would be judged on its own merits. Brownfield land is always the type of land looked at first when considering site allocations but only where they are in appropriate places in terms of connection to a settlement.
Cliff	Baron			
Gill	Winsor	Tesco	Not big developments on derelict places but something that doesn't make a big difference to the village. When figures quoted are above 30 houses then it makes a whole difference to the whole village and the loss of 'village life' is not a good thing.	If the Council supported the reuse of agricultural buildings or derelict land they would have a policy against them and this would look to mitigate impact. It would not be possible cap the amount of development because each site would be judged on its own merits. Brownfield land is always the type of land looked at first when considering site allocations but only where they are in appropriate places in terms of connection to a settlement.
Emily	Benham	Servoca complex care and nursing		
Laura	Cannon			
Shaneen	Illanes		We shouldn't be building in green undeveloped land	The district does not have a history of industrial land use so there is limited brownfield land opportunities or opportunities to build within settlement boundaries. Therefore it is inevitable that greenfield sites will be required to accommodate future growth. When carrying out site allocations, brownfield land should be prioritised in the settlements chosen for growth.
Merryl	Quilter		Define derelict land? Also agricultural buildings..yes if a small development.	Derelict land is brownfield land which has become unsightly.
Bear	Keen			
Jessica	Cox		This should be decided on a case by case basis. Smaller developments of ~10 units or less would be appropriate in not over-developing these rural sites. Larger developments would not be appropriate or sustainable in rural areas and should be subject to a cap on size. The small and medium sized settlements in the district do not have the transport infrastructure to support large scale developments.	If the Council supported the reuse of agricultural buildings or derelict land they would have a policy against them and this would look to mitigate impact. It would not be possible to cap these type of developments as each should be judged on its own merits. Brownfield land is always the type of land looked at first when considering site allocations but only where they are in appropriate places in terms of connection to a settlement.

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 18. 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?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Robert	Burton		In Tillingham, if there is the odd unused derelict barn it could be developed in keeping with the area but 2 or 3 houses and not 10s or 60s, but would have to be affordable for the local younger generation	If the Council supported the reuse of agricultural buildings or derelict land they would have a policy against them and this would look to mitigate impact. It would not be possible to cap these type of developments as each should be judged on its own merits. Brownfield land is always the type of land looked at first when considering site allocations but only where they are in appropriate places in terms of connection to a settlement.
Yvonne	Wade			
Louise	Bywaters-Smith	Hospitality		
Brooke	Roberts-Morgan		Derelict houses/warehouses.	This would include these types of development.
Patricia	Bunkle			
Marc	Rawinsky	M R Sovereign Services Ltd		
Roger	Tiffn		not on agricultal land as we need to provide more food if we are to accept more people and not import it	The district does not have a history of industrial land use so there is limited brownfield land opportunities or opportunities to build within settlement boundaries. Therefore it is inevitable that greenfield sites will be required to accommodate future growth. When carrying out site allocations, brownfield land should be prioritised in the settlements chosen for growth.
Kathryn	Beighton	Publishing	Providing it is of a sensible scale and suitable design	If the Council supported the reuse of agricultural buildings or derelict land they would have a policy against them and this would look to mitigate impact. It would not be possible cap the amount of development because each site would be judged on its own merits. Brownfield land is always the type of land looked at first when considering site allocations but only where they are in appropriate places in terms of connection to a settlement.
Roy	Warren	Sport England		
STUART	SOWTER			
Mark	Raffray			
April	Rowley		Not agricultural fields	The district does not have a history of industrial land use so there is limited brownfield land opportunities or opportunities to build within settlement boundaries. Therefore it is inevitable that greenfield sites will be required to accommodate future growth. When carrying out site allocations, brownfield land should be prioritised in the settlements chosen for growth.
Bill	Withers			
joanna	jeffery			
John	Mitchell		Anyone can simply let land become derelict and use that as an excuse to build on it. Similarly the generous permitted development allowances for agricultural buildings and the like can be similarly abused. These all tend to be in remote locations which are not sustainable for residential development.	If the Council supported the reuse of agricultural buildings or derelict land they would have a policy against them and this would look to mitigate impact. It would not be possible cap the amount of development because each site would be judged on its own merits. Brownfield land is always the type of land looked at first when considering site allocations but only where they are in appropriate places in terms of connection to a settlement.
Peter	Layley			
Rex	Davenport			
Lesley	Mitchelmore	Danbury Parish Council		
Karen	Neath	Tolleshunt Major Parish Council	We would support this but it would need to be carefully considered with capping on the size of development and protection of landscape views.	If the Council supported the reuse of agricultural buildings or derelict land they would have a policy against them and this would look to mitigate impact. It would not be possible cap the amount of development because each site would be judged on its own merits. Brownfield land is always the type of land looked at first when considering site allocations but only where they are in appropriate places in terms of connection to a settlement.
N	DA			
Dorreen	Linton	our group consists of adults, playschool and brownies group		
John	Wileman			
Richard	Courtney	University Of East London	Yes this should be encouraged and should also include small scale commercial developments especially to support low carbon technical and professional businesses. These would be greatly improved with the proposed Bradwell B site	If the Council supported the reuse of agricultural buildings or derelict land they would have a policy against them and this would look to mitigate impact. It would not be possible cap the amount of development because each site would be judged on its own merits. Brownfield land is always the type of land looked at first when considering site allocations but only where they are in appropriate places in terms of connection to a settlement.
sue	Rawlinson	Evolve		
Douglas	Milsted	Heybridge Basin Conservation Society		
Alan	Outlaw	Self Emplyed	However, I disagree that there is not brown land that could be better utilised. The largely defunct Wyndeham print site in Heybridge is a prime example. It is a blight at the side of the canal walk, is largely unused and visually displeasing and would provide a fantastic opportunity for development. it has been closed as a major employer for the past eight years.	Passed this information onto the Officer who manages the Brownfield Land Register to assess whether it should be included.
Lindsey	Squire	North Fambridge Parish Council	In conjunction with the proposal to remove defined settlement boundaries this could result in inappropriate development affecting the open nature of the countryside and extension into the rural setting.	If the Council supported the reuse of agricultural buildings or derelict land they would have a policy against them and this would look to mitigate impact. It would not be possible cap the amount of development because each site would be judged on its own merits. Brownfield land is always the type of land looked at first when considering site allocations but only where they are in appropriate places in terms of connection to a settlement.

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 18. 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?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
K	Jeffries		We should retain our farming land we may need it later to feed ourselves	The district does not have a history of industrial land use so there is limited brownfield land opportunities or opportunities to build within settlement boundaries. Therefore it is inevitable that greenfield sites will be required to accommodate future growth. When carrying out site allocations, brownfield land should be prioritised in the settlements chosen for growth.
John	Lakin	?		
Samantha	Weeks		It depends on the size/number of houses, and what is meant by derelict land.	If the Council supported the reuse of agricultural buildings or derelict land they would have a policy against them and this would look to mitigate impact. It would not be possible cap the amount of development because each site would be judged on its own merits. Brownfield land is always the type of land looked at first when considering site allocations but only where they are in appropriate places in terms of connection to a settlement.
Carlie	Mayes			
Richard	Martin	Scott Properties		
Mike	Spurgeon	Phase 2 Planning and Development		
C/O Agent Mike	Spurgeon	Phase 2 Planning & Development		
Amanda	Mickelsen			
Samuel	Newton	Anglo European School		
Mary-Ann	Munford			
Jo	Harvey		On a small scale, this is not suitable for larger developments.	If the Council supported the reuse of agricultural buildings or derelict land they would have a policy against them and this would look to mitigate impact. It would not be possible cap the amount of development because each site would be judged on its own merits, however these type of sites are normally of a smaller scale. Brownfield land is always the type of land looked at first when considering site allocations but only where they are in appropriate places in terms of connection to a settlement.
Terry	Fleming		But only very small and linked to the agricultural operation of the farm, farmworkers cottages	If the Council supported the reuse of agricultural buildings or derelict land they would have a policy against them and this would look to mitigate impact. It would not be possible cap the amount of development or limit it to one type of housing because each site would be judged on its own merits. Brownfield land is always the type of land looked at first when considering site allocations but only where they are in appropriate places in terms of connection to a settlement.
Philip	Davies		Only if it is sustainable.	If the Council supported the reuse of agricultural buildings or derelict land they would have a policy against them and this would look to mitigate impact. It would not be possible cap the amount of development because each site would be judged on its own merits. Brownfield land is always the type of land looked at first when considering site allocations but only where they are in appropriate places in terms of connection to a settlement.
Susan	Cumming	not applicable		
Ronald	Edge	Construction Industry		
Gordon	Mussett	Little Braxted Parish Council	This would make sense – but does it have to be solely housing ? Is there an opportunity for small scale business parks ?	These type of developments are normally smaller scale and there may be an opportunity to broader the use to economic to help support the rural economy.
Ronnie	Tongue	state school		
Sue	Dobson	Essex Bridleways Association		
David	Webb			
Andrew	Marsh	Historic England		
Brian	Haydon			
Hazel	Notley			
Jean	Brown		The problem with taking Greenfield land is that we would then need to import more food, mostly grain, which again has an environmental cost as well as destroying wildlife.	The district does not have a history of industrial land use so there is limited brownfield land opportunities or opportunities to build within settlement boundaries. Therefore it is inevitable that greenfield sites will be required to accommodate future growth. When carrying out site allocations, brownfield land should be prioritised in the settlements chosen for growth.
Joanne	McGinity			
Stuart	Dedman	Nil		
Kerry	McKenna			
Penny	McCauley	Tiptree dental		
Jane	Phillips	Solicitors		
David	Rees			
Darren	Weeks			
Phil	Manning			
Peter	Clack			
Doug	Lockwood	National Grid		
Sally	George			
Vara	Szajkowski			
Bob	Calver			
Tessa	Lambert	Natural England		
Dawn	Howles			
natasha	frith			

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 18. 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?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Anthony	Bates		Has to be under strict controls	If the Council supported the reuse of agricultural buildings or derelict land they would have a policy against them and this would look to mitigate impact. Brownfield land is always the type of land looked at first when considering site allocations but only where they are in appropriate places in terms of connection to a settlement.
Russell	Howles	WSP		
Gillian	Hollamby			
Brian	Townsend			
Malcolm	Finch			
Peter	Taylor	Retired		
Chris	Melbourne			
Robert	Hollamby			
Kate	Priest	Purleigh Community Primary School		
Gary	SPICER		development should be on brownfield sites & not to the detriment of greenfield & loss of countryside	The district does not have a history of industrial land use so there is limited brownfield land opportunities or opportunities to build within settlement boundaries. Therefore it is inevitable that greenfield sites will be required to accommodate future growth. When carrying out site allocations, brownfield land should be prioritised in the settlements chosen for growth.
Helen	Bridge		Farmers are then tempted to deliberately downgrade used buildings and land for financial gain. Food security could then suffer.	The district does not have a history of industrial land use so there is limited brownfield land opportunities or opportunities to build within settlement boundaries. Therefore it is inevitable that greenfield sites will be required to accommodate future growth. When carrying out site allocations, brownfield land should be prioritised in the settlements chosen for growth.
Melanie	Allen	Government	https://www.maldon.gov.uk/empty_property_list Quest Motors - empty unit	Its not clear what this consultee is meaning.
Adam	Medlycott			
Joanne	Maloney			
Portia	Roelofs			
Lisa	Singh	Direct Call Centres Ltd	Provided the correct infrastructure exists and that it does not go against the character of the smaller villages. The proposed site ALT2 being a very good example.	If the Council supported the reuse of agricultural buildings or derelict land they would have a policy against them and this would look to mitigate impact. Brownfield land is always the type of land looked at first when considering site allocations but only where they are in appropriate places in terms of connection to a settlement. The Council cannot respond on site specifics at this stage of LDP Review. Work on site allocations will be undertaken in the coming months with a Preferred Options consultation being carried out at the end of this period.
Kevin	Head		Such sites on the edge of villages that are currently occupied by disused or redundant agricultural buildings or with poor quality soil conditions should be prioritised over better quality rural greenfield sites.	Support noted
Elizabeth	Sawyer Bayliss			
Michael	Partridge			
Kenneth	Northfield			
Jerry	Petts			
Frederick	McMahon			
Tracey	Merritt	Dengie Hounds and Horses	It is better to reduce the use of productive food producing land for housing by utilising non food productive/derelict land where possible.	The district does not have a history of industrial land use so there is limited brownfield land opportunities or opportunities to build within settlement boundaries. Therefore it is inevitable that greenfield sites will be required to accommodate future growth. When carrying out site allocations, brownfield land should be prioritised in the settlements chosen for growth.
Jo	Crump	Servoca Secure Soutions		
Susan	ARCHER			
Winifred	Sutherland		I understood greenbelt land should not be used for housing?	The Council is not a greenbelt authority. The district does not have a history of industrial land use so there is limited brownfield land opportunities or opportunities to build within settlement boundaries. Therefore it is inevitable that greenfield sites will be required to accommodate future growth. When carrying out site allocations, brownfield land should be prioritised in the settlements chosen for growth.
Chris	clark		Villages do not have the amenities or infrastructure so stick to the areas that do and do not pander to local wealthy farmers	The district does not have a history of industrial land use so there is limited brownfield land opportunities or opportunities to build within settlement boundaries. Therefore it is inevitable that greenfield sites will be required to accommodate future growth. When carrying out site allocations, brownfield land should be prioritised in the settlements chosen for growth.
Jeremy	Richardson		We must preseve our countryside. If there are derelict areas they should be returned to nature	The district does not have a history of industrial land use so there is limited brownfield land opportunities or opportunities to build within settlement boundaries. Therefore it is inevitable that greenfield sites will be required to accommodate future growth. When carrying out site allocations, brownfield land should be prioritised in the settlements chosen for growth.
Cheryl	Carter	Education		
Susan	Mason			
Melad	Kamlow			
Dave	Draper	The Hartford Insurance Group		

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 18. 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?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Kevin	Cooper			
Katherine	Whitehouse			
Linda	Soul			
Robert	Wilson			
Sarah-Jayne	Hunt	SJ Aesthetics LTD		
Jonathan	Hunt			
Deborah	de Boltz	Farleigh Hospice		
Tim	Murphy			
Claire	McGrane			
Tracey	Munford	NA	In most cases there is no infrastructure to support additional housing near villages. Capacity of current road network, schools, medical facilities and utility infrastructure has to be upgraded and increased before housing developments	If the Council supported the reuse of agricultural buildings or derelict land they would have a policy against them and this would look to mitigate impact. It would not be possible cap the amount of development because each site would be judged on its own merits. Brownfield land is always the type of land looked at first when considering site allocations but only where they are in appropriate places in terms of connection to a settlement.
Rowan	Rampersad		Anything other that Greenfield. Its environmentally important to maintain greenfield sites.	The district does not have a history of industrial land use so there is limited brownfield land opportunities or opportunities to build within settlement boundaries. Therefore it is inevitable that greenfield sites will be required to accommodate future growth. When carrying out site allocations, brownfield land should be prioritised in the settlements chosen for growth.
LUKE	MACFARLANE	S A RAVEN	here there are sites that utilise under used land adjacent to existing villages these should be a priority	The district does not have a history of industrial land use so there is limited brownfield land opportunities or opportunities to build within settlement boundaries. Therefore it is inevitable that greenfield sites will be required to accommodate future growth. When carrying out site allocations, brownfield land should be prioritised in the settlements chosen for growth.
Anna	Wombwell	Morris Farm		
Ronald	Owen	Not applicable	Purleigh is wrongly categorised a "large village". Purleigh parish covers a large area and contains a number of small communities with Purleigh village as its administrative centre. The village is a compact community within well defined boundaries and few facilities. The sewerage system is outdated with combined surface and foul water discharging to the small sewage works. The sewage plant is overloaded and unable to accept additional discharges. The village school is over-subscribed with local newcomers unable to secure places for their children. There is only one small shop, which is run by the community and doesn't include a post office. There are only poor and infrequent bus services serving the village. Purleigh should be re— categorised a "medium village ".	At the present time the Council cannot comment on whether individual settlements can or cannot accommodate future growth.The LDP Review process has to plan for future growth and it will have to be accommodated within the District. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and this was one of the reasons for the Issues and Options Consultation. In the coming months work will be undertaken to make the necessary decision using the evidence prepared as part of the LDP Review work.
Elizabeth	Johns		People move to a village to live in a quite area, not to be surrounded by large housing estates which poor infrastructure,	The district does not have a history of industrial land use so there is limited brownfield land opportunities or opportunities to build within settlement boundaries. Therefore it is inevitable that greenfield sites will be required to accommodate future growth. When carrying out site allocations, brownfield land should be prioritised in the settlements chosen for growth.
Colin	Day		I disagree with building on green open space outside the settlement boundary	The district does not have a history of industrial land use so there is limited brownfield land opportunities or opportunities to build within settlement boundaries. Therefore it is inevitable that greenfield sites will be required to accommodate future growth. When carrying out site allocations, brownfield land should be prioritised in the settlements chosen for growth.
Natalie	Bradford			
Harriet	Hurst-Smith			
Tony	Vanner		We live in purleigh with a estimated 2020 population of 1267 which you class as a LARGE Village. Yet St Lawrence has a estimated 2020 population of 1570 and Althorne has a estimated 2020 population of 1328 clearly more densely populated yet these are classed as MEDIUM villages ? I find this very difficult to understand And like most villages in area Purleigh for example have very narrow roads which are close to residents existing properties and would not be able to sustain the large volumes of traffic that the building of a substantial housing project would bring without greatly increased nuisance values Also Purleigh has 1 small community shop with no post office staffed by mainly volunteers that is open 5 days a week for 9 hrs and 4 hrs sat and 2 hrs sun	At the present time the Council cannot comment on whether individual settlements can or cannot accommodate future growth.The LDP Review process has to plan for future growth and it will have to be accommodated within the District. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and this was one of the reasons for the Issues and Options Consultation. In the coming months work will be undertaken to make the necessary decision using the evidence prepared as part of the LDP Review work.
Josie	Vanner		Purleigh is not a large village, it has one shop which does not have a post office, and the one cafe/restaurant is the local pub which is closed on Monday & Tuesday.	At the present time the Council cannot comment on whether individual settlements can or cannot accommodate future growth.The LDP Review process has to plan for future growth and it will have to be accommodated within the District. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and this was one of the reasons for the Issues and Options Consultation. In the coming months work will be undertaken to make the necessary decision using the evidence prepared as part of the LDP Review work.
Tracy	Carroll		Too much of the areas open/green land is being built upon which is having a huge negative impact on the local wildlife. It is imperative to retain as much of this land as possible, rather than continuing to destroy it. Green land, trees and nature are also incredibly important to the well-being of residents.	The district does not have a history of industrial land use so there is limited brownfield land opportunities or opportunities to build within settlement boundaries. Therefore it is inevitable that greenfield sites will be required to accommodate future growth. When carrying out site allocations, brownfield land should be prioritised in the settlements chosen for growth.
Ian	Roberts	N/A		
Tony	Ashton	none		
mandy	SHORT			
Kevin	Money	St. Lawrence Parish Council		

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 18. 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?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Claire	Udall	1	Question how Southminster is a small village when North Fambridge is not??!!	The Settlement Pattern is based on the level of services and facilities in each settlement and groups settlements together which are broadly similar. It is a baseline and does not in itself determine the level of growth or what type of development is supported in each settlement, it is the policies within the LDP that will do that. Southminster is a large village.
Linda	Raffray			
John	Cooper		Purleigh is not a large village by any measure and i would not support any firther housing developments in Purleigh or Cock Clarks	At the present time the Council cannot comment on whether individual settlements can or cannot accommodate future growth.The LDP Review process has to plan for future growth and it will have to be accommodated within the District. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and this was one of the reasons for the Issues and Options Consultation. In the coming months work will be undertaken to make the necessary decision using the evidence prepared as part of the LDP Review work.
Leah	Jewiss			
Elaine	Ketley	South Woodham Ferrers Town Council		
Ruth	Bull	The Othona Communty		
Mark	Jackson	Mark Jackson Planning		
ann	cutting			
Sharon	Cushen			
Ian	Tooley			
Sally	Tokeley			
Christina	Chan			
Tim.	Holdsworth			
Graham	Snow			
Sarah	Packard			
Martin	Cook			
Clifford	Brown			
Steve	Gallant	Crouch Valley Defence Group		
Lesley	Woodley			
Kirsty	Rowsell			
Philip	Wakeling		Generally no because opportunistic individuals plant farm buildings with no agricultural justification across the countryside with the intention of gaining a residential consent. Each case must be on it's merits. Some such plots may be entirely appropriate in the context of what is planned for that settlement. Many others are not.	If the Council supported the reuse of agricultural buildings or derelict land they would have a policy against them and this would look to mitigate impact. It would not be possible cap the amount of development because each site would be judged on its own merits. Brownfield land is always the type of land looked at first when considering site allocations but only where they are in appropriate places in terms of connection to a settlement.
David	Brock			
Niki	Halls			
Stewart	Geden			
Anita	Thomas	Bank	The infrastructure in the smaller villages is not enough to provide any additional housing	If the Council supported the reuse of agricultural buildings or derelict land they would have a policy against them and this would look to mitigate impact. It would not be possible cap the amount of development because each site would be judged on its own merits. Brownfield land is always the type of land looked at first when considering site allocations but only where they are in appropriate places in terms of connection to a settlement.
Andrew	Ashworth			
michael	smith			
Simon	Priest			
Philippa	Marshall		Proposals for further development within north fambridge would put unsustainable strain on the existing infrastructure, particularly on vehicle access in and out of the village. There would also be unacceptable impact on wildlife within and surrounding the village.	At the present time the Council cannot comment on whether individual settlements can or cannot accommodate future growth.The LDP Review process has to plan for future growth and it will have to be accommodated within the District. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and this was one of the reasons for the Issues and Options Consultation. In the coming months work will be undertaken to make the necessary decision using the evidence prepared as part of the LDP Review work.
Lewis	Cook	Form Architecture Ltd.	Developments on large areas of land adjacent to villages can put a strain on the infrastructure of the village. Village growth should be ideally contained to windfall sites in small numbers. Releasing areas of such land is more appropriate adjacent to the towns or largest of villages in the borough where there will less strain on local facilities and infrastructure.	The Council is considering whether to have a windfall policy and this will have caveats on it to mitigate against impact.
EDWARD	GITTINS	Edward Gittins & Associates		
Steve	Williamson			
James	Cowell	E & B R Cowell	The landowner considers that the delivery of housing through the development of agricultural land, whether derelict in nature or not, when in or adjacent to large, medium, and small villages is appropriate. It is arguably most appropriate in large villages, like Southminster.	Support noted
Colin	Hawkes		This could be a speculators charter. Could have major implication for rural lanes, schools etc and significantly alter character of village.	If the Council supported the reuse of agricultural buildings or derelict land they would have a policy against them and this would look to mitigate impact. It would not be possible cap the amount of development because each site would be judged on its own merits. Brownfield land is always the type of land looked at first when considering site allocations but only where they are in appropriate places in terms of connection to a settlement.
Ronald	PIPER			

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 18. 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?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
John	McLarty		These types of buildings and structures have a part to play in the overall housing growth of the District	Support noted
John	McLarty		This would be a suitable use of previous developed land.	Support noted
Norman	Branch	N/A		
John	McLarty		These types of buildings and structures have a part to play in the overall housing growth of the District	Support noted
James	Clarke			
David	Stilwell			
Ann	Thomas			
michael	harris			
Geoffrey	Cox			
John	McLarty		These types of buildings and structures have a part to play in the overall housing growth of the District	Support noted
Barrington	Thomas			
Richard	Edwards		There should not be an automatic presumption that development is appropriate, but the fact that the land is now no longer in productive use should be one of the considerations	If the Council supported the reuse of agricultural buildings or derelict land they would have a policy against them and this would look to mitigate impact. Brownfield land is always the type of land looked at first when considering site allocations but only where they are in appropriate places in terms of connection to a settlement.
Robyn	Woloszczuk			
Lesley	Speller			
Nicola	O'Dean	Balgores Motors		
Alexander	Romang			
Hayley	Holgate	ECC		
Eirlys	Parry	N/A		
Michael	Unwin	N/A		
Tony	Barber			
Nick	Mason	ECOClassics		
Melanie	Osborne	Motor Trade		
Stuart	Turner	Essex search and rescue		
Mike	Carpenter	CODE Development Planners Ltd		
ian	wilson	cm36pt		
c/o Agent	c/o Agent			
kelly	tilley			
Catherine	Bicknell	Mid and South Essex Health and Care Partnership		
N	Baseley	IBA Planning Ltd		
Sue	White		Yes, in principle, but these must be very close to facilities, with no walking along the faster or B roads (regardless of paths). These must use smaller residential roads for access to facilities.	If the Council supported the reuse of agricultural buildings or derelict land they would have a policy against them and this would look to mitigate impact. Brownfield land is always the type of land looked at first when considering site allocations but only where they are in appropriate places in terms of connection to a settlement.
Sarah	Yates		No - further housing will be a blight in the landscape of our picturesque villages. Using Cold Norton (St Stephens Road) as an example, there has already been numerous planning objections from MDC in relation to various lands on the outskirts of the village correctly citing the inadequate road infrastructure (St Stephens Road is a small single track country lane, unsuitable for heavy goods vehicles or any kind of traffic needed for the construction of a development, or thereafter as it would be unsuitable to cope with increased foot flow and traffic from a development), the impact it would have on the village etc, it would be incredibly hypocritical if MDC then allowed the same or similar land in and around Cold Norton to then be used and viewed favourably for new developments.	The district does not have a history of industrial land use so there is limited brownfield land opportunities or opportunities to build within settlement boundaries. Therefore it is inevitable that greenfield sites will be required to accommodate future growth. When carrying out site allocations, brownfield land should be prioritised in the settlements chosen for growth.
Leonard	Lewis		It all depends on the size of the land that the derelict or disused agricultural buildings sit on. It cannot be a carte blanche decision that any piece of land whatever its size can be developed if it has these type of buildings on it. I would suggest a maximum limit of one acre for development of derelict land and a maximum limit of one acre for development if any disused agricultural buildings are present on site. Otherwise this scheme could be open to manipulation by the unscrupulous.	If the Council supported the reuse of agricultural buildings or derelict land they would have a policy against them and this would look to mitigate impact. It would not be possible to cap these type of developments as each should be judged on its own merits. Brownfield land is always the type of land looked at first when considering site allocations but only where they are in appropriate places in terms of connection to a settlement.
R	Minney			
Tim	Grant	Evolution Town Planning		
ANNE	OSBORN	Purleigh Community Shop		
Stephen	Hodgkinson		Greenfield sites on the edge of villages that are currently occupied by disused or redundant agricultural buildings of despoiled land should be prioritised redevelopment over better quality rural greenfield sites. Greenfield sites adjacent to settlements that also comprise existing garden land or paddocks should also be prioritised over functioning agricultural land.	The district does not have a history of industrial land use so there is limited brownfield land opportunities or opportunities to build within settlement boundaries. Therefore it is inevitable that greenfield sites will be required to accommodate future growth. When carrying out site allocations, brownfield land should be prioritised in the settlements chosen for growth.
c/o Agent	c/o Agent	Maldon Wick Limited		
ZOE	HOSTY			
S	Swain			
Kevin	Coleman	Phase 2 Planning		

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 18. 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?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
John	Lawrence		The landowners consider that the delivery of housing through the redevelopment of brownfield and/or previously developed sites, whether agricultural in nature or not, when in or adjacent to large, medium, and small villages is appropriate. It is arguably most appropriate in large villages, like Purleigh.	Support noted
Diane	Wallace			
Jonathan	Aldis	Good life Countryside Services		
Grace	Godwin		Turn these into nature reserves to preserve our wildlife instead of destroying it with new houses (which are cheaply made and overpriced).	The district does not have a history of industrial land use so there is limited brownfield land opportunities or opportunities to build within settlement boundaries. Therefore it is inevitable that greenfield sites will be required to accommodate future growth. When carrying out site allocations, brownfield land should be prioritised in the settlements chosen for growth.
Sue	Hillman		Derelict look and should not mean greenfield land	The district does not have a history of industrial land use so there is limited brownfield land opportunities or opportunities to build within settlement boundaries. Therefore it is inevitable that greenfield sites will be required to accommodate future growth. When carrying out site allocations, brownfield land should be prioritised in the settlements chosen for growth.
michael	carr	NHS		
Simon	Plater	Plater+Claiborne		
Mark	Anderson			
Karen	Wellum		I do not think greenfield sites should be built on while there are other areas of the country that have derelict land and better communications.	The district does not have a history of industrial land use so there is limited brownfield land opportunities or opportunities to build within settlement boundaries. Therefore it is inevitable that greenfield sites will be required to accommodate future growth. When carrying out site allocations, brownfield land should be prioritised in the settlements chosen for growth.
Emma	Wright		No because of wildlife habitat	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth, the Council has a statutory duty to ensure that the future housing and economic needs of the district are planned for and it will make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months.
Linda	Coom		Clicking on the link showed me nothing, so I'm unable to comment. I am, however, concerned about green areas inside existing settlements. Whilst it might seem better to build on a playing field rather than a farmers' field at the edge of a settlement, please make allowances for the people living around and using the playing field. Many of us have lived in the area for generations, and playing fields/open spaces are very important to us all. So, please listen to local people and leave our playing fields/small open spaces alone.	Green amenity space and playing fields are not considered as brownfield land and are protected in the present LDP and will continue to be protected.
Caitlin	Soul			
Michelle	Curtis	Tollesbury Parish Council		
Mary	Hammond		Purleigh is NOT a large village , it is a medium size village. The village does not have the infrastructure nor the amenities. The proposal to build opposite Purleigh community shop is inappropriate as the road could not cope with the quantity of extra vehicles.	At the present time the Council cannot comment on whether individual settlements can or cannot accommodate future growth.The LDP Review process has to plan for future growth and it will have to be accommodated within the District. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go and this was one of the reasons for the Issues and Options Consultation. In the coming months work will be undertaken to make the necessary decision using the evidence prepared as part of the LDP Review work.
Ian	Drinkwater		The villages must be consulted and involved in any process relating to housing development	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth, the Council has a statutory duty to ensure that the future housing and economic needs of the district are planned for and it will make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months.
john	hand	N/A		
Emma	Smith	Bradwell on Sea Parish Council		
Tim	Dixon		Yes if that land cannot be used for agricultural development in the future I would generally always favour developing a brown field site over a green field.	Support noted
Nicola	Taylor	Elixirr	Each development should be assessed on a case by case basis considering more than just whether the area is currently 'disused'. Such a sweeping statement does not consider the local infrastructure, road safety, access, surrounding natural environment or ecology.	If the Council supported the reuse of agricultural buildings or derelict land they would have a policy against them and this would look to mitigate impact. Brownfield land is always the type of land looked at first when considering site allocations but only where they are in appropriate places in terms of connection to a settlement.
Graham	Johnson	graham v johnson		
Chris	Yates		No - further housing will be a blight in the landscape of our picturesque villages. Using Cold Norton (St Stephens Road) as an example, there has already been numerous planning objections from MDC in relation to various lands on the outskirts of the village correctly citing the inadequate road infrastructure (St Stephens Road is a small single track country lane, unsuitable for heavy goods vehicles or any kind of traffic needed for the construction of a development, or thereafter as it would be unsuitable to cope with increased foot flow and traffic from a development), the impact it would have on the village etc, it would be incredibly hypocritical if MDC then allowed the same or similar land in and around Cold Norton to then be used and viewed favourably for new developments.	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth, the Council has a statutory duty to ensure that the future housing and economic needs of the district are planned for and it will make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months.
Sally	Everritt	Community360		
Mark	Garrett			
Paul	Vidler			

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 18. 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?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Victoria	Long		They would need to be considered on their own merit taking into account sustainable transport and surrounding infrastructure.	If the Council supported the reuse of agricultural buildings or derelict land they would have a policy against them and this would look to mitigate impact. Brownfield land is always the type of land looked at first when considering site allocations but only where they are in appropriate places in terms of connection to a settlement.
Victor	Staines			
Jayne	Moore	Essex County Fire and Rescue Service	Our villages are being ruined. Farming is important. Effective use of land should be allowing flood planes to remain as such rather than identifying them as suitable sites for building. (LD2)	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth, the Council has a statutory duty to ensure that the future housing and economic needs of the district are planned for and it will make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months.
Kevin	Bennett			
Nicholas	Matthams		As long as the proposed development is sympathetic to the area.	If the Council supported the reuse of agricultural buildings or derelict land they would have a policy against them and this would look to mitigate impact. Brownfield land is always the type of land looked at first when considering site allocations but only where they are in appropriate places in terms of connection to a settlement.
Christian	van Stolk	RAND Europe		
Nicholas	Jepson		For large villages this is reasonable where facilities exist or can be delivered before the housing is in place. For medium, small villages and hamlets this should not be considered and boundaries for building should be set in all.	Support noted
Pamela	Lacey		If we concrete the fields over. We will have redundant farmers and no food. Good planning?	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth, the Council has a statutory duty to ensure that the future housing and economic needs of the district are planned for and it will make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months.
Chloe	Soul			
carole	kirk			
Sharon	Jackson		Each case should be subject to consultation with local villages.	Consultation is part of the LDP process and is also carried out with regard to planning applications
RICHARD	GROUT			
Charles	Bishop			
Paul	Jewiss	Self Employed		
Deborah	Anderson	NHS		
John	Pilgrim	Self employed		
Gloria	Gold	London Design and Engineering UTC		
Linda	Curry		Where it is in the best interests of the local residents and community.	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth, the Council has a statutory duty to ensure that the future housing and economic needs of the district are planned for and it will make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months.
Lucy	Waterhouse			
Jon	Mayhew			
James	Goody	James Goody refurbishments		
Johanna	Dale		Far better to use derelict land and disused agricultural buildings than productive farm land	Support noted
Tracy	Kinnane			
Carlos	Rodriguez			
Rebecca	Tucker			
Mark	Faraway		Existing areas are generally complete. Boundaries between areas need to be kept villages need to remain villages. The delivery of housing now need to see new towns being created to the north.	The Council is not proposing to develop between villages.
T	Ketteley			
Elizabeth	Weston			
Jacky	Barber			
Ursula	Benjafield		yes if it is sustainable location. Should not build on greenfield sites	Support noted
Paul	Mitchell			
Kristian	Tokeley	CTC Construction Ltd		
Ziyad	Thomas	Churchill Retirement Living / McCarthy Stone		
James	Campbell	HMPPS	I do not know if there is a particularly high amount of 'derelict' land around our areas.	The district does not have a history of industrial land use so there is limited brownfield land opportunities or opportunities to build within settlement boundaries. Therefore it is inevitable that greenfield sites will be required to accommodate future growth. When carrying out site allocations, brownfield land should be prioritised in the settlements chosen for growth.
William	Moss		If appropriate scale and minimal impact on the landscape	If the Council supported the reuse of agricultural buildings or derelict land they would have a policy against them and this would look to mitigate impact. Brownfield land is always the type of land looked at first when considering site allocations but only where they are in appropriate places in terms of connection to a settlement.
Simon	Mackenzie Smith			

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 18. 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?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Richard	Udall		This is prone to abuse by landowners	If the Council supported the reuse of agricultural buildings or derelict land they would have a policy against them and this would look to mitigate impact. It would not be possible cap the amount of development because each site would be judged on its own merits. Brownfield land is always the type of land looked at first when considering site allocations but only where they are in appropriate places in terms of connection to a settlement.
Rosalind	Bishop			
John	Symington			
Michael	Manning			
Jack	Inglis	Kelvedon Hall		
Peggy	Shields			
Dawn	Adams	Catesby Estates		
Wayne	Tilley	RTG Group Limited		
David	Dronfield	Braxted park		
John	Peirson			
Ron	Brown	Corporate		
Roger	HAWES		Yes assuming it complies with the Planning Policies of the relevant village or parish.	If the Council supported the reuse of agricultural buildings or derelict land they would have a policy against them and this would look to mitigate impact. It would not be possible cap the amount of development because each site would be judged on its own merits. Brownfield land is always the type of land looked at first when considering site allocations but only where they are in appropriate places in terms of connection to a settlement.
Anne	Hull	Elmwood Equestrian Centre		
Matthew	Bloxham	Matt		
Julia	Morris			
Amanda	MacKenzie			
Jenny	Shepherd			
Jack	Ellum		only where employment use is not viable	If the Council supported the reuse of agricultural buildings or derelict land they would have a policy against them and this would look to mitigate impact. It would be possible to include employment. It would not be possible cap the amount of development because each site would be judged on its own merits. Brownfield land is always the type of land looked at first when considering site allocations but only where they are in appropriate places in terms of connection to a settlement.
Bernard	Steeples			
Anna	mccomb	NHS Property Services Ltd		
Natalie	Kermath	Environment Agency		
Peter	Knights			
Unknown	Unknown	Ministry of Defence		
Duncan	Clark		There are a range of wider considerations which need to be taken into account, including the sustainability of the location (including access to public transport and services/facilities), environmental impacts (including on ecology), landscape and heritage impacts (where applicable) etc.	If the Council supported the reuse of agricultural buildings or derelict land they would have a policy against them and this would look to mitigate impact. Brownfield land is always the type of land looked at first when considering site allocations but only where they are in appropriate places in terms of connection to a settlement.
Patricia	Smith			
Mick	Sargeant		Re-use of Brownfield should always be considered first From recent experience Barn conversions are problematic as Class Q appears to override all normal planning issues and the LDP should have specifics re location & flood risk	If the Council supported the reuse of agricultural buildings or derelict land they would have a policy against them and this would look to mitigate impact. It would not be possible cap the amount of development because each site would be judged on its own merits. Brownfield land is always the type of land looked at first when considering site allocations but only where they are in appropriate places in terms of connection to a settlement.
John	Cockerell	Hatfield Peverell Parish Council		
Catherine	Williams	C/O Savills (Agent)		
Tom	Kelly			
Linda	Gemmill			
Linda	Gemmill			
Mark	Norman	Highways England		
Thomasin	Foster			
*	*			
Alan	Massow		Maldon District has limited options for brownfield development and is going to be primarily reliant on greenfield sites. This approach is noted.	Noted
*	*			
Ian	Butt			
Sarah	Sayer			
*	*			

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 19. 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?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Jenny	Clemo	Langford & Ulting Parish Council		
Gavin	Rowsell		Maldon was always deemed traditionally rural and 'quaint'... it is already fast becoming just another semi-rural town, so further high density urbanisation would finish it off for ever.	Traditional development within towns is normally at quite a high density but because of the way it is laid out and designed its visual appearance gives a view of lower density. Therefore, an import aspect of density is design and achieving higher density could reduce the amount of land needed to develop within the district
Gareth	Davies	N / A	More density will usually mean that the housing is more affordable and this is an important goal for the LDP.	Noted, supplying much needed affordable housing to those that are struggling to access the open housing market is an important factor for the Council.
Jackie	Gibbs		I'm torn on this one.....large building sites tend to be associated with the cheaper end of the construction industry....high quality of design doesn't always translate to better quality build. Smaller projects, if sympathetically placed, can add character to the region.	Traditional development within towns is normally at quite a high density but because of the way it is laid out and designed its visual appearance gives a view of lower density. Good design and layout gives the impression that larger sites are split into smaller sites and this assists with intergration into a wider urban area. Therefore, an import aspect of density is design and achieving higher density could reduce the amount of land needed to develop within the district
Mike	Hayes		Yes, but subject to a strict design criteria/space standards.	Support noted, design will be considered in its own policy in the review of the LDP.
David	Sismey			
Stuart	Willsher	Persimmon Homes Essex	With reference to the above, we would suggest that increased densities within urban areas are unlikely to be compatible with historic centres and local character. We would therefore recommend that all assessments of built heritage impacts, particularly where the Council are suggesting allocating fewer sites but at higher densities, be fully assessed by up to date evidence, noting that the many of the Council's Conservation Areas/Character Appraisals do not appear to have been updated for some time, and therefore may not accurately reflect existing site conditions.	Traditional development within towns is normally at quite a high density but because of the way it is laid out and designed its visual appearance gives a view of lower density. Therefore, an import aspect of density is design and achieviing higher density could reduce the amount of land needed to develop within the district. Any site allocation which would affect a heritage asset will have to have somekind of impact assessment. A council would only review a conservation area if there had been significant changes to it which has not occurred within the district at the present time.
Anthony	Fittock		If greenspace is to be protected efficient use of land is paramount It is also good practice from a climate mitigation perspective	Support noted.
Daniel	McAllister	Robert Mulholland And Company Limited	It should be the ambition of the plan to achieve the highest possible densities of development to limit sprawl over open countryside. At higher densities in the more accessible locations large numbers of homes can be provided on little land and unnecessary sprawl avoided.	Support noted
Sarah	Sapsford		In towns like Maldon higher densities would be the norm historically. Clever development can create an illusion of space. But the development should be appropriate to the community and town/village and of course parking	We would agree with these comments, traditional development within towns is normally at quite a high density but because of the way it is laid out and designed its visual appearance gives a view of lower density. Therefore, an import aspect of density is design and achieviing higher density could reduce the amount of land needed to develop within the district
Stephanie	Ireland			
e	e	e	Higher density housing generally means a lower carbon footprint per capita; it creates less impervious ground cover and so has less impact on the watershed; less urban sprawl means less pressure on greenfield sites; it keeps residents closer to core services such as shops, work, transport hubs – thus reducing car usage – and generally encourages new services and businesses to set up. It is more affordable, meaning people can stay in the area when they reach adulthood – which would reduce our tendency to be a retirement district. There must be excellent cycling and pedestrian links to reduce car-dependence. Shared (possibly underground) parking may avoid people converting garages to living space, which makes parking an even bigger problem. If we build any higher-rise housing, it MUST be of good design to avoid feeling cramped, and it MUST look good. Large buildings with dozens of different facias, colours, and materials need to be avoided: a few simple surfaces look far more attractive. If we have must have taller buildings, we must avoid any that would over-shadow existing low-rise	Agree with the comments.
Kevin	Lagan		Has Covid taught us nothing? We need space so people should not be crammed in.	Traditional development within urban areas is normally at quite a high density but because of the way it is laid out and designed its visual appearance gives a view of lower density. Therefore, an import aspect of density is design and achieviing higher density could reduce the amount of land needed to develop within the district
Bethany	Jones	Colchester Borough Council		

Question 19

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 19. 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?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
magnus	Magnusson	Parker Planning Services	Building at higher densities on greenfield sites (thus making more efficient use of this resource) can be appropriate but subject to design and other 'environmental' considerations. Indeed, para. 124 of the NPPF2021 demands that planning policies and decisions should support development that makes efficient use of land, considering (among other) the availability and capacity of infrastructure and services – both existing and proposed – as well as their potential for further improvement and the scope to promote sustainable travel modes that limit future car use. Our call for sites responses in respect of sites BOC4 & BOC5 (appendix A & B) demonstrated the potential of these sites to be integrated with existing communities within Burnham-on-Crouch in a sustainable manner, making use of and enhancing existing infrastructure provision and including	Support noted. The Council cannot respond on site specifics at this stage of LDP Review. Work on site allocations will be undertaken in the coming months with a Preferred Options consultation being carried out at the end of this period.
Nick	Whiteley		Whilst reducing garden sizes removes some of the 'private outside space', more and more public outside space is being consumed. Fields, woods, places to explore are disappearing (across the country, not just the district). Building up in existing locations, would prevent some loss of the nature and for the environment, places to grow.	The district does not have a history of industrial land use so there is limited brownfield land opportunities or opportunities to build within settlement boundaries. Therefore it is inevitable that greenfield sites will be required to accommodate future growth. When carrying out site allocations, brownfield land should be prioritised in the settlements chosen for growth.
Linda	Flowers	Self Employed	High density housing isn't generally appropriate in rural settings without very good reason. It just allows developers to make greater profit. When building on green fields environmental impact should be minimised with lots of green space and gardens. Also the demand for housing from in-migration would not support this commercially? There is not a market for flats on sites not centrally located. Exceptions being sites such as the Sadds Wharf site. Higher density may be achieved by smaller home terraces but prices have to be reflective and	Building at a higher density means using less land. Each type of development would be considered on its own merits and that would include flats.
Peter	Holmes			
Colin	Pryke		Better to minimise urban sprawl	Support noted
John	Hitcham		This would fundamentally challenge/change the tradition and long established character of Maldon District and also be in breach with the appropriate sections of the NPPF. Higher densitity and/or greater height would be the wrong way to go. The only beneficiaries would be developers. It would create lasting damage	Traditional development within urban areas is normally at quite a high density but because of the way it is laid out and designed its visual appearance gives a view of lower density. Therefore, an import aspect of density is design and achieviing higher density could reduce the amount of land needed to develop within the district. It would not be out of conformity with the NPPF in that national policy advocates the best use of land alongside
Richard	Kelly	Croudace Homes	Whilst the principle of making an efficient use of land is supported, building at higher densities can be to the detriment of ensuring a mix of types and tenures of housing is delivered – most often, that of family housing. Alongside ensuring development can deliver a mix of housing, it is also vital that in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework ('NPPF') schemes are well-designed, attractive and create healthy places (paragraph 124). Therefore, whilst higher densities can be pursued in some circumstances, it is	Building at higher densities would not compromise the ability of development to bring forward family housing. The Local Housing Needs Assessment sets out the appropriate housing mix for the District and this will translate into future policy.
Andy	Quelch			
James	Rushton		High quality of design in such circumstances is a priority - but so is the protection of the diversity of the unique Natural Environment in particular within the medium and smaller villages and their surrounds. In-fill is surely supportable but potentially building larger, high density housing developments outside the respective village envelopes carries with it many risks as regards the historic characteristics of the District.	Traditional development within urban areas and this does include some villages is normally at quite a high density but because of the way it is laid out and designed its visual appearance gives a view of lower density. Therefore, an import aspect of density is design and achieviing higher density could reduce the amount of land needed to develop within the district.
Catherine	Champion			
Terence	Hughes	Burnham-on-Crouch constituent	Higher density housing has been found lacking in many parts of the country. Bad for mental and physical health. Hard to maintain and will spoil the unique attractions in many cases.	Traditional development within urban areas and this does include some villages is normally at quite a high density but because of the way it is laid out and designed its visual appearance gives a view of lower density. Therefore, an import aspect of density is design and achieviing higher density could reduce the amount of land needed to develop within the district.

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 19. 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?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
John	Tompkins		Increasing density is never a satisfactory way of dealing the quantum issue. There is a danger that developments will fall into the 'back-to-back' classification or worse still go for medium rise developments. Neither of these are suitable for rural nor semi-rural areas. Residents should be able to expect a quality of life that the District can offer. Design becomes an important factor in this scenario to avoid potential 'ghettos' especially as a result of political, social, legal, environmental or economic pressure. High densities will increase the urbanisation of what was rural/semi-rural landscape. In terms of density, a sensible mix of housing and density is essential to ensure a balanced environment and community. Design and end-user requirements should dictate density and the mix of units. High density housing in small villages would be totally out of character and destroy what small amount of rural life remains. The District would lose its identity and become just another urban area as indeed some areas of Maldon are becoming. The policy of brownfield sites first is sound but it should not preclude the development of brownfield land for housing. As in all cases a measured approach would be effective for existing residents	Traditional development within urban areas and this does include some villages is normally at quite a high density but because of the way it is laid out and designed its visual appearance gives a view of lower density. Therefore, an import aspect of density is design and achieviing higher density could reduce the amount of land needed to develop within the district. Each site would still be determined on its own merits and different minimum densities could be set out for different levels of settlement in the pattern.
Jeremy	Potter	Chelmsford City Council		
Daniel	Goodman	Rochford District council		
Chris	Harvey			
Jane	Senior			
Amanda	Clack		Not necessarily. Higher density does not equate to better quality. Some of the developments that have been permitted thus far do not encompass good design, placemaking or community provision. Density has driven site utilisation rather than good design and empathy to those residents already living nearby or those entering the development. Greenfield land should be sacrificed only where absolutely necessary, and when released a higher emphasis on design quality, excellent landscaping and minimal height to preserve the beauty of the local landscape needs to be considered. It is important to be cognisant of The National Planning Policy Framework 2012, which includes the following statements that are critical considerations for any development: • Paragraph 7: Sustainable development includes an environmental role which requires the use of natural resources prudently and that waste and pollution is minimised. • Paragraph 17: Core principles focusing on effective use of land that has been previously developed (brownfield land) provided not of high environmental quality. The role and character of different areas should be taken into account including the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside. Local authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity. • Paragraph 109: Planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by protecting and enhancing local landscapes. The proposal under ALT2 to build 1750 homes in Althorne, is disproportionate in its impact on our village, which currently comprises just 650 homes (thereby effectively increasing the village by 269% making it effectively a small town). I would draw your attention to the fact that the Council's own assessment of the area reads: "This area incorporates the Dengie Peninsula with its rural character, open big skies, tranquillity, marshland and mudflats". The size, scale and very nature of this site, having been identified as a 'yes' in the HELAA Call for Sites 2022, would severely negatively impact on this very landscape, cause noise and light pollution, as well as further increase the volumes of traffic to a road that currently cannot cope with existing traffic volumes	Traditional development within urban areas and this does include some villages is normally at quite a high density but because of the way it is laid out and designed its visual appearance gives a view of lower density. Therefore, an import aspect of density is design and achieviing higher density could reduce the amount of land needed to develop within the district. The district does not have a history of industrial land use so there is limited brownfield land opportunities or opportunities to build within settlement boundaries. Therefore it is inevitable that greenfield sites will be required to accommodate future growth. When carrying out site allocations, brownfield land should be prioritised in the settlements chosen for growth.
Daphne	Scott			
Kenny	Alexander	Thomas Gainsborough School		
David	Kennedy		Again the answer is in the detail. Developers want to build big houses as they make more profit selling a 4 or 5 bedroom house that a 2 or 3 bedroom house, however there is significant need for the smaller property, particularly for those entering the property market. It would be acceptable to build the smaller houses at a greater density. The larger houses are usually occupied by families with children, who need and benefit for good levels of garden space which is precisely the space that is lost when larer houses are built at greater density	Housing mix is set out in the Local Housing Needs Assessment May 2021, which will be updated prior to the submission of the LDP review for examination. It sets out what percentage smaller properties should be provided on developments coming forward, this means that development should provide the size of housing that the District needs.
Mark	Behrendt	Home Builders Federation	In order to maximise the use of previously developed land the NPPF is clear that Local Plans should seek to make the most effective use of land. However, with regard to density the NPPF requires that these should be appropriate taking into account not only the quality of the design but also the character of the area, market conditions, viability, and the nature of housing need in that area. Therefore, whilst higher density development should be considered the Council must ensure that any proposed densities are considered against each of these variables and would not make a site or the plan as whole undeliverable	The Council is going to update its design policy and this will help to ensure that developments integrate into the character of an area.

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 19. 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?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Matthew	Cooper			
Terry	Inkpen	None	Provision must be made for sufficient car parking on site with two vehicles per house and access roads built to adequate width standards. The houses should be two bedroom maximum and aimed at first time buyers.	Housing mix is set out in the Local Housing Needs Assessment May 2021, which will be updated prior to the submission of the LDP review for examination. It sets out what percentage smaller properties should be provided on developments coming forward, this means that development should provide the size of housing that the District needs. Parking standards are presently set out in the Councils Supplementary Planning Document which may require updating alongside the review of the LDP.
christine	collins		providing that the housing that presumably would be aimed at young families could have access to the facilities that make a development sustainable	Housing mix is set out in the Local Housing Needs Assessment May 2021, which will be updated prior to the submission of the LDP review for examination. It sets out what percentage smaller properties should be provided on developments coming forward, this means that development should provide the size of housing that the District needs. The Council is seeking to ensure that development is located in sustainable places.
Stuart	Williams	Ace group		
Reegan	Howles		Delivering large density housing on greenfield sites is unsustainable. A pepper pot approach would help to mitigate damage to the environment. If this isn't satifactory to meet housing goals, greenfield land should be picked away from significant areas of semi-natural habitat that make an important contribution to the area's diverse landscape character.	The district does not have a history of industrial land use so there is limited brownfield land opportunities or opportunities to build within settlement boundaries. Therefore it is inevitable that greenfield sites will be required to accommodate future growth. Where that growth is going to be located has not been determined yet. When carrying out site allocations, brownfield land should be prioritised in the settlements chosen for growth.
jasbir	Singh			
Janice	Jackson			
Roy A	Clare	Charities	Yes, in conjunction with Option 5.	Support noted
Felicity	Gale			
Lindsey	Wright			
David	Hill	Dandara Ltd	The NPPF identifies that Local Plans should seek to make the most effective use of land but with regards to density, the NPPF requires that these discussions should take into account matters such as: the quality of the design; the character of the area; market conditions; viability; and the nature of housing need in that area. Whilst higher density development could be considered, it will be necessary to ensure that any proposed densities are considered against each of the aforementioned variables and would not make a site or the plan as whole undeliverable.	Comments noted, the updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area.
Steven	Potter		Yes, but in towns only, not villages.	Traditional development within urban areas and this does include some villages is normally at quite a high density but because of the way it is laid out and designed its visual appearance gives a view of lower density. Therefore, an import aspect of density is design and achieviing higher density could reduce the amount of land needed to develop within the district.
Vysian	Banyard	TKPC	High density creates parking and other difficulties with potential for friction between residents.	Traditional development within urban areas and this does include some villages is normally at quite a high density but because of the way it is laid out and designed its visual appearance gives a view of lower density. Therefore, an import aspect of density is design and achieviing higher density could reduce the amount of land needed to develop within the district. There is no evidence that high density creates parking difficulties.
Diane	Carter			
Luke	Garrett	Obsidian Strategic Asset Management Ltd	In order to maximise the use of previously developed land, Obsidian Strategic recognises that Local Plans should seek to make the most efficient use of land. However, and with regard to density, the NPPF at Paragraph 124 requires this policy direction to take into account, inter alia, the availability of land suitable for accommodating housing; market conditions; viability; and an area's prevailing character and setting. Therefore, and whilst higher density development may be appropriate in certain circumstances, the District Council must ensure that any proposed densities are appropriate having regard to NPPF Paragraph 124 and would not make a site, or the Local Plan as a whole, undeliverable. In this context, Obsidian Strategic welcomes and accepts the reference at Paragraph 13.1 to significant greenfield development being inevitably needed.	Comments noted, the updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area.
Robin	Fanshawe			
John	Brown			
Chris	Waumsley	Inovo Consulting		
Phil	Jacklin		Provided that the emphasis was on affordable housing.	It would be not be appropriate to just insist that affordable housing is built at a higher density, consideration should be given to a higher density for other sections and parts of the district.
Robert	Jones	The University of Reading		
Robert	Stephens	N/A	I would support higher densities but only if, and only if, it can be proven there is no detrimental social and mental impact on the well being of all residents of all ages.	Support noted
Pete	Butcher		Yes provided they are in the appropriate setting e,g. town or village centers	Support noted
JO	COOMBES			
Jonney	Aldridge		only for some	It is not clear what the respondant means so no response can be made.

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 19. 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?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Mark	Hurley	Selfridges	Absolutely not, people are not animals to be kept in cages!	Traditional development within urban areas and this does include some villages is normally at quite a high density but because of the way it is laid out and designed its visual appearance gives a view of lower density. Therefore, an import aspect of density is design and achieviing higher density could reduce the amount of land needed to develop within the district.
Neil	Burke	Bradwell Power Generation Company Limited	Bradwell B do not have any specific comments to make on this question.	Noted
Lynne	Goodbourn		Stop spoiling our beautiful and unique environment. the dengie peninsula (and maldon!)seem to have taken more than their fair share of development there are insufficient schools, doctors, social amenities, parking, transport access for our current population. Roads are over busy with traffic often nose to tail and endless, minor issues cause major hold ups. We also need cycle lanes as the roads are too dangerous to cycle safely and this will only get worse with additional building. Tourism will fall due to poor access and parking and the area will die not improve	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth, the Council has a statutory duty to ensure that the future housing and economic needs of the district are planned for and it will make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months.
Christopher	Kent		Either way large site bring would bring a strain on already inadequate infrastructure.	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth, the Council has a statutory duty to ensure that the future housing and economic needs of the district are planned for and it will make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months.
Sophie	Pryor		Developments at higher densities need to be considered within the context of the relevant site. Consideration should be given to the housing need and character of the local area. Building at higher densities can impact on viability and this needs to be analysed to ensure the proposed densities are deliverable	Building at higher densities normally improves the viability of a site, so this would not be a matter which would be of concern. An import aspect of density is design and achieviing higher density could reduce the amount of land needed to develop within the district
c/o Agent	c/o Agent	Clarion Housing		
Stephanie	Jones	home		
Phillipa	Griffiths			
Matthew	Taylor		I certainly support this approach to the effective use of land and the protection of our countryside. Higher densities in sustainable locations are clearly suitable, they just need to be fully considered in their context and be of exceptional quality.	Support noted
Anne	Bailey			
Lucien	Taylor			
David	Baker		Building at higher density will speed up the decline of the districts character and come with all the adverse impacts that suck developments come with. We do not need slum development in rural locations	Traditional development within urban areas and this does include some villages is normally at quite a high density but because of the way it is laid out and designed its visual appearance gives a view of lower density. Therefore, an import aspect of density is design and achieviing higher density could reduce the amount of land needed to develop within the district.
Glenna	Wilkins			
Danny	Soul			
Fiona	Barkham	Private Individual	Needs to be considered in context to housing needs in each area	Comments noted, the updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area.
Isabel	Adcock		Good design usually means good quality housing. The opposite does not increase the looks of the area and can lead to criminal behaviour	Though one of the key tenant of good design is to design out crime there is no direct correlation between poor design and a rise in crime or an increase in criminal behaviour.
alan	johnson	sky broadcasting	only in Maldon and Burnham though and only if it fits the character of the area	Comments noted, the updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area.
Victoria	Cutmore	Endurance Estates	In many respects higher densities militate against good design in its broadest sense.	Comments noted, the updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area. There is no evidence that higher densities reduce the qualities of good design
Jane	Potter	Purleigh Parish Council	Higher density housing may be appropriate in certain circumstances, provided it met the highest design and energy efficient standards, but in towns only, not villages.	Comments noted, the updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area, whichever area that is.
Brian	Haydon	Cold Norton Parish Council	Not appropriate to the rural aspect of Maldon District	Comments noted, the updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area, whichever area that is.
Lee	Foster		Higher densities developments spoils the natural beauty of the Maldon district and should be avoided at all costs in areas of natural beauty. we are losing these areas fast and they should be maintain at all costs	Comments noted, the updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area, whichever area that is.
Vanessa	Horner		Would also lead to more affordable housing.	Comments noted, the Council would support affordable housing as there is a high need across the District.
Brian	Howson	Pharmaceutical company		
Marion	Gunn		Not appropriate in rural settlements in Maldon district	Traditional development within the urban environment and this does include many villages is normally at quite a high density but because of the way it is laid out and designed its visual appearance gives a view of lower density. Therefore, an import aspect of density is design and achieving higher density could reduce the amount of land needed to develop within the district
BRIAN	COLLINS			

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 19. 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?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Peter	Lampard		High density does not provide high quality design.	Traditional development within the urban environment and this does include many villages is normally at quite a high density but because of the way it is laid out and designed its visual appearance gives a view of lower density. Therefore, an import aspect of density is design and achieving higher density could reduce the amount of land needed to develop within the district
Tim	Chilvers		While it is important to use land efficiently, the sensitivity of the District's landscape, environment and heritage need to be respected. Building at higher density generally means increasing storey heights and sacrificing private amenity space and parking provision. In a largely rural district these compromises are unlikely to be appropriate. Historically, trying to develop at higher densities has failed and led to low quality developments which do not function well and often feel to be car dominated. Today there is a greater understanding of the benefits of outdoor space for health and wellbeing. In addition, there is a general move to above ground surface water attenuation solutions and the need to deliver in excess of 10% biodiversity net gains. There is also the need to make the neighbourhoods pedestrian and cycle friendly, increased on plot car parking provision (including significantly larger base sizes) all results in a much greater land take which in turn reduces the actual gross development density which is achievable. It is therefore necessary for the Plan and site-specific policies to be pragmatic about the densities which can actually be delivered, both in terms of the scale of allocations made and also any density policy standards which are included. In addition, provision for higher densities can result in over-provision for apartments and flats and it is important that a range of densities are allowed for to ensure an adequate mix of housing and tenures.	Traditional development within the urban environment and this does include many villages is normally at quite a high density but because of the way it is laid out and designed its visual appearance gives a view of lower density. Therefore, an import aspect of density is design and achieving higher density could reduce the amount of land needed to develop within the district. Housing mix is set out in the Local Housing Needs Assessment May 2021, which will be updated prior to the submission of the LDP review for examination. It sets out what percentage smaller properties should be provided on developments coming forward, this means that development should provide the size of housing that the District needs.
Elliott	George		Yes. However, the NPPF only identifies specific support for increasing densities in urban locations or those well served by public transport (paragraph 125a) which is unlikely to apply to most greenfield allocations. Maldon is also generally fairly low density in character. As such, and proposals to significantly increase density compared to the surrounding area will require very careful consideration and also need to ensure that they respond to the latest evidence on housing mix, which the Maldon District Local Housing Needs Assessment shows for market housing to be heavily weighted toward family housing.	Traditional development within the urban environment and this does include many villages is normally at quite a high density but because of the way it is laid out and designed its visual appearance gives a view of lower density. Therefore, an import aspect of density is design and achieving higher density could reduce the amount of land needed to develop within the district. Housing mix is set out in the Local Housing Needs Assessment May 2021, which will be updated prior to the submission of the LDP review for examination. It sets out what percentage smaller properties should be provided on developments coming forward, this means that development should provide the size of housing that the District needs.
Kate	Ellis		Depends on the location and again if the infrastructure of the identify areas is appropriate.	Comments noted, the updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area.
Kevin	Ashman	Estates and Agency Strategic Land	High density housing is supported in policy, but it needs to be applied in a contextually appropriate way. Any application of height will need careful design considerations. Equally, it is appropriate that density policies and judgements have regard to the mix of housing needed.	Comments noted, the updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area.
Jake	Nugent	Endurance Estates Ltd		
John	Buchanan		Yes People need to move away from the idea of detached/ semidetached housing with gardens for everyone. First time buyers should be offered cheaper solutions even though there may be compromise in terms of density	Comments noted, the updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area.
Tim	Bradford	leadenhall	depends on situation and infrastructure	Comments noted, the updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area.
Jacky	Bannerman	Woodham Walter Parish Council	Increasing density is never a satisfactory way of dealing the quantum issue. There is a danger that developments will fall into the 'back-to-back' classification or worse still go for medium rise developments. Neither of these are suitable for rural nor semi-rural areas. Residents should be able to expect a quality of life that the District can offer. Design becomes an important factor in this scenario to avoid potential 'ghettos' especially as a result of political, social, legal, environmental or economic pressure. High densities will increase the urbanisation of what was rural/semi-rural landscape. In terms of density, a sensible mix of housing and density is essential to ensure a balanced environment and community. Design and end-user requirements should dictate density and the mix of units. High density housing in small villages would be totally out of character and destroy what small amount of rural life remains. The District would lose its identity and become just another urban area as indeed some areas of Maldon are becoming. The policy of brownfield sites first is sound but it should not preclude the development of brownfield land for housing. As in all cases a measured approach	Housing mix is set out in the Local Housing Needs Assessment May 2021, which will be updated prior to the submission of the LDP review for examination. It sets out what percentage smaller properties should be provided on developments coming forward, this means that development should provide the size of housing that the District needs. Comments noted, the updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area.
Mark	Tentori	Mazdev Limited	It is important to make the most effective and efficient use of land, but this must be tempered with the need to deliver the right type of housing. Housing allocations and meeting housing need is not a spreadsheet exercise; instead it is about providing new homes for current and future generations in the right places. Increasing densities as an arithmetic exercise simply to "meet the numbers" will lead to an oversupply of the wrong type of homes, and an undersupply of the types of homes that are required. This approach must, therefore, be balanced against the identified mix of housing needs for the District.	Comments noted, the updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area.

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 19. 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?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Peter	Ingram		We need to be very careful. What seems a good plan now can turn into a slum in the future. Future development needs to be of good quality and not unduly dense.	Comments noted, the updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area.
Jane	Pilgrim			
Judith	Radcliffe			
Christopher	Mabbutt	Burnham Primary School		
Mary	Putt		The density of housing in all villages is already too high. Any additional housing should be build as a new settlement closer to the A12 corridor, including utilities and services for the size. It would also benefit from better transport links, health access and remove the requirement for yet another several hundred cars to be travelling across the district daily, poluting the environment	The density in village heartlands is actually quite high as in most urban areas. Comments noted, the updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area.
Alan	Shrimplin	N/A	No this would destroy our area's character and cause lasting damage to our area	Comments noted, the updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area.
Valerie	Coleby	Berrys	The Council places a focus on 'making the built environment beautiful' in its Key issues for the Local Plan review. As such density must be defined by the site characteristics and site assessment. whilst Strategic sites may achieve higher densities this needs to be balanced against the need for green space and biodiversity net gains	Comments noted, the updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area.
Kevin	Bruce		Only if provided by low level flats for starter homes or single people	Comments noted, the updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area. It may not be appropriate to just focus on low level flats or starter homes, the Council has to consider all types of development
William	Shepherd			
victoria	newson	Childrens Nursery		
David	Banfield			
Phillip	Wright	CALA Homes (North Home Counties) Ltd		
.	.	SN Developments	It is noted in the Issues & Options consultation document that there is a limited supply of previously developed land available in Maldon District, and as such greenfield sites would need to be allocated in emerging MLP so that identified development needs are met in full. As set out below in the response to Question 21, national policy supports higher density residential development in accessible locations, but also expects development to be of high quality design. Therefore, density and design matters should both be considered in any decisions about potential site allocations in emerging MLP.	Support noted. Comments noted, the updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area.
.	.	Cooper Property Holdings Ltd		
Jane	Coleman	Maldon Town Council		
Roy	Martin	Mr Roy Martin	Yes but only if used within a sensible mix of dwelling types and appropriate to location and typical occupancy.	Comments noted, the updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area.
Simon	Butler-Finbow	Pigeon Investment Management	In some cases higher density development can be appropriate. However, this will depend on the location and should be determined, in part, by the nature of the settlement. It is typical in housing development that a range of densities are delivered thus creating character to any new development. We would not expect to see, or support, a blanket restriction on low or high density within the LDPR as this would not support the thrust of the NPPF or National Design Guide, and the focus on delivering high quality, well designed development. However, it might be appropriate to set densities in relation to certain (parts of) certain allocated sites as part of a design strategy.	Comments noted, the updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area.
sara	doran		I think the high density housing is exactly what is so awful with all the current new developments, everyone living on top of each other. with tiny gardens. I think that there could be options of eg flats in an urban centre, but with appropriate ground for gardens available (I think all homes should have access to a garden area)	Agree with the comments concerning garden and outdoor space. The updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area.
Colin	Horner	Villageretreat	This would also lead to more affordable housing.	Higher densities may lead to higher affordable housing which the Council would support.
Robert	Scott	Lewis & Scott Retirement Living Ltd		
Rob	Bard			
Tim	Hann		Building at higher densities in certain instances would be acceptable but would have to be accompanied by additional parking facilities etc. This may in-turn negate the gain achieved by higher density building. I must stress that I would be totally against returning to the 1960's plan of high rise blocks of flats	Comments noted, the updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area.
Burnham	Town Council	Burnham on Crouch Town Council		
Justin	Barkham	Self employed	Needs to be considered in context to housing needs in each area	Comments noted, the updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area.
Poppy	Vidler	Crown Consumer Ltd	Yes but not in open countryside and subject to clever design and a mix of housing.	Comments noted, the updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area. National Planning Policy does not support open market housing in the open countryside so this would not be a feature in the LDP review.
Stephen	Sutton			
Tim	Madelin		Must be supported by high design standards an suitable green infrastructure in and around these high density developments	Comments noted, the updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area along with with suitable green infrastructure.

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 19. 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?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Joanna	Jeffery	Althorne Parish Clerk	Provision must be made for sufficient car parking on site with two vehicles per house and access roads built to adequate width standards. The houses should be two bedroom maximum and aimed at first time buyers.	Comments noted, the updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area. Housing mix is set out in the Local Housing Needs Assessment May 2021, which will be updated prior to the submission of the LDP review for examination. It sets out what percentage smaller properties should be provided on developments coming forward, this means that development should provide the size of housing that the District needs.
Paul	Coppin		This would need careful design considerations with regard to the mix of housing actually required and the impact of this.	Housing mix is set out in the Local Housing Needs Assessment May 2021, which will be updated prior to the submission of the LDP review for examination. It sets out what percentage smaller properties should be provided on developments coming forward, this means that development should provide the size of housing that the District needs.
Steven	Bardwell	S P Bardwell Ltd		
David	Oxford	Lloyds Banking Group	For all the reasons above in 18	The response to question 18 does not relate to housing density so no further comment can be made.
Stephen Francis	Dewick	Curry Farm	People need open spaces for well being within their communities. Trees etc.	Comments noted, the updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area along with with suitable open space.
George	Dixon		The ever diminishing green field land should be preserved at all costs to prevent the district being changed completely. This has to be balanced with only increasing the density of populations in already urbanised areas. A block of flats is more detrimental in its aesthetic to a village such as Stow Maries or Tiptree, than it is to more developed areas such as Heybridge or Witham.	Comments noted, the updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area.
Douglas	Channer	Private	Sorry but for this question and the previous one I cannot see any document that is there that really gives detail about effective use of land. I keep getting a single paragraph of about four lines which to me does not really explain or detail Effective Use of Land	Comment noted.
Lynda	Bugg		Only if it's designed to fit in with the existing local character of the area.	Comments noted, the updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area.
Paul	Burgess	None	Good design should be a core requirement density is not relevant.	Comments noted, the updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area. Density would be relevant if we believe that the most effective use of land is a key priority in the delivery of housing
D	Cooper			
C/O Agent	C/O Agent		The Council have acknowledged that it is inevitable that the majority of new housing will be delivered on greenfield sites, as the district does not have a legacy of industrial landscapes laying derelict. Our client supports using higher densities on greenfield sites. The use of higher densities should not be solely applicable to brownfield sites as it is important that development make optimal use of the potential of each site and meet as much of the identified housing need as possible. This is reflective of the provisions of the NPPF2021 which encourages effective use of land in meeting the need for homes and other uses. Paragraph 125 of the NPPF2021 sets out that masterplans can be used to help ensure that land is used efficiently while also creating beautiful and sustainable places and where there is an existing shortage of land for meeting identified housing needs, it is especially important that planning policies avoid homes being built at low densities and ensure that developments make optimal use of the potential of	Comments noted, the updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area and that the Council makes the most effective use of land for development
Zoe	May	East of England Ambulance Service NHS Trust	Any new housing development requires assessment on the suitability of existing stations, with potential to reduce, redevelop or extend and in certain instances relocate to a more suitable location. In addition to reviewing the suitability of premises, EEAST, also needs to consider the age, number and type of ambulance response vehicles and provision of latest medical equipment required to manage any increase in population growth. Additional ambulances and ambulance station response posts will be required in the area to support this additional population growth	The comment does not relate to the question so no further response can be made.
Roger	Woodcock			
Braxted and Blackwater Conservation Grou	BBCG	The Braxted and Blackwater Conservation Group (BBCG)	High density housing is supported in policy, but it needs to be applied in a contextually appropriate way. Any application of height will need careful design considerations. Equally, it is appropriate that density policies and judgements have regard to the mix of housing needed.	Comments noted, the updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area and that the Council makes the most effective use of land for development. Housing mix is set out in the Local Housing Needs Assessment May 2021, which will be updated prior to the submission of the LDP review for examination. It sets out what percentage smaller properties should be provided on developments coming forward, this means that development should provide the size of housing that the District needs.
raymond	dundas	Householder	Subject to planning regulations and high quality designs and climate friendly.	Support noted
John	Watson		If greenspace is to be protected efficient use of land is paramount. It is also good practice from a climate mitigation perspective	Support noted
Josh	Plant	Gladmans		

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 19. 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?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
*	*		While it is important to use land efficiently, the sensitivity of the District's landscape, environment and heritage need to be respected. Building at higher density generally means increasing storey heights and sacrificing private amenity space and parking provision. In a largely rural district, these compromises are unlikely to be appropriate. Historically, trying to develop at higher densities has failed and led to low quality developments which do not function well and often feel to be car dominated. Today, there is a greater recognition of the benefits of outdoor space for health and well-being. In addition, there is a general move to above ground surface water attenuation solutions and the need to deliver in excess of 10% biodiversity net gains. Coupled with the need to make the neighbourhoods pedestrian and cycle friendly, increased on plot car parking provision (including significantly larger base sizes) all results in a much greater land take, which in turn reduces the actual gross development density that is achievable. It is, therefore, necessary for the Plan to be pragmatic about the densities that can actually be delivered both in terms of the scale of allocations made and also any density policy standards which are included. One solution would be to take a positive stance in respect of a modest increase in Storey height in rural areas, traditionally communities and authorities oppose development above two stories adjacent to existing settlements, however, in visual impact and the landscape impact terms such developments are not necessarily demonstrably harmful. Encouraging a greater proportion of three story properties in such locations would enable a more efficient use of land.	Traditional development within the urban environment and this does include many villages is normally at quite a high density but because of the way it is laid out and designed its visual appearance gives a view of lower density. In the right locations some higher level properties may be acceptable, an import aspect of density is design and achieving higher density could reduce the amount of land needed to develop within the district.
*	Willmott		While it is important to use land efficiently, the sensitivity of the District's landscape, environment and heritage need to be respected. Building at higher density generally means increasing storey heights and sacrificing private amenity space and parking provision. In a largely rural district these compromises are unlikely to be appropriate.	Traditional development within the urban environment and this does include many villages is normally at quite a high density but because of the way it is laid out and designed its visual appearance gives a view of lower density. Therefore, an import aspect of density is design and achieving higher density could reduce the amount of land needed to develop within the district.
Ivor	Watson			
*	*			
*	*		Developments should be appropriate to their context. In central locations, higher densities are likely to be effective while in more rural locations the expectations will likely be for greater private amenity space and lower density development. An approach that considers the context of a site and access to services would be more welcome than arbitrary approaches to density. We also disagree with the premise that there is a trade-off between high density and high quality design in current developments	Comments noted, the updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area and that the Council makes the most effective use of land for development.
*	*		While it is important to use land efficiently, the sensitivity of the District's landscape, environment and heritage need to be respected. Building at higher density generally means increasing storey heights and sacrificing private amenity space and parking provision. In a largely rural district these compromises are unlikely to be appropriate. It is recognised in the spatial portrait that Maldon has a very low population density and therefore has a significant proportion of land that is rural countryside. People are attracted to Maldon for many reasons and one will be the quality of life and quality of housing, including the value of private gardens and public and private open space. It is considered that, with the exception of town centre locations, the Local Plan should focus on delivering homes with good levels of private amenity and attractive public realm and be less concerned with an overly efficient approach to land allocations as this may be ultimately detrimental to the quality of those places.	Comments noted, the updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area and that the Council makes the most effective use of land for development.
*	*			
*	*		While it is important to use land efficiently, the sensitivity of the District's landscape, environment and heritage need to be respected. Building at higher density generally means increasing storey heights and sacrificing private amenity space and parking provision. In a largely rural district these compromises are unlikely to be appropriate. It is recognised in the spatial portrait that Maldon has a very low population density and therefore has a significant proportion of rural land. People are attracted to Maldon for many reasons and one such reason is likely to be the quality of life and, associated with that, the quality and type of housing, including the value of private gardens and public and private open space. It is considered that, with the exception of town centre locations, the Local Plan should focus on delivering homes with good levels of private amenity space and attractive public realm, and be less concerned with an overly efficient approach to land allocations as this may be ultimately detrimental to the quality of those places.	Comments noted, the updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area and that the Council makes the most effective use of land for development.
*	*		While it is important to use land efficiently, the sensitivity of the District's landscape, environment and heritage need to be respected. Building at higher density generally means increasing storey heights and sacrificing private amenity space and parking provision. In a largely rural district these compromises are unlikely to be appropriate. It is recognised in the spatial portrait that Maldon has a very low population density and therefore has a significant proportion of rural land. People are attracted to Maldon for many reasons and one such reason is likely to be the quality of life and, associated with that, the quality and type of housing, including the value of private gardens and public and private open space. It is considered that, with the exception of town centre locations, the Local Plan should focus on delivering homes with good levels of private amenity space and attractive public realm, and be less concerned with an overly efficient approach to land allocations as this may be ultimately detrimental to the quality of those places.	Comments noted, the updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area and that the Council makes the most effective use of land for development.
*	*			
Ben	Binder	University of Adelaide		

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 19. 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?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Lorraine	Bailey	Wickham Bishops Parish Council		
Ali	Aldis			
David	Smye	The Maldon Society		
Stewart	Newlands	Fambridge Lake	Some mixed use buildings would be appropriate in some villages shops/offices with affordable flats above a change from the traditional building in some places but needed.	Comments noted, the updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area and that the Council makes the most effective use of land for development
Stewart	Newlands	Fambridge Lake	Some mixed use buildings would be appropriate in some villages shops/offices with affordable flats above a change from the traditional building in some places but needed.	Comments noted, the updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area and that the Council makes the most effective use of land for development
Paula	Stanbury			
Sonia	Whiskin	Financial Services		
Geoffrey	Charge	n/a		
Robert	Collins			
Ben	Thornett			
Matthew	Wood	Phase 2 Planning		
Tim	Aves		The council should allow no more significant housing developments until the district has the schools, GP and dental surgeries, roads sewerage and other vital infrastructure to support all the people who have moved or are moving into the hundreds of homes already built in the past five years! No exceptions. It's time to say enough is enough. I have no problem with building houses per se. We desperately need more homes in this country and they have to go somewhere. However, I do not accept that any planning system worthy of the name should allow so much housing to be built without the infrastructure to support it. Developers should be legally obliged to pay much, much more from the vast profits they rake in from these sites and this should be channeled directly into infrastructure to suppo	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth, the Council has a statutory duty to ensure that the future housing and economic needs of the district are planned for and it will make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months. The present LDP has an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which was approved through its examination, infrastructure is agreed with statutory providers such as the NHS and ECC and should be to mitigate the impact of development. Infrastructure is being provided under the terms of S106 legal agreements and will be assessed further as part of the LDP Review work. The matter in the majority of cases is not that infrastructure has not been provided but that its trigger points such as the number of homes completed has not been reached. This matter is monitored carefully and contributions pursued as they become liable..
Helen	James		Only if the required infrastructure of doctors, dentists, schools and road transport access are built At the same time.	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth, the Council has a statutory duty to ensure that the future housing and economic needs of the district are planned for and it will make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months
Kathy	Day			
Peter	Wakling			
Sara	Howarth			
Eissa	Leo			
Michele	Williams		To be avoided if possible as quality of life and where and how with live has direct links to mental health now and in the future	Comments noted, the updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area and that the Council makes the most effective use of land for development
Tara	Strydom			
Jenny	Ball		It will depend on the settlement and the proposed building project(s). Its not possible to answer this question in blanket terms for the whole district.	Comments noted, the updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area and that the Council makes the most effective use of land for development
Cliff	Baron			
Gill	Winsor	Tesco	Definitely not unless as I said above a whole new community it built away from other developments with its own amenities so it doesn't effect existing services.	Comments noted. If the Council was to support a new settlement it would be more appropriate to have higher density so that less land was taken up in the development. The updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area and that the Council makes the most effective use of land for development
Emily	Benham	Servoca complex care and nursing		
Laura	Cannon			
Shaneen	Illanes		This isn't a one of the other scenario. Don't build on greenfield land	The district does not have a history of industrial land use so there is limited brownfield land opportunities or opportunities to build within settlement boundaries. Therefore it is inevitable that greenfield sites will be required to accommodate future growth. When carrying out site allocations, brownfield land should be prioritised in the settlements chosen for growth.
Merryl	Quilter			
Bear	Keen			
Jessica	Cox			
Robert	Burton			
Yvonne	Wade			
Louise	Bywaters-Smith	Hospitality		

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 19. 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?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Brooke	Roberts-Morgan			
Patricia	Bunkle			
Marc	Rawinsky	M R Sovereign Services Ltd		
Roger	Tiffn		yes providing the right infrastructure is in place i.e the Buligh park railway station which should have been built under the first phase of the development and ha still to be designed and not this late in the overall development	Support noted
Kathryn	Beighton	Publishing	Housing should not be high density, leasehold apartments - this is not what anyone wants. Small cluster houses that are freehold are far preferable. This is a rural area and homes should reflect this, have their own gardens and space. The only exception perhaps would be higher density immediately around railway stations or in town centre positions	The updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area and that the Council makes the most effective use of land for development.
Roy	Warren	Sport England		
STUART	SOWTER			
Mark	Raffray			
April	Rowley		Not on agricultural land	The district does not have a history of industrial land use so there is limited brownfield land opportunities or opportunities to build within settlement boundaries. Therefore it is inevitable that greenfield sites will be required to accommodate future growth. When carrying out site allocations, brownfield land should be prioritised in the settlements chosen for growth.
Bill	Withers		I strongly disagree here. Whilst the council appears to be holding a view that it is better to save land space and instead build higher density developments, this comes at a cost. This cost is developments that feel 'tight' and become dominated by housing. Typically in a high density development road widths will be the bare minimum and housing will be situated as close to the pavement, or road edge in in the case of a shared surface, as possible. This does not create a nice place to live. If I think about the developments that are more enjoyable to move through I am picturing the lower density developments where houses are set back from the road giving a great sense of space and openness. Instead I feel it would be far better to build up rather than closer together. Building larger numbers of 2.5 storey and 3 storey buildings can allow for a smaller property footprint, meaning less land is required, but still allowing for lower density.	The updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area and that the Council makes the most effective use of land for development.
joanna	jeffery			
John	Mitchell		The Quest Place development in Maldon is an excellent example of high density quality development	Comment noted.
Peter	Layley			
Rex	Davenport			
Lesley	Mitchelmore	Danbury Parish Council		
Karen	Neath	Tolleshunt Major Parish Council		
N	DA			
Dorreen	Linton	our group consists of adults, playschool and brownies group		
John	Wileman			
Richard	Courtney	University Of East London	I don’t think we need high density just yet:) I am somewhat skeptical of claims that high density/high well being can be done through building design alone. These two usually occur in rental homes in urban areas where short term rental is the norm	The updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area and that the Council makes the most effective use of land for development. High density is not just found in rental homes in urban areas, there are many examples of high density developments around the country including in rural areas.
sue	Rawlinson	Evolve	like a new garden village with a school and doctors etc.	The response to the question does not relate to housing density so no further comment can be made.
Douglas	Milsted	Heybridge Basin Conservation Society		
Alan	Outlaw	Self Emplyed	Higher density housing developments have always led to problems in the future, people need space!	The updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area and that the Council makes the most effective use of land for development. There is no evidence that higher density developments lead to problems with those occupying them
Lindsey	Squire	North Fambridge Parish Council	Impossible to achieve a high quality of design with high densities other than in a central town location. Existing densities already prevent beautiful design with token hedges and trees and little open space within the design.Homogenous estates appear in villages which could be placed anywhere.North Fambridge has mostly an eclectic type of design not standard mathboxes. This is also true of other smaller and medium villages	Traditional urban areas are at quite a high density and no just in town centres. The updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area and that the Council makes the most effective use of land for development
K	Jeffries			
John	Lakin	?		
Samantha	Weeks		Yes. More reasonable sized modest family homes at affordable prices should be the main focus and at higher density to mitigate the lack of land available. Also more flats for single occupancy and older people.	Housing mix is set out in the Local Housing Needs Assessment May 2021, which will be updated prior to the submission of the LDP review for examination. It sets out what percentage smaller properties should be provided on developments coming forward, this means that development should provide the size of housing that the District needs
Carlie	Mayes			

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 19. 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?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Richard	Martin	Scott Properties	Higher densities will not be achievable in all areas and will not work for all demographics, i.e. single-storey housing which is suitable for older people.	The updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area and that the Council makes the most effective use of land for development.
Mike	Spurgeon	Phase 2 Planning and Development		
C/O Agent Mike	Spurgeon	Phase 2 Planning & Development		
Amanda	Mickelsen			
Samuel	Newton	Anglo European School		
Mary-Ann	Munford			
Jo	Harvey			
Terry	Fleming			
Philip	Davies		This is acceptable as long as properties are designed to the minimum standard of quality and room size as directed by the Government. And that there is proper access for refuge and emergency services.	Comment noted. The updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area and that the Council makes the most effective use of land for development.
Susan	Cumming	not applicable		
Ronald	Edge	Construction Industry		
Gordon	Mussett	Little Braxted Parish Council	The pandemic identified a need for individual (personal) green space – not likely to be achieved with higher density housing.	The updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area and that the Council makes the most effective use of land for development. Green space can still be incorporated into higher density housing.
Ronnie	Tongue	state school		
Sue	Dobson	Essex Bridleways Association		
David	Webb			
Andrew	Marsh	Historic England	Historic England recommend that the density, scale, character and detailed designed of new housing be appropriate for its context. The capacity for an area to accommodate new housing development whilst maintaining its historic environment should be a key consideration, so that the quality and character of neighbourhoods, towns and villages is conserved. Integrating consideration of the historic environment into plan making alongside other considerations is a key principle of sustainable development. Allocation of new housing sites should be considered in the most sustainable locations and densities and character should reflect that of the surrounding area. This approach will require a careful and detailed analysis of locations to ensure that distribution of housing is appropriate. The historic environment is a critical factor in this analysis in terms of considering the ability of sites and locations to accommodate new housing without undue harm to heritage assets and their settings.	Comment noted. The updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area and that the Council makes the most effective use of land for development. The Council will also be updating the Heritage Policy.
Brian	Haydon			
Hazel	Notley			
Jean	Brown		If building was put around the outskirts of large towns it might be possible to include a greater mix of flats, say about six floors high, that would give many more homes on less land.	Comment noted. The updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area and that the Council makes the most effective use of land for development.
Joanne	McGinity			
Stuart	Dedman	Nil		
Kerry	McKenna			
Penny	McCauley	Tiptree dental		
Jane	Phillips	Solicitors	Greenfield land should be sacrificed only where absolutely necessary.	The district does not have a history of industrial land use so there is limited brownfield land opportunities or opportunities to build within settlement boundaries. Therefore it is inevitable that greenfield sites will be required to accommodate future growth. When carrying out site allocations, brownfield land should be prioritised in the settlements chosen for growth.
David	Rees		This would depend on deep consideration of the nature of individual communities and the land available e.g whether there is a need for starter homes or low rise flats etc. demographic considerations also need great consideration e.g the needs of younger adults or those living alone.	Housing mix is set out in the Local Housing Needs Assessment May 2021, which will be updated prior to the submission of the LDP review for examination. It sets out what percentage smaller properties should be provided on developments coming forward, this means that development should provide the size of housing that the District needs.
Darren	Weeks			
Phil	Manning			
Peter	Clack		Not necessarily. Higher density does not equate to better quality. Some of the developments that have been permitted thus far do not encompass good design, placemaking or community provision. Density has driven site utilisation rather than good design and empathy to those residents already living nearby or those entering the development. Greenfield land should be sacrificed only where absolutely necessary, and when released a higher emphasis on design quality, excellent landscaping and minimal height to preserve the beauty of the	Comment noted. The updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area and that the Council makes the most effective use of land for development. The district does not have a history of industrial land use so there is limited brownfield land opportunities or opportunities to build within settlement boundaries. Therefore it is inevitable that greenfield sites will be required to accommodate future growth. When carrying out site allocations, brownfield land should be prioritised in the settlements chosen for growth.
Doug	Lockwood	National Grid		
Sally	George			

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 19. 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?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Vara	Szajkowski		Definitely not.	Objection noted
Bob	Calver			
Tessa	Lambert	Natural England		
Dawn	Howles			
natasha	frith			
Anthony	Bates			
Russell	Howles	WSP		
Gillian	Hollamby			
Brian	Townsend		High density housing would be inappropriate in a small village like Stow Maries.	Comment noted. The updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area and that the Council makes the most effective use of land for development. The Council cannot comment on individual settlements at this stage of the LDP review.
Malcolm	Finch			
Peter	Taylor	Retired		
Chris	Melbourne			
Robert	Hollamby			
Kate	Priest	Purleigh Community Primary School		
Gary	SPICER		covid has seen a lot of business's re-locating & actually giving up their office space - develop these & brownfield rather than keep building on greenfield	Comment noted. The updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area and that the Council makes the most effective use of land for development.
Helen	Bridge		Higher densities lead to a lower quality of life no matter how pretty or well -built they are.	Comment noted. The updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area and that the Council makes the most effective use of land for development.
Melanie	Allen	Government		
Adam	Medlycott			
Joanne	Maloney		I think low rise blocks of flats are appropriate for young people who don't want a garden but just want affordable housing. The only ones in the district are for old people	Comment noted. The updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area and that the Council makes the most effective use of land for development.
Portia	Roelofs			
Lisa	Singh	Direct Call Centres Ltd		
Kevin	Head		Increasing housing densities on greenfield sites would create more sustainable settlements, as long as design standards aren't compromised and new developments respect the existing character and aesthetic of the area	Comment noted. The updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area and that the Council makes the most effective use of land for development.
Elizabeth	Sawyer Bayliss			
Michael	Partridge			
Kenneth	Northfield			
Jerry	Petts			
Frederick	McMahon			
Tracey	Merritt	Dengie Hounds and Horses	As long as there was minimal impact of the existing character of the are and the design fits in with the aesthetics of an area.	Comment noted. The updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area and that the Council makes the most effective use of land for development.
Jo	Crump	Servoca Secure Soutions		
Susan	ARCHER			
Winifred	Sutherland			
Chris	clark			
Jeremy	Richardson		If higher density means smaller more affordable housing then yes	Comment noted. The updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area and that the Council makes the most effective use of land for development. The mix of affordable housing is set out in the Local Housing Needs Assessment, the Council tries to match the afforable housing in developments to the need within the District.
Cheryl	Carter	Education		
Susan	Mason			
Melad	Kamlow		Infrastructure of village cannot cope. Proposals for increased housing will cause significant damage to quality of life in these villages. Increased noise, increased traffic, congestion and inability to access key services such as healthcare.	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth, the Council has a statutory duty to ensure that the future housing and economic needs of the district are planned for and it will make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be undertaking the necessary work to make that decision in the coming months. Future plans must also include future planning for infrastructure.
Dave	Draper	The Hartford Insurance Group		
Kevin	Cooper			
Katherine	Whitehouse			

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 19. 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?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Linda	Soul		This would be a consideration if more smaller houses/flats were built for single or couple occupancy, which seems to be lacking in the Maldon District.	Housing mix is set out in the Local Housing Needs Assessment May 2021, which will be updated prior to the submission of the LDP review for examination. It sets out what percentage smaller properties should be provided on developments coming forward, this means that development should provide the size of housing that the District needs.
Robert	Wilson		Higher densities generally lead to additional problems and are not in keeping with the present housing in the district.	Traditional development within towns is normally at quite a high density but because of the way it is laid out and designed its visual appearance gives a view of lower density. Therefore, an important aspect of density is design and achieving higher density could reduce the amount of land needed to develop within the district.
Sarah-Jayne	Hunt	SJ Aesthetics LTD		
Jonathan	Hunt			
Deborah	de Boltz	Farleigh Hospice		
Tim	Murphy			
Claire	McGrane			
Tracey	Munford	NA	Infrastructure has to be in place first	The LDP has an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which was approved through its examination, infrastructure is agreed with statutory providers such as the NHS and ECC and should be to mitigate the impact of development. Infrastructure is being provided under the terms of S106 legal agreements and will be assessed further as part of the LDP Review work.
Rowan	Rampersad			
LUKE	MACFARLANE	S A RAVEN	density should be appropriate to local character and provide houses with enough indoor and outdoor space not crammed together.	Comment noted. The updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area and that the Council makes the most effective use of land for development.
Anna	Wombwell	Morris Farm		
Ronald	Owen	Not applicable		
Elizabeth	Johns		Priority should be to deliver high quality spacial housing, not small inadequately built cheap housing. This often leads to cramped conditions, poor parking options, little to no consideration for outdoor space for children of all ages, which in turn leads to increased crime rates.	Comment noted. The updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area and that the Council makes the most effective use of land for development.
Colin	Day		I disagree with building on green open space outside the settlement boundary	The district does not have a history of industrial land use so there is limited brownfield land opportunities or opportunities to build within settlement boundaries. Therefore it is inevitable that greenfield sites will be required to accommodate future growth. When carrying out site allocations, brownfield land should be prioritised in the settlements chosen for growth.
Natalie	Bradford			
Harriet	Hurst-Smith			
Tony	Vanner		The building on green open space would be detrimental to the look feel and charm of what a small village can offer and the current residents are accustomed to and as mentioned before does not have the infrastructure to support the influx of relatively high numbers of new residents with their relevant needs and motor vehicles	The district does not have a history of industrial land use so there is limited brownfield land opportunities or opportunities to build within settlement boundaries. Therefore it is inevitable that greenfield sites will be required to accommodate future growth. When carrying out site allocations, brownfield land should be prioritised in the settlements chosen for growth. The LDP Review will be assessing the infrastructure needs of any future growth.
Josie	Vanner		Purleigh is not a large village, it has one shop which does not have a post office, and the one cafe/restaurant is the local pub which is closed on Monday & Tuesday.	The response does not relate to the question and therefore any further response is not possible.
Tracy	Carroll			
Ian	Roberts	N/A		
Tony	Ashton	none		
mandy	SHORT			
Kevin	Money	St. Lawrence Parish Council		
Claire	Udall	1		
Linda	Raffray			
John	Cooper			
Leah	Jewiss			
Elaine	Ketley	South Woodham Ferrers Town Council		
Ruth	Bull	The Othona Communty		
Mark	Jackson	Mark Jackson Planning	High Density is unsuitable for Maldon District	Comments noted, the updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area, whichever area that is.
ann	cutting			
Sharon	Cushen		Again, appropriate to the infrastructure and amenities to cope with higher density of housing.	Comments noted. The LDP Review will be assessing the future infrastructure needs of the District.
Ian	Tooley			
Sally	Tokeley			
Christina	Chan		I do not think building high density housing is in keeping with the rural nature of Maldon District Council's locality.	Comment noted. The updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area and that the Council makes the most effective use of land for development.

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 19. 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?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Tim.	Holdsworth			
Graham	Snow			
Sarah	Packard			
Martin	Cook			
Clifford	Brown			
Steve	Gallant	Crouch Valley Defence Group		
Lesley	Woodley			
Kirsty	Rowsell			
Philip	Wakeling			
David	Brock			
Niki	Halls			
Stewart	Geden			
Anita	Thomas	Bank		
Andrew	Ashworth			
michael	smith			
Simon	Priest			
Philippa	Marshall			
Lewis	Cook	Form Architecture Ltd.	Higher density developments can work to provide more housing however they should remain in Town locations, not within the village settlements, as this will erode the character of the smaller rural locations.	Comment noted. The updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area and that the Council makes the most effective use of land for development. In some villages there is already quite high density, rural locations are not always built as low densities
EDWARD	GITTINS	Edward Gittins & Associates	We consider the question of density is better determined on a site-by-site basis rather than encouraging higher densities or prescribing a target or average density. Higher densities may be acceptable, for example, where associated with compensatory open space. Density, however, is often influenced by the character of the area, site constraints, household sizes, tenure and the housing market - so apart from a broad policy commitment to the effective use of land - we do not consider the Plan can be too prescriptive in this respect.	Comment noted. The updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area and that the Council makes the most effective use of land for development.
Steve	Williamson		Only if the higher density is in keeping with the surrounding areas	Comment noted. The updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area and that the Council makes the most effective use of land for development.
James	Cowell	E & B R Cowell	So long as the development's design was sensitive to the local character.	Comment noted. The updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area and that the Council makes the most effective use of land for development.
Colin	Hawkes			
Ronald	PIPER			
John	McLarty		There is limited land which can deliver higher density across the district given the rural make up.	Comment noted. The updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area and that the Council makes the most effective use of land for development. It is not known at this stage how much land could deliver higher density developments that is part of the work of the LDP Review to determine this matter.
John	McLarty		There will be very limited opportunities for higher density development in a rural authority such as Maldon District.	Comment noted. The updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area and that the Council makes the most effective use of land for development. It is not known at this stage how much land could deliver higher density developments that is part of the work of the LDP Review to determine this matter.
Norman	Branch	N/A		
John	McLarty		There is limited land which can deliver higher density across the district given the rural make up.	Comment noted. The updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area and that the Council makes the most effective use of land for development. It is not known at this stage how much land could deliver higher density developments that is part of the work of the LDP Review to determine this matter.
James	Clarke			
David	Stilwell			
Ann	Thomas		For reasons previously stated, density should not be increased until adequate facilities and services can be provided.	Comments noted, the updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area, whichever area that is. Infrastructure will be assessed as part of the LDP review process.
michael	harris			
Geoffrey	Cox			
John	McLarty		There is limited land which can deliver higher density across the district given the rural make up.	Comment noted. The updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area and that the Council makes the most effective use of land for development. It is not known at this stage how much land could deliver higher density developments that is part of the work of the LDP Review to determine this matter.
Barrington	Thomas			

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 19. 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?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Richard	Edwards		Such high density developments require addition infrastructure suport and my experience is that this is not provided	Comments noted. The LDP Review will be assessing the future infrastructure needs of the District.
Robyn	Woloszczuk			
Lesley	Speller			
Nicola	O'Dean	Balgores Motors		
Alexander	Romang			
Hayley	Holgate	ECC	Because affordable housing should be the priority.	Comments noted.
Eirlys	Parry	N/A		
Michael	Unwin	N/A		
Tony	Barber			
Nick	Mason	ECOClassics		
Melanie	Osborne	Motor Trade		
Stuart	Turner	Essex search and rescue		
Mike	Carpenter	CODE Development Planners Ltd	Largely dependent upon site circumstances and character of area.	Comment noted. The updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area and that the Council makes the most effective use of land for development.
ian	wilson	cm36pt		
c/o Agent	c/o Agent			
kelly	tilley			
Catherine	Bicknell	Mid and South Essex Health and Care Partnership		
N	Baseley	IBA Planning Ltd		
Sue	White		ABSOLUTELY NOT! We are a rural district and I will never support higher densities.	Traditional development within towns is normally at quite a high density but because of the way it is laid out and designed its visual appearance gives a view of lower density. Therefore, an import aspect of density is design and achieving higher density could reduce the amount of land needed to develop within the district.
Sarah	Yates			
Leonard	Lewis			
R	Minney			
Tim	Grant	Evolution Town Planning		
ANNE	OSBORN	Purleigh Community Shop		
Stephen	Hodgkinson		Increasing housing densities on greenfield sites would create more sustainable settlements, as long as design standards aren't compromised and new developments respect the existing character and aesthetic of the area.	Comments noted, the updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area, whichever area that is.
c/o Agent	c/o Agent	Maldon Wick Limited		
ZOE	HOSTY			
S	Swain			
Kevin	Coleman	Phase 2 Planning		
John	Lawrence		So long as the development's design was sensitive to the local character.	Comments noted, the updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area, whichever area that is.
Diane	Wallace			
Jonathan	Aldis	Good life Countryside Services		
Grace	Godwin			
Sue	Hillman			
michael	carr	NHS		
Simon	Plater	Plater+Claiborne	Who is the arbiter of high quality design? Looking at new builds around Colchester and some Suffolk towns the quality of design varies dramatically.	Comments noted, the updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area, whichever area that is.
Mark	Anderson			
Karen	Wellum			
Emma	Wright		That's a oxymoron. High density living has always failed in its efforts to provide high standards of livings and quality of life for families.	Comments noted, though there is no evidence to support that high density living always fails in terms of the standards of living it provides. Good quality design can accommodate high density without compromising living standards.

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 19. 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?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Linda	Coom		With the pressure on land now, I don't see why we shouldn't be building flats and apartments or terraced houses. Our ancestors lived mainly in terraced houses in towns, as Maldon is a great example of. Also, the current housing appears to benefit those with more money already. Many of the houses building by TW south of Maldon cost, I believe, around half a million each. Bearing in mind we had a lack of housing before TW started that build, and the fact that most Maldonians can't afford such expensive housing, most of the building seems to be being built to benefit people with money from London and Brentwood/surrounding areas that want to move to Maldon because they saw the town recommended in (for example) The Sunday Times and they can buy here for less than they sell there. I don't understand how you expect us to believe the housing started out of local demand - even the affordable housing was used to house people from London, I believe? I know it's good for the town to have people with money, it would be a poor town otherwise, but I think we need more balance and more terraced houses so locals can afford them and we get more housing per acre.	Support noted
Caitlin	Soul			
Michelle	Curtis	Tollesbury Parish Council		
Mary	Hammond			
Ian	Drinkwater			
john	hand	N/A		
Emma	Smith	Bradwell on Sea Parish Council		
Tim	Dixon			
Nicola	Taylor	Elixirr	overall quality and design must be achieved however	Comments noted, the updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area, whichever area that is.
Graham	Johnson	graham v johnson		
Chris	Yates			
Sally	Everritt	Community360		
Mark	Garrett		The pandemic identified a need for individual (personal) green space – not likely to be achieved with higher density housing.	Comments noted, the updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area, whichever area that is. Higher density developments can also provide greenspace in the same way as lower density development.
Paul	Vidler		High density housing is needed but it needs to be applied in an appropriate way.	Comments noted, the updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area, whichever area that is.
Victoria	Long		Although size and height impacting on surroundings areas should be considered carefully.	Comments noted, the updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area, whichever area that is.
Victor	Staines			
Jayne	Moore	Essex County Fire and Rescue Service	Higher density means more residents. The infrastructure can't cope.	The LDP Review process has to take into account future growth, the Council has a statutory duty to ensure that the future housing and economic needs of the district are planned for and it will make a choice on where that growth is going to go and will be and what infrastructure will be required.
Kevin	Bennett			
Nicholas	Matthams		This would only be appropriate in the larger towns where a vast range of recreational facilities are available.	Comments noted, the updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area, whichever area that is.
Christian	van Stolk	RAND Europe	High density housing seems appropriate to address the need for additional housing in the District. However, it needs to be done in a way that is sympathetic to local realities. Careful consideration should be given to develop high density housing in a rural District.	Comments noted, the updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area, whichever area that is.
Nicholas	Jepson			
Pamela	Lacey		Higher density causes neighbourly friction. And this wastes police time!!!!	There is no evidence that higher density development causes anymore neighbourly friction than lower density development.
Chloe	Soul			
carole	kirk			
Sharon	Jackson			
RICHARD	GROUT			
Charles	Bishop			
Paul	Jewiss	Self Employed		
Deborah	Anderson	NHS		
John	Pilgrim	Self employed	The quality of design needs to be higher than they are currently building.	Comments noted, the updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area, whichever area that is.
Gloria	Gold	London Design and Engineering UTC		
Linda	Curry		Seems inconsistent with the current nature of the settlement.	Comments noted, the updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area, whichever area that is.
Lucy	Waterhouse			
Jon	Mayhew			

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 19. 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?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
James	Goody	James Goody refurbishments		
Johanna	Dale		In the last 5 years the council has given the go-ahead to large sprawling suburban estates (even in the small and medium villages). Well-built and designed housing of a higher density would not only take up less land, but would be a better way of delivering starter homes for those locals currently finding themselves priced out of the market. At the core of most of our historic villages are terraces of houses around green spaces - this is not only a much better use of space, but a much better way of creating a community	The strategic allocations in the LDP were only in the towns of the district not in the medium and small villages. The updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area, whichever area that is.
Tracy	Kinnane			
Carlos	Rodriguez		High density housing is supported in policy, but it needs to be applied in a contextually appropriate way. Any application of height will need careful design considerations.	Comments noted, the updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area, whichever area that is.
Rebecca	Tucker			
Mark	Faraway		Quality of life for those living in high density areas needs great considerations and high density development in small and medium sized villages is not fair on existing home owners who in the majority which to remain villages to remain villages with space and open view to appreciate what the area has to offer	Comments noted, the updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area, whichever area that is.
T	Ketteley			
Elizabeth	Weston			
Jacky	Barber		High density housing is supported in policy, but it needs to be applied in a contextually appropriate way. Any application of height will need careful design considerations.	Comments noted, the updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area, whichever area that is.
Ursula	Benjafield			
Paul	Mitchell			
Kristian	Tokeley	CTC Construction Ltd		
Ziyad	Thomas	Churchill Retirement Living / McCarthy Stone		
James	Campbell	HMPPS		
William	Moss		subject to appropriate height restrictions	Comments noted, the updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area, whichever area that is.
Simon	Mackenzie Smith		Yes this is fine but only if properly high standard are applied to the development	Comments noted, the updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area, whichever area that is.
Richard	Udall			
Rosalind	Bishop			
John	Symington			
Michael	Manning			
Jack	Inglis	Kelvedon Hall		
Peggy	Shields			
Dawn	Adams	Catesby Estates	With regard to density the NPPF requires that these should be appropriate taking into account not only the quality of the design but also the character of the area, market conditions, viability, and the nature of housing need in that area. Therefore, whilst higher density development should be considered the Council must ensure that any proposed densities are considered against each of these variables and would not make a site or the plan as whole undeliverable	Comments noted, the updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area, whichever area that is.
Wayne	Tilley	RTG Group Limited		
David	Dronfield	Braxted park	Development Densities High density housing is supported in policy, but it needs to be applied in a contextually appropriate way. Any application of height will need careful design considerations.	Comments noted, the updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area, whichever area that is.
John	Peirson			
Ron	Brown	Corporate		
Roger	HAWES		Depends where they are being built of course	Comments noted, the updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area, whichever area that is.
Anne	Hull	Elmwood Equestrian Centre		
Matthew	Bloxham	Matt		
Julia	Morris			
Amanda	MacKenzie			
Jenny	Shepherd			
Jack	Ellum			
Bernard	Steeples			
Anna	mccomb	NHS Property Services Ltd		
Natalie	Kermath	Environment Agency		
Peter	Knights			
Unknown	Unknown	Ministry of Defence		
Duncan	Clark		High density housing is supported in policy, but it needs to be applied in a contextually appropriate way. Any application of height will need careful design considerations. Equally, it is appropriate that density policies and judgements have regard to the mix of housing needed.	Comments noted, the updated design policy should assist in ensuring that development provides high quality design in line with the character of an area, whichever area that is.
Patricia	Smith			
Mick	Sargeant			
John	Cockerell	Hatfield Peverell Parish Council		

First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Question 19. 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?	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Catherine	Williams	C/O Savills (Agent)		
Tom	Kelly			
Linda	Gemmill			
Linda	Gemmill			
Mark	Norman	Highways England		
Thomasin	Foster			
*	*			
Alan	Massow			
*	*			
Ian	Butt			
Sarah	Sayer			
*	*			