

## ECC Response to Maldon Local Development Plan (Regulation 18) - Issues and Options consultation (January 2022)

---

### Overview

Thank you for consulting Essex County Council (ECC) on the Maldon District Local Development Plan Review (Regulation 18) – Issues and Options consultation published in January 2022. Maldon District Council’s (MDC) engagement with ECC has been proportionate at this early stage of plan preparation. The Issues and Options Document is not a policy document but a discussion paper setting out the issues, challenges and constraints faced in the Maldon District across a number of environmental, economic and social themes. Once prepared, the new Local Plan will include the required strategies, policies and site proposals to guide future planning across the District up to 2043, and will replace the approved Local Development Plan (2017).

As plan preparation continues, ECC is committed to working with MDC through the established mechanisms of the MDC and ECC Local Plan Liaison and Transport Co-ordination officer working groups to prepare evidence that ensures the preferred spatial strategy, policies and site allocations are sound, viable and deliverable, where future development is aligned to the provision of required local and strategic infrastructure.

A Local Plan provides a platform from which to secure a sustainable economic, social and environmental future to the benefit of residents, businesses and visitors. A robust long-term strategy will provide a reliable basis on which MDC, ECC and its partners may plan and provide the services and required infrastructure for which they are responsible. To this end, ECC will use its best endeavours to assist on strategic and cross-boundary matters under the adopted MDC duty to cooperate (the Duty) strategy, including engagement and co-operation with other organisations for which those issues may have relevance. This will ensure MDC, in consultation with ECC, can plan and provide the necessary cross boundary infrastructure and services; whilst securing necessary funding.

### ECC interest in the Maldon Issues and Options Local Plan consultation

ECC aims to ensure that local policies and related strategies, including those of neighbouring authorities, provide the greatest benefit to deliver economic renewal, ambition and equality to create a buoyant economy for the existing and future population that lives, works, visits and invests not only in Maldon District, but in Essex as a whole. For strategic and cross boundary matters, this is likely to include a balance of land uses to create great places for all communities and businesses across all sectors; and that the developer funding for the required infrastructure is clear and explicit from the outset. As a result, ECC is keen to understand, inform, support and help refine the formulation of the development strategy and policies delivered by LPAs within and adjoining Essex. Involvement is necessary and beneficial because of ECC’s role as:

## APPENDIX 2

- a. the highway and transport authority, including responsibility for the delivery of the Essex Local Transport Plan; the lead authority for education including early years and childcare (EYCC), Special Education Needs and Disabilities, and Post 16 education; Minerals and Waste Planning Authority; Lead Local Flood Authority; lead advisors on public health; and responsibilities for adult social care in relation to the securing the right housing mix which takes account of the housing needs of older people and adults with disabilities;
- b. an infrastructure funding partner which seeks to ensure that development allocations proposed are realistic and do not place an unnecessary (or unacceptable) cost burden on the public purse and, specifically, ECC's Capital Programme;
- c. major provider and commissioner of a wide range of local government services throughout the administrative county (and where potential cross boundary impacts need to be considered);
- d. Advocate of the Essex Climate Action Commissioner's (ECAC) Report 2021 Net Zero – Making Essex Carbon Neutral providing advice and recommendations for action on climate change mitigation and adaptation including setting planning policies which minimise carbon. This work has been tailored for use in the county of Essex. In November 2021 the [Essex County Council's Response to Net Zero: Making Essex Carbon Neutral](#) report was approved by ECC's Cabinet with regard to land use and green infrastructure; energy; built environment; transport and waste matters.

In accordance with the Duty and the MDC Duty to cooperate Strategy, ECC will assist and contribute cooperatively to the review of the Maldon Local Development Plan, particularly within the following broad subject areas,

- Evidence base. Guidance with assembly and interpretation of the evidence base both for strategic/cross-boundary projects and Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs) (A12 widening and Bradwell B), education provision and transport studies (including modelling and wider strategic highway schemes);
- ECC assets and services. Where relevant, advice on the current status of assets and services and the likely impact and implications of proposals in the Local Plan review for the future operation and delivery of ECC services. In June 2021, ECC submitted a potential development site at Primrose Meadow, Maldon through the 'Call for Sites';
- Sub-regional and broader context. Assistance with identification of relevant information and its fit with broader strategic initiatives, and assessments of how emerging proposals for Maldon may impact on areas beyond and vice-versa;
- Policy development. Contributions on the relationship of the evidence base with the structure and content of emerging policies and proposals; and
- Inter-relationship between Local Plans. Including the Essex Minerals Local Plan (2014); Minerals Local Plan Review regarding proposed amendments to Policy S6 – Provision for sand and gravel extraction and the Essex and Southend-on-Sea Waste Local Plan (2017) and the Maldon Local Development Plan review where ECC is the upper tier authority for Maldon District.

Of critical importance is the additional evidence required for the site assessment process at both the individual and cumulative level to refine and develop the spatial strategy, as it relates to strategic and cross boundary matters. There are also challenges arising from COVID-19 and how these can be addressed through the new Local Plan.

### Key issues and messages of the ECC response

The ECC response is set out within the context of national policy, including the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) and ECC's organisation plan proposals within "Everyone's Essex" based on ECC's strategies, policies, objectives and evidence base. The response also makes reference to the Essex Climate Action Commission's (ECAC) Report 2021 [Net Zero – Making Essex Carbon Neutral](#) and the [Essex County Council's Response to Net Zero: Making Essex Carbon Neutral](#). The ECC response therefore identifies where we support emerging options and proposals, and where we recommend further work and engagement with ECC in order to refine and inform the "Preferred Options", the next iteration of the local plan preparation, scheduled for consultation in later 2022. The key messages in ECC's response are summarised below.

- ECC support MDC preparing a new Local Plan and will assist with the preparation of sound evidence and policies, that plan for long term sustainable infrastructure delivery.
- The key reason for the review has been the under delivery of housing at the two Garden Suburbs as set out in paragraph 2.16 of Policy S3 of the approved LDP, whereby a cumulative shortfall of 447 homes has occurred when matched against a target of 1,022 homes. Clarity is required on whether the review is a full or partial review of the approved MLDP and accordingly which parts and policies are to be reviewed. ECC consider a full review is the appropriate approach given the issues identified for a review being significant in nature.
- It is still too early to provide detailed comments on the impacts, opportunities and requirements for the full range of ECC infrastructure and services, because the 'Growth Options' do not provide any details on overall scale; the location of growth by Town/Village or specific site allocations. Consequently, no individual or cumulative assessments of growth on ECC services can be undertaken at this time and additional engagement and evidence is required for transportation, education, minerals and waste, flood and water management, economic need and employment. ECC will also contribute to the evidence in respect of skills, Adult Social Care, Public Health, climate change, and green and blue infrastructure so that the plan can deliver safer, greener, healthier communities.
- New secondary school - the scale of growth requires an additional secondary school as there is no scope to further expand the Plume Academy at Maldon beyond existing expansion plans. There are also concerns with regards the scope to further expand Ormiston Academy, Burnham-on-Crouch and William de Ferrers, South Woodham Ferrers beyond that identified in the [School Organisation ECC 10 Year Plan for Essex school places \(2022 to 2031\)](#).
- Spatial Growth Scenarios – the preferred scenario should meet national policy to deliver housing and other growth requirements; climate change resilience and adaptation; infrastructure delivery, including the potential for a new secondary school and environmental aspirations of MDC. As a minimum, the standard methodology should be met and any buffer to drive local economic growth or address unmet need from elsewhere is supported but will need to be based on sound evidence and follow the EPOA (Essex Planning Officers' Association) Unmet Housing Needs Protocol.
- Proportional growth options relative to settlement size are unlikely to secure the delivery of viable and sustainable infrastructure at a scale necessary for the level of growth to be planned for and is not an approach ECC could support.

## APPENDIX 2

- A preferable option is likely to see a combination of the consultation options presented resulting in some urban intensification, a focus on main towns subject to secondary school capacity, and concentrated growth in one or more locations (preferably at a scale to deliver a new secondary school) and subject to infrastructure capacity and provision.
- ECC will need to be involved if any cross-boundary development proposals are pursued. In addition to those identified by MDC, strategic and cross boundary issues include the implications arising from Bradwell B Nuclear Power Station; highway and transportation matters including the South Maldon Relief Road (SMRR) and strategic road corridors along the A414; B1012/A132 and B1019, rail capacity; water supply and quality; and mineral and waste planning.
- It is unclear how the major infrastructure policy would be implemented or the criteria that it would include, and ECC reserves the right to comment on any specific policy wording.
- The potential impact of Bradwell B on the future planning of the district, the potential need for development that may be contrary to the preferred 'Growth Option' and the cross border strategic impacts are significant to warrant a commitment by MDC to undertake a full review of any spatial strategy and the Plan, if and when proposals for Bradwell B resume.
- The application of the windfall policy is unclear and will need to be reviewed once detailed policy wording has been drafted including the specific criteria against which sites would be considered. ECC would seek as much of the housing growth as possible to be identified through specific site allocations, as this will provide more certainty with regards infrastructure planning. ECC does not consider a 'cap' should be placed on specific sites as these will be confirmed through the detailed site assessments, masterplanning and planning application process. ECC would seek as much of the housing growth as possible to be identified through specific site allocations.
- Clarification is sought on the approach to settlement boundaries and their application to different sized villages. ECC support, in principle, the use of settlement boundaries as a policy tool reflecting the area where plan policies are to be applied, as it provides more certainty with regard to specific site allocations and the policies which apply to those sites/areas and is consistent with a plan-led system.
- MDC should take account of locations which stand a better chance of securing new infrastructure, particularly at scale. MDC and ECC will need to engage and work closely together to help inform site selection, both individually and cumulatively, to ensure they are at the right location and scale to deliver viable and sustainable infrastructure provision.
- ECC and MDC are working collaboratively on agreeing the baseline on existing infrastructure delivery, costs and phasing to support the plan review and the future Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). Moving forward it will be necessary to identify which settlements have existing infrastructure deficits/service shortages and existing available capacity to accommodate potential growth.

The ECC response is set out in table from page 6 onwards and reflects the order of the IOCD paper including responses to specific questions.

## Maldon Local Development Plan Review (Regulation 18) – Issues and Options consultation questions

Document Reference	MDC Question and ECC Response
2.0	<b>The District of Maldon - A Spatial Picture</b>
Q1	<p><b>Do you agree with this spatial picture of the District?</b></p> <p>No. ECC considers that paragraph 1.1 does not provide an accurate description of the Local Development Plan (LDP) for Maldon District, which is presently made up of the approved LDP, the <a href="#">Essex and Southend-on-Sea Waste Local Plan 2017 (WLP)</a> , the <a href="#">Essex Minerals Local Plan 2014 (MLP)</a> and the <a href="#">Burnham-on-Crouch</a> and <a href="#">Wickham Bishops</a> `made' neighbourhood plans. ECC can provide appropriate wording to inform the next iteration of the LDP with regards the policy framework and role of the MLP and WLP.</p> <p>ECC considers the spatial picture concentrates on Maldon district itself and a wider context incorporating its neighbouring districts and the relationship to the wider region should be presented. This is important given that the Growth Options make reference to locations adjacent to the district boundary (Option 5) and to linking into the service and facilities in neighbouring Tiptree and Witham (Option 6) as well as the identification of a number of cross boundary/strategic issues (for example - the A12 widening scheme).</p> <p>ECC recommend a description is provided with regards the three road corridors in the district, namely</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A414 connecting to the A12 via Danbury;</li> <li>• B1012 Lower Burnham Road to the A132 South Woodham Ferrers; and</li> <li>• B1019 Maldon Road to Hatfield Peverel and the A12.</li> </ul> <p>Reference should also be made to the Southminster Branch Line, in particular the passing loop at North Fambridge. Further details regarding these corridors are provided with the responses to Questions 3, 4 and 15. ECC recommend reference is also made to the relatively poor connectivity between the north and south of the district with the absence of key strategic routes and any railway connection.</p> <p>ECC recommend reference is made within the South and East section (section 2.15) to the relationship to South Woodham Ferrers in terms of secondary education planning. Ormiston Academy, Burnham-on-Crouch is grouped with William de Ferrers in South Woodham Ferrers to enable ECC, as education authority, to plan for sufficient school capacity based on geography and historical admission patterns. In addition, reference should be made in the Central Area (Maldon and Heybridge – 2.19) to the Plume Academy, which is one of the largest schools in Essex and is being expanded to its full capacity to accommodate growth in the approved Local Plan. ECC considers this is a key issue in the future determination of any spatial strategy and should be referenced here accordingly.</p> <p>ECC recommend the South and East Area should reference Bradwell B, which is identified in National Policy Statement for Nuclear Power Generation (EN – 6) as a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP). The project is at pre-application stage but further work has been paused since January 2021. The project will have a significant impact beyond the district boundary if progressed.</p>

Document Reference	MDC Question and ECC Response
	<p>ECC recommend the references to spatial connections in paragraph 2.2 are referenced appropriately and an explanation provided as to their relationship to the district. While important economic corridors and localities within Essex, Haven Gateway; Thames Gateway and M11 Corridor (now UK Innovation Corridor) are no longer specifically defined as ‘regional growth areas’ by national policy. The following amendments should be made for clarity in terminology:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• M11 Corridor is now termed UK Innovation Corridor;</li> <li>• Refer to London Stansted Airport and London Southend Airport; and</li> <li>• Chelmsford <u>City</u>.</li> </ul> <p>ECC recommend reference should be made to the new housing market area of Chelmsford and Braintree as evidenced in the <a href="#">Maldon District Local Housing Needs Assessment Part 1 2021</a>, and comments are provided in the response to Question 3.</p> <p><u>Other comments on the Spatial Picture</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ECC recommend an indication should be given as to the position within the settlement pattern and population size of the key settlements referenced in order to provide an indication of their role and function;</li> <li>• paragraph 2.14 refers to the North Heybridge Garden Suburb and its close connection with the main settlement of Maldon and Heybridge. Consequently, is this reference more relevant within the Central Area (Maldon and Heybridge) than the North and West Area?;</li> <li>• <a href="#">The Rural Facilities and Settlement Hierarchy Study (January 2022)</a> could be used to provide some context with regards the provision of community and other facilities throughout the district;</li> <li>• reference should be made to the in/out commuting flows to higher order service centres, travel to work areas and self-containment patterns in the district as identified in paragraphs 2.46 – 2.57 of the <a href="#">Maldon District Local Housing Needs Assessment Part 1 2021</a>. This would be consistent with the issues highlighted in Question 4, Issue 3, bullet 2 with regards out commuting to Basildon and Chelmsford;</li> <li>• ECC seeks further clarification with regards the contribution of tourism to employment in the district, as 17% of all employment appears high. Is this assuming that all accommodation, food service and leisure jobs exclusively serve tourists – whereas much of this will be serving local residents.</li> <li>• ECC recommend reference should be made to the primary areas of employment and in particular the districts main employment area at <a href="#">Causeway Regeneration Area</a>, where key opportunity sites are being earmarked for redevelopment to initiate its regeneration, creating jobs, investment and environmental enhancement.</li> <li>• ECC recommend reference is made to non-designated heritage assets and the Essex Historic Environment Record (EHER) in paragraph 2.5 and be considered as part of the next iteration of the plan consistent with NPPF, paragraphs 190 and 192.</li> </ul>
<b>COUNCILS RESPONSE</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Agreed that there should be reference to the lack of strategic connections within the district, the reference to road networks and connections is not that clear and needs to be set out so that it is clear to the reader, a map should be added to illustrate these connections.</b></li> </ul>

Document Reference	MDC Question and ECC Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agreed that there needs to be a sentence added into the South East Area section about South Woodham Ferrers and its role in relation to the District including education. There is no need to mention the Plume Academy because it does not link in with anywhere outside of the District in spatial terms.</li> <li>• Agreed that reference should be made to Bradwell B in the South East Area section.</li> <li>• Agreed that the correct terminology should be used in regard to the Spatial picture and the alterations to the text will be made.</li> <li>• Agreed that there should be a mention of the housing market that the District lies in.</li> <li>• Agreed that some mention should be put in of the settlement pattern – put in the numbers of towns, large, medium and small villages.</li> <li>• Agreed that the paragraph which refers to the North Heybridge Garden Suburb should be moved into the Central Area Section of the Spatial Picture.</li> <li>• Agreed a sentence should be put in about commuting into and out of the District.</li> <li>• With regard to the statistics in the strategy these will be checked and amended prior to the next publication.</li> <li>• Agreed that there should be some reference to employment sites and include the Causeway Regeneration Area as this is a key project for the Council.</li> <li>• Agreed that there should be a mention of non-designated heritage assets, there is no need to mention the Essex Historic Environment Record in the spatial picture it does not add to the overall picture.</li> </ul>
4.0	<b>Key Issues for Maldon District</b>
Q2	<p><b>Are these issues still relevant?</b></p> <p>Yes – partly. ECC considers the consultation document is unclear on whether the review is a full or partial review of the approved LDP. If a 'partial review', it should be clear which parts and policies of the approved Plan are to be reviewed. Any parts/policies not subject to review should be supported by a clear and detailed explanation as to why this is the case. Whilst it is possible to review part only of an existing plan PPG (Paragraph: 070 Reference ID: 61-070-20190315), ECC consider a full review is the appropriate approach given the issues identified for a review being significant in nature. PPG (Paragraph: 062 Reference ID: 61-062-20190315) states that to be effective plans need to be kept up-to-date.</p> <p>ECC acknowledges that the principal reason for a review is the under delivery of housing since 2019/2020 at the two Garden Suburbs, as triggered by paragraph 2.16 of Policy S3 of the approved LDP, whereby a cumulative shortfall of 447 homes has occurred when matched against a target of 1,022 homes in the approved LDP. However, ECC considers that the other reasons presented by MDC for a 'partial review' of the plan are significant in nature and warrant a full review of the Plan. These reasons include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the lack of a 5 year supply of housing land, namely 3.26 years at April 2021 meaning decision making is no longer plan-led, but is subject to the '<i>presumption in favour of sustainable development</i>';</li> <li>• the evidence base, which supports the LDP, is becoming out of date;</li> </ul>

Document Reference	MDC Question and ECC Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) have been significantly amended since the approved LDP with some aspects no longer in conformity with national policy (for example – the inclusion of strategic and non-strategic policies to address each LPA’s priorities);</li> <li>• the Standard Method is now used to identify housing needs and some 4,500 additional homes, in addition to commitments, are required to be identified up to 2043. This is likely to require a different spatial strategy to the approved LDP placing pressure on existing infrastructure previously not impacted and the need for new infrastructure depending on the locations of growth will need to be funded by that growth;</li> <li>• Growth Option 1 is as per the approved LDP. Growth Options 2 – 7 are all significantly different to the existing spatial strategy to which the development management policies also relate. How relevant would these existing development management policies be in managing future development in the district if an Option 2 – 7 were selected;</li> <li>• small and medium sized sites are now required to contribute 10% of housing delivery – the approved LDP only had a district wide windfall allowance;</li> <li>• the implications arising from Bradwell B Nuclear Power Station need to be considered as development will likely commence within the plan period with significant local and wider implications;</li> <li>• existing LDP policies do not provide the best foundation to manage and mitigate the impacts of climate change. MDC declared a Climate Emergency in February 2021 and approved a Climate Action Strategy in December 2021; and</li> <li>• the legal requirement on protecting and enhancing Green Infrastructure (GI), its accessibility and providing 10% biodiversity net gain is now mandatory through the Environment Act 2021. ECC acknowledge that MDC has adopted its own Green Infrastructure Strategy SPD (2019) but consideration should be given to the use of the <a href="#">Essex Green Infrastructure Strategy (2020)</a> and <a href="#">Essex Green Infrastructure Standards</a>. ECC is establishing a Local Nature Partnership (LNP) covering Greater Essex along with a Local Nature Recovery Strategy.</li> </ul> <p>The consultation document identifies the following main issues that were to be addressed by the approved LDP. ECC provides comments on these matters.</p> <p>4.2 – Housing - ECC notes that no reference is made to the specific impacts on older people, care leavers and people with disabilities and whether supply has addressed demand from these groups in the district. The Local Development Plan Review (LDPR) will need to assess the demand and supply for these forms of housing and their locational requirements.</p> <p>4.3 – Economy - ECC recommend additional detail should be provided using information from the completed MDC <a href="#">Economy Study (January 2021)</a> and Employment Land and Premises Study once completed, which may identify current issues regarding the economy. At present there is no reference to the primary areas of employment such as The Causeway and the need for their regeneration. This will help give some context to Objective 3. Reference should also be made as to why the employment allocations in the LDP have not yet come forward.</p> <p>4.4 - The Natural and Built Heritage - ECC would welcome early engagement to optimise GI from development in order to help provide</p>

Document Reference	MDC Question and ECC Response
	<p>well connected, multi-purpose spaces that help to improve the health and well being of the community and contribute towards flood attenuation and water resource management. The Environment Act 2021 places a legal requirement on protecting and enhancing GI, its accessibility and makes providing 10% biodiversity net gain mandatory. ECC acknowledge that MDC has adopted its own Green Infrastructure Strategy SPD (2019).</p> <p>ECC is seeking to support local plans by promoting the “mainstreaming” of high quality multifunctional GI into the Essex planning system through stronger policy wording and decision making. ECC considers the LDPR should use the <a href="#">Essex Green Infrastructure Strategy (2020)</a> and <a href="#">Essex Green Infrastructure Standards</a> as part of its evidence base, which have been endorsed by Natural England. The <a href="#">Essex Green Infrastructure Standards</a> guide has been published to support ECC and local authorities to deliver better outcomes for nature and should be read in conjunction with the Essex Design Guide, which ECC consider MDC should endorse (see Question 36). The GI Principles and the corresponding GI Standards for Essex can be viewed in Table 1 on pages 10/11. ECC is establishing a LNP covering Essex, Southend and Thurrock along with a Local Nature Recovery Strategy. Specific themes to be covered include the natural environment, biodiversity net gain, GI, local nature recovery, climate change, and environmental links to economy and planning and health and wellbeing. The LNP will also contribute to the delivery of the recommendations in the Essex Climate Action Commission (ECAC) Report (July 2021) and the <a href="#">ECC Response (November 2021)</a>. Some immediate actions relate to Land Use and GI, pages 3 - 5. All funding commitments outlined relate to the next 4 years to 2025/26 (unless stated otherwise).</p> <p>As the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA), ECC considers it is important to ensure that further consideration is given to minimise impacts of flooding within new and existing developments, particularly relating to flood risk from surface water, groundwater and ordinary watercourses. In the early stages of Plan preparation, the LLFA would welcome engagement regarding a high level assessment of potential development sites in terms of our responsibilities outlined above, particularly their relationship to Critical Drainage Areas (CDAs). It should be noted that whether or not a new development is located within a revised CDA, does not impact on the need for this to have a suitable Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) strategy, that will need to be approved by the LLFA. Any site strategy will need to reduce site runoff to greenfield rates and maintain the existing water quality in accordance with the <a href="#">Essex SuDS Design Guide</a>. The ECAC Report 2021 recommends that there is stronger policy on SuDS and Green SuDS to ensure it is included as the default for new developments (buildings and infrastructure).</p> <p>In addition, ECC recommend exploring the need of new surface water infrastructures, on the basis that the majority of old town sewer systems are more likely to be supported by combined sewers. ECC would not recommend the new development surface water runoff is connected to existing combined sewers in the absence of surface water sewers in the vicinity. ECC has concerns regarding the additional demand and cost associated to treat surface water from combined sewers. The old drainage systems do not support ECC’s SuDS principles and ECC would not support proposals of “minimum SuDS onsite” because the discharge would be to combined sewers.</p> <p>ECC supports the reference in Paragraph 4.4 to a framework to optimise the distinct natural, historic and built heritage of the district. This should be reflected in the title to refer to ‘Natural, <u>Historic</u> and Built Heritage’ and will better reflect the significance of the historic sites and landscapes in the district consistent with NPPF, paragraph 174 a) – f).</p>

Document Reference	MDC Question and ECC Response
	<p data-bbox="277 260 524 292"><u>4.5 – Accessibility</u></p> <p data-bbox="277 331 1778 363">ECC considers these issues are still relevant and further details are outlined in response to Question 3 and 15.</p> <p data-bbox="277 424 2157 523">ECC recommend reference is made to the relatively poor connectivity between the north and south of the district with the absence of key strategic routes and, whilst the south includes the Crouch Valley Line and the north some railway connections at Hatfield Peverel and Witham, there is no rail connection at Maldon/Heybridge.</p> <p data-bbox="277 552 2157 683">Reference is made to the delivery of local highway infrastructure identified in the current LDP including the South Maldon and North Heybridge Relief Roads as being a strategic cross boundary issue in Question 3. These issues are still relevant in progressing the growth identified in the LDP through specific planning applications and their delivery and funding arrangements. These improvements will also need to be considered as committed infrastructure in any future highway modelling of the preferred option for growth.</p> <p data-bbox="277 711 2157 842">A Local Cycling Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) is being prepared by ECC and will help co-ordinate potential walking and cycling schemes identified in the Maldon Cycling Action Plan (2018) prepared by ECC; proposals within MDC adopted masterplan documents (e.g. Maldon and Heybridge Central Area; Maldon Central; Causeway Regeneration Area and the Leisure Quarter) and to new development.</p> <p data-bbox="277 871 696 903"><u>4.6 - People and Communities</u></p> <p data-bbox="277 943 2157 1185">ECC supports the principle in section 4.6 of the need to provide infrastructure and facilities to ensure development is sustainable and contributes to the well-being of communities. New development should be accessible by active and sustainable modes and where possible incorporate green infrastructure. The dispersed nature of the settlement pattern with generally low levels of population and limited key services is a key consideration in determining any future spatial strategy. Moving forward it will be necessary for the local plan process to identify which settlements have existing infrastructure deficits/service shortages and existing available capacity to accommodate potential growth. MDC and ECC (with other infrastructure providers) will need to engage and work closely to help inform site selection, both individually and cumulatively, to ensure they are at the right location and scale to deliver viable and sustainable infrastructure provision.</p> <p data-bbox="277 1225 2157 1465">ECC seek reference to libraries and their role in the provision of public services and that ECC would expect to be engaged by MDC on this matter in respect of any new developments. ECC has recently consulted on a draft Plan titled '<a href="#">Everyone's Library Service (2022 - 2026)</a>', which details ECC intends to transform the Library service over the next four years into a modern, vibrant and sustainable service for all. It will help children and adults improve their literacy, encouraging people to enjoy reading for pleasure and increasing the range of online resources available. There is a commitment to keep all 74 libraries open. ECC seek to explore a range of 'options' that may be considered by ECC for future provision of library services for new developments of 4000+homes (such as a new Garden Suburb/Community), and all of these points/options would require significant funding for not only to set up the service but also to ensure sustainability.</p>

Document Reference	MDC Question and ECC Response
	ECC, as the lead authority for education, strongly considers the limited space available for the district's two secondary schools to expand is a significant constraint that must be addressed by the LDPR. Further details are outlined in response to Question 3 – Education.
<b>COUNCILS RESPONSE</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>There is no need at this stage to set out what kind of review the LDP is undertaking it is not relevant to the issues section of the Plan. Agreed that all the reasons set out by ECC are relevant and at the right time there will be a section added to the plan setting out its rationale but this is not required at the present time.</b></li> <li>• <b>Agreed that there should be mention of the issue of older persons housing in the issues section.</b></li> <li>• <b>Agreed that the employment section will need updating once the Employment Study is completed.</b></li> <li>• <b>Comments noted about green infrastructure</b></li> <li>• <b>Disagree about the change of the heading for the historic and built environment. We have altered it to make it more clear but its not all heritage it's also concerning the environment.</b></li> <li>• <b>Agreed that additional information should go into the accessibility section about connectivity to line up with the spatial picture of the District.</b></li> <li>• <b>The People and Communities Section has been deleted as it did not have any issues in it, its been replaced with a climate change section which is now more relevant and lines up with the objectives more effectively.</b></li> </ul>
Q3	<p><b>Do you consider these to be the extent of strategic and cross boundary issues applicable for the Maldon District?</b></p> <p>No. ECC recommends the preparation of additional evidence, the refinement of the Growth Options and identification of specific locations for growth should be progressed through the MDC and ECC Local Plan Liaison and Transport Co-ordination officer working groups and in accordance with the MDC approved Duty to cooperate Strategy (2021). MDC and ECC will need to work closely together to help inform site selection, both individually and cumulatively, to ensure they are at the right location and scale to deliver viable and sustainable infrastructure provision. The identification of any preferred spatial option will require additional evidence to be undertaken and the impacts of that option to be assessed and mitigated, where possible, both within and adjoining the district, namely Braintree, Chelmsford and Colchester districts.</p> <p>Some necessary assessments include, but are not limited to,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transportation assessments and modelling (including sustainable transport and accessibility) to develop a strategy to realise modal shift including analysis of existing active and sustainable travel infrastructure (including bus network and services), impacts on key junctions within and adjoining the district including necessary mitigation. Any modelling will need to consider the growth aspirations and highway modelling of neighbouring districts, most notably Chelmsford City Council, given key transport corridors along the A414 through Danbury to the A12 and the B1012 Lower Burnham Road to the A132 South Woodham Ferrers to the A130 including key junctions;</li> <li>• Scenario testing for education provision including EYCC and the approach to Special Education Needs with Disabilities provision;</li> <li>• Minerals and waste policy compliant assessments in terms of mineral safeguarding and impacts within mineral and waste consultation areas to inform site proposals, pending the outcome of the Minerals Local Plan Review regarding Policy S6 – Provision for sand and</li> </ul>

Document Reference	MDC Question and ECC Response
	<p>gravel extraction;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flood and water management assessments through revised CDAs and any necessary revisions to the Maldon Surface Water Management Plan;</li> <li>• Economic need and employment evidence to refine the level of economic growth to be planned for taking account changes post COVID pandemic. ECC acknowledges that MDC has undertaken an <a href="#">Maldon District Economic Study 2020</a> and note that input from ECC was minimal;</li> <li>• ECC will also contribute to the evidence base in respect of skills, adult social care (including independent living), public health, climate change, and green and blue infrastructure so that the plan can deliver safer, greener, healthier communities.</li> <li>• Relevant applications will need to be subject to a Health Impact Assessment (HIA) as promoted and endorsed by the Essex Planning Officers' Association, where guidance is included on the Essex Design Guide website, to ensure health and wellbeing is comprehensively considered and integrated into the LDP development management policies. Any Plan moving forward will need to have a clear overriding strategic policy for health and well-being to bring these elements together for place making and supporting healthier communities. A policy should be included regarding the need for developments to undertake a HIA. Suitable policy wording can be provided from recent Essex local plan examinations, where this approach and policy has been found sound. MDC should also consider the impact of the proliferation of hot-food takeaways, including around schools if evidenced, in order to address obesity issues. ECC Public Health can advise on a suitable approach to the evidence this work.</li> </ul> <p>ECC provides the following comments with regards the strategic matters identified by MDC and highlight other strategic/cross border matters to be considered.</p> <p><u>Highways</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>A12 widening and junction improvements at Hatfield Peverel, Rivenhall and Witham</u></li> </ul> <p>See comments in response to Question 15, Option 1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Delivery of local highway infrastructure identified in the current LDP including the South Maldon and North Heybridge Relief Roads</u></li> </ul> <p>Section 6.8 states that there is a shortfall on infrastructure funding from that forecast to be available in the approved LDP, which has led to delays in the provision of key highway infrastructure in Maldon, Heybridge and Burnham-on-Crouch. It should be noted that some infrastructure has been provided in accordance with the LDP, and part in advance of growth, and most of the delay has resulted from the lag in the delivery of housing to fund this infrastructure and the demand for such infrastructure has not yet been triggered.</p> <p>The following highway improvements have been implemented as being required by ECC to deliver the LDP growth, namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Widening of the roundabout and approaches to the A414 / B1018 Limebrook Way, Maldon roundabout;</li> <li>• Installation of pre-signals at the A414 / Little Baddow Road / Mayes Lane (Eves Corner), Danbury mini roundabouts;</li> </ul>

Document Reference	MDC Question and ECC Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Safety measures at the A414 / Well Lane, Danbury junction; and</li> <li>• widening to provide a dedicated northbound lane at the A414 / Spital Road, Maldon junction.</li> </ul> <p>The A414 Oak Corner Junction, Maldon will be subject to a detailed design and safety audit. Mitigation will be funded by pooled s106 contributions from the strategic sites in the approved LDP, of which all have planning consent, and most are under construction.</p> <p>The SMRR is required in addition to the improvements already implemented at Limebrook Way in order to accommodate growth on the highway network from LDP growth. MDC has secured financial contributions towards the construction of the SMRR via S106 agreements with those parts of the South Maldon Garden Suburb that have commenced development. A significant contribution and land reserved for the SMRR is to be secured via the site at North of Wycke Hill (outline permission) through which the SMRR will be routed. It will also provide access to the site and the community uses (including circa 1.53ha site reserved for the NHS for 10 years). This includes the land for the NHS to deliver the Maldon Health Hub, which is otherwise landlocked. This Health Hub will replace the District's ageing community hospital near the Maldon town centre, which is no longer fit for purpose. Growth has progressed at a slower rate than anticipated and there is presently insufficient funds available to facilitate a full design of the road which is required before an application for Reserved Matters can be submitted. MDC submitted a bid to the Government's Levelling Up Fund in May 2021 to pump-prime the delivery of the SMRR through funding the design of the road and to provide reassurance to the NHS that the road will be brought forward in a timely manner, but this was unsuccessful. ECC with MDC are both investigating options to secure the necessary funding to commence design work on the SMRR, including the potential re-allocation of monies already collected for unspecified highway improvements towards funding the design of the road.</p> <p>The North Heybridge Relief Road between Broad Street Green Road and Langford Road has detailed planning permission. The Relief Road will provide a direct link to the network of roads bypassing the centres of Maldon and Heybridge alleviating traffic flows within these built up areas and improve linkages to the north of the District and the A12. The section 106 agreement requires the section between Langford Road to Maypole Road to be open prior to the occupation of the 100th dwelling and to be fully completed to Broad Street Green Road prior to the occupation of the 350th dwelling.</p> <p><u>Environment</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Impacts of continued growth in Maldon &amp; Heybridge on Air Quality Management Area in Maldon &amp; Danbury (within Chelmsford City area)</u></li> </ul> <p>The impact of any Growth Option on the link and junction capacity and safety along the A414 to A12 junction 18 at Sandon will need to be included within any future highway modelling, particular given the nature of the route passing through built up areas. The pre-signals installed at the Eves Corner junction to manage approved LDP growth to 2029 will need to be reviewed as part of new highway modelling to assess whether they remain satisfactory mitigation. An Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) was designated in October 2018 (post LDP adoption) between Gay Bowers Lane and Danbury Village Green, adjacent to Eves Corner. An Air Quality Action Plan is being</p>

Document Reference	MDC Question and ECC Response
	<p>prepared by Chelmsford City Council.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Impact of residential growth on protected habitats in Essex</u></li> </ul> <p>ECC recommend that this cross boundary issue should be amended to read:</p> <p><i><u>The impacts of all growth on protected and Priority habitats and species, as well as opportunities to contribute to conserving and enhancing the local Nature Recovery Network for Maldon District.</u></i></p> <p>Impacts from residential growth on protected sites in Maldon is supported by the implementation of the adopted Essex Coast RAMS and the supporting <a href="#">Supplementary Planning Document</a> (SPD).</p> <p>Natural England's District Level Licensing (DLL) for great crested newts also supports protected species conservation as well as streamlining the planning process at application stage. In considering future site selection it is recommended that MDC use the DLL Risk Zones to steer development away from "amber" zones (there are currently no red zones in Essex). The Environment Act 2021 makes the delivery of 10% Biodiversity Net Gain mandatory, and if habitats cannot be retained within developments, all losses will need to be compensated for ahead of restoration/creation of habitats to meet at least 10% biodiversity net gain. This often includes the enhancement of green infrastructure locally but also across local authority boundaries. Further collaborative working is necessary between authorities to consider the feasibility of delivering 10% Biodiversity Net Gain on all sites to support local plan allocations. Some authorities are considering setting a 20% net gain but will require further feasibility assessment. In considering mitigation for site allocations the mitigation hierarchy of avoid, mitigate, compensate, enhance should be progressed in the first instance ahead of any offsite biodiversity net gain provision.</p> <p>ECC is establishing a Local Nature Partnership (LNP) covering Greater Essex along with the outline for a Local Nature Recovery Strategy and further details are provided within the response to Question 2, section 4.4.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Impact of growth on the water cycle</u></li> </ul> <p>Water Resources East (WRE) estimate that by 2050 there will be a water deficit in the Eastern region of between 703 megalitres (Ml/d) and 2,267 Ml/d a day. The <a href="#">Water Resources Regional Plan</a> (WRMP) was informally consulted upon between January – February 2022 with a final published version by 2023 and will help inform the Plan. The East of England faces the following water supply pressures including being the driest area of the country, is subject to the highest population/development growth outside of London along with a strong economic ambition, has significant internationally important environments and is a leading agricultural producer. There is also anticipated to be a reduction in levels of abstraction in environmentally sensitive areas including central and south Essex. These pressures all need to consider the need to adapt and mitigate the impact of climate change. WRE are actively progressing work on demand</p>

Document Reference	MDC Question and ECC Response
	<p>management and catchment level multisector solutions including leakage detection and reduction; metering; grey water reuse and water efficiency.</p> <p>Essex includes reservoirs at Abberton near Colchester (supplying Essex and Suffolk Water), Ardleigh near Colchester (supplying Anglian and Affinity Water) and Hanningfield near Billericay (operated by Essex and Suffolk Water). Essex is generally regarded as more resilient to public water supply scarcity due to the transfer of water from neighbouring counties, but this may not always be an option in the future. The existing transfers may be put at risk as other areas come under increasing water stress.</p> <p>The water shortage/ scarcity will have significant impacts on our water resources. ECC, as LLFA, seeks to work with MDC in ensuring any water policy in the local plan sets a clear framework for seeking to reduce water use and promote water re-use as much as possible. Some of the key principles include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a strategy that sets a clear framework and actions to achieve long-term water sustainability in relation to water usage for agriculture, industry and commercial sectors and sustainable practices to manage water resources;</li> <li>• to ensure that planning decisions are informed and consider the appropriate actions necessary regarding flood risk, water scarcity, and fulfil clean water demand;</li> <li>• to ensure water reuse and recycling are given high consideration;</li> <li>• to promote sustainable drainage practices to ensure flood mitigation;</li> <li>• incorporate regional level SuDS measures; and</li> <li>• to provide effective education and public awareness on the matters of water scarcity and demand and sustainable drainage.</li> </ul> <p><u>Housing</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Housing market area changes - Maldon is now in a Housing Market Area (HMA) with Chelmsford and Braintree.</li> </ul> <p>ECC would encourage MDC to fully meet its own housing needs within its administrative boundary. MDC will need to formally approach their HMA and other appropriate districts to see if they will be required to meet any unmet need. ECC would expect MDC to follow the EPOA Guidance Note - Mechanism for the Consideration of Unmet Housing Need (2017) if it is not to fully meet its own housing needs.</p> <p>ECC recommend that meeting the need and provision of housing for the following groups are also fully considered as part of the LDPR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• extra-care housing and independent living;</li> <li>• supported living for people with disabilities and/or care needs; and</li> <li>• provision of affordable housing for those leaving supported accommodation.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>The need and provision of Gypsy &amp; Traveller Transit Sites in Essex</u></li> </ul>

Document Reference	MDC Question and ECC Response
	<p>ECC supports the reference in bullet 6 to providing different types and sizes of housing including Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople pitches. Further details regarding Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople matters are included in the response to Questions 27 and 28. ECC consider the approach to the provision for temporary Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation to be a cross boundary matter and is aware that it is being progressed in co-operation with Essex authorities, through the EPOA.</p> <p><u>Education</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>the provision of secondary education</u></li> </ul> <p>ECC, as the lead authority for education, strongly considers there is no scope to further expand the Plume Academy at Maldon beyond existing expansion plans identified in the <a href="#">School Organisation ECC 10 Year Plan for Essex school places (2022 to 2031)</a>. This identifies the expansion of The Plume by 2023/24 by 300 places (2fe). Any future strategy will need to consider the alternatives for secondary school provision including the scale of growth to deliver a new school (approx. 4,500 homes); potential to review priority admission areas; and potential expansion of other secondary schools adjacent to the district.</p> <p>In addition, the Planning Group for secondary school provision at Burnham-on-Crouch includes Ormiston Academy and William de Ferrers in South Woodham Ferrers (which is in the Chelmsford City administrative area). The current forecasts suggest an additional 2FE (300 places) is required to meet peak demand but may be only one form entry on average. ECC has undertaken some feasibility work at Ormiston Academy with 1FE expansion planned to open in 2022/23 as identified in the <a href="#">School Organisation Plan</a>. William de Ferrers will increase its admission number by 30 places within its existing accommodation in 2023/24. The school has capacity to expand by 1FE (150 places) within its existing accommodation and this is likely to be necessary from 2023. A further 1FE expansion is feasible but would be expensive given site constraints, and is not supported by the school.</p> <p>ECC consider the limited space available for the district's two secondary schools to expand is a significant constraint that must be addressed by the Plan. Any future strategy will need to consider the alternatives for secondary school provision including the scale of growth to deliver a new school (approx. 4,500 homes); potential to review school priority admission areas, and potential expansion of other secondary schools adjacent to the district. A full housing scenario test will be required to determine if, and where, the spatial strategy can deliver land for new provision in accordance with the <a href="#">ECC Local and Neighbourhood Planners Guide to School Organisation and/or the Garden Communities and Planning School Places Guide</a>. This scenario test will also identify the impact of growth on the provision of primary education and early years and childcare.</p> <p><u>Health</u></p> <p>Health and wellbeing has an important role at underpinning place shaping and ensuring that leisure, culture and healthy lifestyles are facilitated and supported. The ECAC Report highlights the ambition to create and maintain 'Healthy Places' in terms of design, placemaking and place management to ensure these locations both positively contribute to physical and mental health and mitigate</p>

Document Reference	MDC Question and ECC Response
	<p>climate change. This is critical to promoting healthy and safe communities as set out in the NPPF (paragraph 92) and to enable and support healthy lifestyles. ECC as the organisation with lead responsibility for public health within Essex welcomes working with MDC in seeking to shape the draft Plan in this subject matter.</p> <p>ECC would seek the Plan to include an overarching health and wellbeing strategy policy to effectively address the health and wellbeing matters identified in the <a href="#">Essex JSNA Countywide Report (2019)</a> and the <a href="#">Maldon District Profile, Essex Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy (2018 - 2022)</a> and importantly any local Health and Wellbeing Strategies and the Livewell campaign, in order to influence behavioural change, as well as deprivation and to address inequalities within the district. A range of Essex local plans recently found sound at examination and now adopted, include such a policy and ECC could provide relevant further information.</p> <p>HIA is the established and recognised means of providing a comprehensive and systematic process for assessing health and wellbeing impacts from new development proposals. HIA ensures that the wider determinants of health can be factored into the assessment process, including socio-economic, lifestyle and other considerations.</p> <p>The HIA best practice guidance publication led by Public Health England (PHE) <a href="#">Health Impact Assessment in Spatial Planning</a> states, '<i>Local authorities are encouraged to adopt policies that require an HIA to be carried out for certain types of developments in their local plan or spatial development processes</i>'. In Essex, this process is supported by comprehensive guidance in the form of the updated EPOA HIA guidance <a href="#">Essex Healthy Places Advice - Notes for planners developers and designers</a> (hosted on the <a href="#">Essex Design Guide</a> website). This guidance outlines the stepped process of HIA from screening, scoping, assessment, recommendations to monitoring, and ensures a robust, flexible and manageable process; defines thresholds and triggers for when HIA will be required, identifies different types of HIA including a rapid review or a full/comprehensive detailed review. This ensures that a proportionate approach is taken to the type of HIA work required according to the merits of each, on a case by case basis. The level of evidence required is relative to the scale of development proposed and HIA being implemented and can be determined at pre-application stage. An HIA assessment is made of the benefits of a proposal and identifies any unintended consequences. The resulting HIA should make recommendations on how to maximise these benefits to inform the evolution of the proposals, including design, in order to maximise health outcomes. These can be secured through planning conditions or obligations.</p> <p>ECC can provide further guidance on this matter as the Plan preparation continues.</p> <p>PPG (Paragraph: 004 Reference ID:53-004-20190722) states that planning can influence the built environment to improve health and reduce obesity and excess weight in local communities, partly through access to healthy foods. It also states that planning policies and supplementary planning documents can, where justified, seek to limit the proliferation of particular uses where evidence demonstrates this is appropriate including in proximity to locations where children and young people congregate such as schools, community centres and playgrounds. As part of any Local Plan scoping exercise MDC will need to consider whether there are higher than average levels of obesity in parts of the district, areas of deprivation/obesity and proximity to density of fast food outlets, the proliferation of outlets in locations where children have high levels of access (including schools), health inequalities and general poor health in specific locations</p>

Document Reference	MDC Question and ECC Response
	<p>that need to be addressed. Obesity is identified as one of the district's three main health priorities alongside mental health and social isolation. As indicated above the following documents could be used to assist in this process, namely <a href="#">Essex JSNA Countywide Report (2019)</a> and the <a href="#">Maldon District Profile, Essex Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy (2018 - 2022) (EJHWS)</a> and importantly any local Health and Wellbeing Strategies and the Livewell campaign. The EJHWS for the period 2022-2026 is currently on public consultation until 25<sup>th</sup> March and can be viewed by the link below</p> <p><a href="#">Essex Joint Health &amp; Wellbeing Strategy 2022-2026 Consultation - Essex County Council - Citizen Space</a></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Delivery of strategic infrastructure projects including NHS Health Hubs, GP surgeries and relief roads for Maldon and Heybridge</u></li> </ul> <p>Please see comments in response under '<i>Delivery of local highway infrastructure identified in the current LDP including the South Maldon and North Heybridge Relief Roads</i>' above.</p> <p>ECC consider there are additional strategic and cross border issues to be considered in the review and are outlined below.</p> <p><u>Bradwell B Nuclear Power Station</u></p> <p>The consultation proposes a major infrastructure policy to consider the impacts of, and plan for, the implications of Bradwell B Nuclear Power Station and other major infrastructure projects. ECC considers it is unclear how any such policy would be implemented or the criteria that it would include, and ECC reserves the right to comment on any specific policy wording once drafted.</p> <p>MDC is preparing some evidence base which incorporates the potential implications arising from Bradwell B, namely the Housing Needs Assessment Part 2 and Employment Study. Will this be a requirement for all evidence supporting the plan? ECC is of the understanding that the review and the Growth Options assume Bradwell B will progress during the plan period.</p> <p>ECC acknowledges that the Bradwell B NSIP has been paused since January 2021 and it is uncertain when the project will resume. ECC acknowledges that there are many uncertainties regarding the scheme and its associated development. For example, in responding to the Stage 1 consultation, ECC sought clarity with regards a future transport strategy, including a clear position regarding the distribution and modal split of sea, rail and road movements to inform transport modelling, the preferred Strategic Routes during construction and operation; and the specific locations and scale of freight management facilities and park and ride locations.</p> <p>The NSIP will have significant local and cross boundary impacts which may well be inconsistent with any preferred strategy leading to it being undeliverable or need to be revised. ECC considers that the potential impact of Bradwell B on the future planning of the district, the potential need for development that may be contrary to the preferred 'Growth Option' and the cross border strategic impacts are significant to warrant a commitment by MDC to undertake a full review of any spatial strategy and the Plan. ECC seek MDC to give due consideration to the inclusion of a commitment to commence a full review and update of the local plan in paragraph 12.17</p>

Document Reference	MDC Question and ECC Response
	<p>should Bradwell gain a Development Consent Order in the Plan period. PPG, Paragraph: 062 Reference ID: 61-062-20190315 states that there may be ‘occasions where there are significant changes in circumstances which may mean it is necessary to review the relevant strategic policies earlier than the statutory minimum of 5 years, for example, where new cross-boundary matters arise’. <a href="#">PAS Local Plan Route Mapper (October 2021)</a>, paragraph 36 states that ‘if local circumstances suggest that a different strategy or strategic policy approach is required you are likely to need to update your local plan’. It is felt that Bradwell B falls into this category.</p> <p><u>Other Highway related matters</u></p> <p>ECC consider there are additional strategic and cross border highway related issues to be considered in the LDPR and these are considered in detail within the response to Question 15, Option 1. They include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A414 through Danbury to the A12, Junction 18 including the AQMA at Eves Corner;</li> <li>• B1012 Lower Burnham Road to the A132 South Woodham Ferrers to the A130 including key junctions, Ferrers Road and Rettendon Turnpike;</li> <li>• B1019 Maldon Road and junction at the B1019 Maldon Rd / B1137 Duke of Wellington mini roundabout, Hatfield Peverel; and</li> <li>• Capacity of the Southminster Branch Line and onward movements to London Liverpool Street.</li> </ul> <p><u>Minerals and Waste Planning</u></p> <p>ECC as the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority (MWPA) consider that minerals and waste is a strategic and cross boundary issue. The Local Plan should explicitly set out that ECC must be consulted on all applications for non-mineral development proposed within Mineral Consultation Areas, Mineral Safeguarding Areas and Waste Consultation Areas. The MWPA welcome ongoing discussions with MDC as their preferred allocations emerge to ensure that minerals and waste safeguarding implications can be addressed throughout the plan making process, including the assessment of potential site allocations individually, and cumulatively. Depending on the scale and location of growth proposed any need for a mineral resource assessment may be cross border, particularly in relation to Growth Options 5 and 6. A Minerals Local Plan Review has commenced with several proposed amendments to Policy S6 – Provision for sand and gravel extraction It is now considered that there will be a need for new extraction sites in Essex as part of the current Minerals Local Plan review to maintain a sufficient supply of sand and gravel.</p> <p><u>Economy</u></p> <p>Everyone’s Essex sets out a strategic aim for a strong, inclusive and sustainable economy including the following 5 commitments which will be important in any LDPR, namely the provision of good jobs; delivery of high quality infrastructure; future growth and investment creating the conditions for growth; and developing Essex as a centre for innovation, supporting new technologies and business models to enable the economy to transition to net zero and secure green jobs.</p>

Document Reference	MDC Question and ECC Response
	<p>ECC considers a key issue is to ensure that policies and related strategies, including those of neighbouring authorities, provide the greatest benefit to deliver economic renewal, ambition and equality to create a buoyant economy for the existing and future population that lives, works, visits and invests not only in MDC's area but in Essex as a whole. For strategic and cross boundary matters, this is likely to include a balance of land-uses to create great places for all communities, and businesses across all sectors; and that the developer funding for the required infrastructure is clear and explicit from the outset. A key issue is the quality of existing business accommodation, provision for grow on space and the need to ensure new employment space is flexible and adaptable. ECC supports the need to seek opportunities for rural diversification, tourism, retail, leisure and town centres, to meet the life cycle needs of business including 'Grow on Space' and development of skills and training opportunities.</p>
<b>COUNCILS RESPONSE</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>It is not clear that the respondent has understood the question, it was asking if the cross boundary issues are the relevant ones. The answer should have been a list of ones that the Council may wish to consider adding on, not the potential solution or what the Council should do about them. Therefore, most of these comments the Council can make no further response to.</b></li> <li>• <b>This is only a broad list and cannot set down in detail all the matters which cross boundaries – this is for the duty to co-operate meetings that have been set up to do. Agreed that a further bullet point can be added into the Highway Section to emphasise that there may issues with highway capacity on the roads leading into and out of the District and their associated junctions but there is no need to list their detail.</b></li> <li>• <b>Agreed to add in water deficit into the environment section and to alter the bullet point about protected habitats to include all growth and protected species.</b></li> <li>• <b>The Council does not agree that minerals and waste needs to be added into this section of the plan as far as the Council is aware it is not a cross boundary issue just a matter for discussion and it should be added somewhere in the relevant part of the plan as part of the development plan.</b></li> </ul>
Q4	<p><b>Are these key issues the right ones or are there any key issues that you think have been missed?</b></p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>1. <u>Reducing emissions and adapting to climate change</u></p> <p>ECC supports this issue and that the LDPR will need to consider climate change at its heart. The key issues identified in bullets 1 – 3 are consistent with Everyone's Essex and the Essex Climate Action Commission recommendations. ECC as an advocate for climate change and established the Essex Climate Action Commission which has published its report <a href="#">Net Zero: Making Essex Carbon Neutral (July 2021)</a>. Further comments on climate change can be seen in the response to Questions 39 – 42.</p> <p>ECC supports the reference in bullet 3 regarding the lack of funding that could compromise the ability of MDC and other Risk Management</p>

Document Reference	MDC Question and ECC Response
	<p>Authorities, including ECC, as the LLFA (surface water, groundwater and ordinary watercourses) and the Environment Agency (main rivers, reservoirs and coastal flooding) to bring forward viable flood risk mitigation schemes that could support existing and new communities. A key theme of Everyone's Essex is regarding 'Levelling up the Environment' including helping make communities more resilient against flooding. The Flood and coastal erosion investment plan (2021 - 2027) is a 6-year investment programme in England to reduce national flood risk by up to 11% by 2027. The programme is made up of projects developed and promoted by local authorities, internal drainage boards and the Environment Agency. However, it is acknowledged that partnership funding from local authorities, communities and the private sector will be important in delivering these schemes. Bullet 5 refers to water resources and future work will need to consider the guidance in the <a href="#">SuDS Design Guide</a>, <a href="#">Essex Green Infrastructure Strategy (2020)</a> and <a href="#">Water Resources Regional Plan</a>.</p> <p>The <a href="#">Essex Coast Recreational Disturbance Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy (Essex RAMS)</a> and the <a href="#">Essex Green Infrastructure Strategy (2020)</a> will assist in addressing some of the issues identified in bullet 4. RAMS sets out a long-term strategic approach to lessen the impact of local housing development on protected birds along the Essex coast, and is supported by the a <a href="#">Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)</a> that requires developers to make payments (tariff) if their new development is within a defined 'zone of influence' around a designated site.</p> <p>With regards the <a href="#">Essex Green Infrastructure Strategy (2020)</a> and <a href="#">Essex Green Infrastructure Standards</a> please refer to comments under Question 2, section 4.4 - The Natural and Built Heritage.</p> <p>The energy landscape is becoming more decentralised with new developments implementing smart local energy systems, whereby renewable sources of energy are generated, stored and used on a more local basis within specific developments.</p> <p>ECC supports the identification of bullet 5 with regards the pressure on water resources, need for additional supply and its distribution and need for more water efficiency measures in new development. Please see the response to Question 3 regarding WRE and its future regional strategy to 2050.</p> <p><u>2. Resident-centred places to live</u></p> <p>ECC supports bullet 1 in that future development needs to be well designed and resident focussed. The <a href="#">Essex Design Guide</a> includes a section on Walkable Neighbourhoods, which are new neighbourhoods and streets designed to promote the use of walking, cycling and sustainable transport reducing the need to travel and incorporating a mix of uses, green spaces and facilities to support new development. The ECAC recommends bringing forward 10 walkable neighbourhoods by 2021 and then 20 schemes each year between 2022-2030. ECC is developing a Walkable Neighbourhood Development Model. ECC would urge MDC to endorse the <a href="#">Essex Design Guide</a> as it contains new sections that provides a much wider scope than previously and a range of Supplementary Planning Guidance including the Essex Quality Charter and Design Quality Review Panel. Further details are contained in the responses to Questions 34 – 38.</p>

Document Reference	MDC Question and ECC Response
	<p>With regards bullet 3, ECC supports the ambition of the plan to promote the effective use of land but considers that the suggested approach placing a <i>'greater emphasis'</i> on encouraging the development of brownfield land for housing is not consistent with national policy, as stated in NPPF, paragraph 119. This has a stronger emphasis requiring strategic policies to accommodating housing needs that <i>'makes as much use as possible of previously developed land or brownfield land'</i>. Further responses regarding brownfield land are contained within response to Questions 18 and 24.</p> <p>Bullet 5 refers to the over-reliance on larger-scale developments which has contributed to the lack of a 5 year supply in the district. ECC support the need to allocate more smaller sites which is required by NPPF, paragraph 69, namely 10% of a district's housing allocation. ECC supports the reference in 10.4 that a 20% buffer will help to ensure that there is a range of different types of sites, large, medium and small and that there is a continuous supply of housing over the plan period, which is consistent with NPPF, paragraph 60. It is important to ensure delivery of homes and infrastructure is plan led. The scale and pattern of growth should be informed by the infrastructure required and balanced to ensure there is the necessary scale of development to secure the developer funding for necessary infrastructure including provision of a new secondary school which is only likely to be possible on a larger site allocation.</p> <p>ECC considers the dispersed nature of the settlement pattern with generally low levels of population and limited key services is a key consideration in determining any future spatial strategy. Moving forward it will be necessary for the local plan process to identify which settlements have existing infrastructure deficits/service shortages and existing available capacity to accommodate potential growth. MDC and ECC will need to engage and work closely together to help inform site selection, both individually and cumulatively, to ensure they are at the right location and scale to deliver viable and sustainable infrastructure provision.</p> <p>The Plan should include wider recognition and inclusion of the need to meet the housing needs of people who require specialised housing and further joint working between ECC and MDC will be required to meet this need. The LDP should seek to deliver accessible and adaptable general needs housing which enables people to live more independently, whilst also saving on health and social care costs in the future. It will be important to differentiate between care cohorts, who may have very different housing need requirements, in the assessment of housing need. The housing needs assessment, which forms part of MDC's evidence base for its LDP, does not differentiate between the housing needs of older people and the housing needs of people with disabilities. This is not consistent with the PPG which emphasises the differing needs of older persons and people with disabilities and the different policy responses required to address these needs.</p> <p>ECC, with responsibilities for Adult Social Care, is concerned that there is no reference to the need for and provision of housing with care/independent living for older people and people with disabilities. ECC considers the need to provide housing for older people is critical given the demographics of the district. The provision of appropriate housing for people with disabilities, including specialist and supported housing, is crucial in helping them to live safe and independent lives. Unsuitable or un-adapted housing can have a negative impact on people with disabilities and the level of care they receive. It can lead to mobility problems inside and outside the home, poorer mental health and lead to a lack of employment opportunities. Providing suitable housing can enable disabled people to live more independently and safely, with greater choice and control over their lives. Suitable housing can also allow people to live closer to their informal support</p>

Document Reference	MDC Question and ECC Response
	<p>networks (i.e. family and friends) as their mobility declines as they age.</p> <p>ECC notes there is no reference to the considerable benefits of new build general needs housing having to be constructed to high standards of accessibility and adaptability. Without accessible and adaptable housing people with disabilities or mobility issues will continue to face discrimination and disadvantages within the housing system. This can have a significant negative effect on their quality of life. The NPPF, paragraph 65b, requires local planning authorities to plan for a mix of homes to meet the different needs of the community including families with children, older people and people with disabilities.</p> <p>With regards bullet 6, ECC is concerned that the <i>Maldon District Local Housing Needs Assessment (Part 1 – 2021)</i> does not differentiate between the housing needs of older people and the housing needs of people with disabilities. The study specifically states, “<i>The two groups are taken together as there is a clear link between age and disability</i>”. This is inconsistent with guidance in paragraphs: 004 Reference ID: 63-004-20190626/ 005 Reference ID: 63-005-20190626 of the PPG, which identifies the differing needs of older persons and people with disabilities and the different policy responses required to address these needs. The NPPF, paragraph 60 recognises the needs of groups with specific housing requirements are addressed. The health and lifestyles of older people will differ greatly, as will their housing needs, which can range from accessible and adaptable general needs housing to specialist housing with high levels of care and support. Similarly, disabilities can include, but are not limited to, people with physical and sensory impairments, learning disabilities, autism and mental health needs. These disabilities generate a range of housing requirements which can change over time. The Housing Needs Assessment does not appear to assess these needs or how specific needs within the Maldon district population will be met through the plan making process. ECC seek engagement with MDC to address these issues through the LDPR process in order to ensure that the needs of older persons and people with disabilities are appropriately addressed. ECC is to commence the preparation of separate Position Statements regarding the need for housing for older people, young people leaving care and for people with learning disabilities, which can be added to the local plan evidence base.</p> <p><u>3. A stronger, more resilient and inclusive local economy</u></p> <p>ECC supports bullet 3 and the reference to the need to provide Grow-on space for businesses that have outgrown their initial accommodation.</p> <p>Please see response to Question 3 – Economy.</p> <p><u>4. Thriving, Distinctive Rural Communities for all ages</u></p> <p>Please see response to Question 11 – 13 regarding settlement pattern.</p> <p><u>5. Protecting and Enhancing our Diverse Natural Environment</u></p>

Document Reference	MDC Question and ECC Response
	<p>With regards the <a href="#">Essex Coast Recreational Disturbance Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy (Essex RAMS)</a> please refer to comments under Question 2, section 4.4 - The Natural and Built Heritage. This will assist in addressing some of the issues identified in bullet 1 including the protection of the Flats and Old Hall Marshes.</p> <p>ECC recommends reference is made to the <a href="#">South Suffolk and Essex Shoreline Management Plan</a> in the LDPR and in particular for Epochs 2 (2025 – 2055) and Epoch 3 (2055 – 2100). The proportion of frontage where the preferred management policy is either managed realignment or no active intervention significantly increases so that awareness in communities living in these areas is raised and they realise that adaptation could become necessary.</p> <p>With regards bullets 2 - 4 and the <a href="#">Essex Green Infrastructure Strategy (2020)</a> and <a href="#">Essex Green Infrastructure Standards</a> please refer to comments under Question 2, section 4.4 - The Natural and Built Heritage. ECC considers there is a lack of tree planting across the district, a lack of accessible green space and green corridors leading to habitat fragmentation. Essex is implementing the Essex Forest Initiative and in October 2019 committed to plant £1million worth of trees over the next five years – some 375,000 trees over 150 hectares.</p> <p>Bullet 3 states that Maldon District has a reasonable level of ancient woodland concentrated in the west of the district; which plays host to numerous flora and fauna and is an important source of biodiversity which is under threat nationally. NPPF, paragraph 174 b) requires planning policies and decisions recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, and the wider benefits including the economic and other benefits of trees and woodland. Paragraph 131 highlights the important contribution to the character and quality of urban environments made by trees, and that they can help to mitigate and adapt to climate change. In general terms the tree stock must be considered more highly as part of any development and therefore any additional/new designations must be considered thoroughly prior to adoption. Paragraph 6.2. of the approved LDP outlines the committed of MDC to maintaining and enhancing the quality of the environment and by setting out a clear strategic approach for the protection, enhancement, creation and management of networks of green infrastructure. ECC recommend this approach is implemented as part of the new local plan. Any approach should also consider the need for new developments to connect areas of GI and woodland to increase carbon capture and other climate change adaptation and improve access to GI to improve residents health and wellbeing.</p> <p><u>6. Making the Built Environment Beautiful</u></p> <p>ECC support the reference in bullet 2 to the EHER database which contains the significant archaeological finds in the district. The EHER should be the primary source for assessment for archaeological potential and embedded into future policy. This will require applicants to have consulted the EHER data if there is the potential for their development to impact heritage assets and their setting.</p> <p>ECC recommend bullet 3 is amended to be consistent with the ECC suggested amendment to Objective 4, bullet 5 by referring to both designated and non-designated heritage assets and their settings. This is consistent with the NPPF and PPG,</p> <p>ECC supports bullet 4 and recommend MDC endorses the <a href="#">Essex Design Guide</a> as it contains new sections that provides a much wider</p>

Document Reference	MDC Question and ECC Response
	<p>scope than previously and a range of Supplementary Planning Guidance including the <a href="#">Essex Quality Charter and Quality Panel</a>. Further details are contained in the responses to Questions 34 – 38.</p> <p><u>7. Ensuring that infrastructure meets residents, visitors and business needs</u></p> <p>With regards bullet 1, larger development sites often have longer lead in times, build out rates and require the delivery and funding of more strategic infrastructure. It is important to ensure delivery of homes and infrastructure is plan led. The scale and pattern of growth should be informed by the infrastructure required and balanced to ensure there is the necessary scale of development to secure the developer funding for necessary infrastructure (e.g. secondary school). Moving forward it will be necessary for the local plan process to identify which settlements have existing infrastructure deficits/service shortages and existing available capacity to accommodate potential growth. Further detail is contained in the response to Question 11 and 12.</p> <p>ECC and MDC are working collaboratively on an IDP Update to agree a baseline position with regards completed projects supporting the approved LDP, the secured developer contributions by scheme, the outstanding contributions and their triggers for payment in order to identify any existing funding gap. This will inform the baseline of any updated IDP supporting the LDPR and to inform any future CIL.</p> <p>Bullet 2 makes reference to the district having a higher than average ageing population. ECC will be preparing three position statements covering the need for housing for older people, young people leaving care and people with a learning disability and the content can inform the next iteration of the Plan on these matters.</p> <p>ECC, as an infrastructure funder and provider, welcomes reference in bullet 3 to the need to work with infrastructure providers to ensure that the district's growth options have affordable and viable solutions. Further details can be viewed in the response to Question 60.</p>
<b>COUNCILS RESPONSE</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Add in a sentence about air quality in the climate change section.</b></li> <li>• <b>Agreed that the issues need to say something about older persons housing and its continuing need given the rising older population.</b></li> <li>• <b>The Local Housing Needs Assessment will need updating and there are two issues which have been picked up, the older persons numbers should be calculated from age 65 not 70 and there needs to be a disconnect with disabilities in the write up even if they are then brought together again in the conclusion.</b></li> <li>• <b>Need to add in a sentence about out commuting as an issue.</b></li> <li>• <b>Agreed that a bullet point needs adding about the Shoreline Management Plan – this should go in the climate change section.</b></li> <li>• <b>Agreed to amend bullet point 3 of the beautiful environment section to include designated and non designated heritage assets.</b></li> <li>• <b>There is no need at this point in the plan to endorse the Essex Design Guide this will be addressed in the design policy.</b></li> </ul>

Document Reference	MDC Question and ECC Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="331 196 2067 260">• <b>The Council is interested in the position statements with regard to older persons, people with disabilities and young people as this may add to the evidence base for these matters.</b></li> </ul>
5.0	<b>Spatial Vision</b>
Q5	<p data-bbox="275 403 862 435"><b>Do you agree with the amended Vision?</b></p> <p data-bbox="275 475 2145 611">No. Question 10 seeks views on whether the plan should cover a 15 or 20 year period. The approved Local Development Scheme states the Plan period is to 2038 but other policies, including housing supply refer to an end date of 2043. ECC recommend MDC confirm this as soon as possible as it will be required to inform the evidence base documents being prepared, and yet to be commissioned. Would the proposed spatial vision be any different if the Plan period was to cover a 15 or 20 year period?</p> <p data-bbox="275 651 2163 826">ECC recommend Part 1 below is strengthened to better reflect the climate change emergency declared by MDC in February 2021, the MDC Climate Action Strategy approved in December 2021 and the recommendations from the ECAC report <a href="#">Net Zero: Making Essex Carbon Neutral (July 2021)</a> and the <a href="#">ECC Response</a> (November 2021). ECC can assist MDC in formulating appropriate policy positions on these matters. ECC would encourage a commitment being made by MDC to attain the net zero target by 2050 in line with the ECAC recommendations but should be significantly reducing emissions in line with that by 2043.</p> <p data-bbox="275 866 2163 930"><i>1) A commitment translated into local action which adapts to and reduces the risks of, <u>and contribution towards</u> climate change, including <u>driving supporting</u> the transition to a low carbon economy.</i></p> <p data-bbox="275 970 2163 1074">ECC recommend Part 4 of the vision is amended to refer to ‘protects’ but also ‘enhances’ the natural, built and historic environment to be consistent with NPPF, paragraph 8c and Chapters 15 and 16. MDC should also consider adding reference to the built environment particularly given the consultation document poses key questions regarding making effective use of land (Questions 18 – 24).</p> <p data-bbox="275 1114 2163 1177">ECC recommend a further amendment is made to refer to ‘multifunctional’ GI which is a key planning principle within the <a href="#">Essex Green Infrastructure Strategy (2020)</a>. ECC recommend Part 4 and paragraph 8.5 relating to objectives are amended to read:</p> <p data-bbox="275 1217 2163 1321"><i>4) A high-quality environment that protects <u>and enhances</u> the special merits of the District, particularly the <u>natural, built and historic environment, open landscapes, <del>protected natural environment</del> including nationally significant areas <u>and multifunctional green infrastructure including the unique biodiversity and geodiversity.</u></u></i></p> <p data-bbox="275 1361 1176 1393">Amend Part 5 and paragraph 8.6 relating to the objectives to read:</p> <p data-bbox="275 1433 2163 1465"><i>5) <u>Joined-up and funded infrastructure in the right place and in a timely manner</u> <del>at the right time</del> to increase overall connectivity,</i></p>

Document Reference	MDC Question and ECC Response
	<i>accessibility and mobility for the needs of both residents, business and visitors.</i>
<b>COUNCILS RESPONSE</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>The Council will in due course confirm the length of the plan period and this will go in the preferred options document.</b></li> <li>• <b>The first suggested change for the spatial vision does not make sense in the way it is written it is not clear - 1) A commitment translated into local action which adapts to and reduces the risks of, <i>and contribution towards</i> climate change, including <i>driving</i> supporting the transition to a low carbon economy. The second suggested change is more positive and the Council would agree with this.</b></li> <li>• <b>The Council is cautious of using the term enhance in terms of the natural, built and historic environment because development inevitably has some kind of negative impact and this is unavoidable and if every development had to enhance then actually this could prevent development coming forward. The Council has added the word locally into the clause, this was suggested by one of the other respondents to the consultation, this does then include all the local types of environmental considerations, there is no need to list everything in the objectives they are meant to be high level.</b></li> <li>• <b>Agreed to amend clause 5 and insert “and funded”, With regard to the other suggestion, the words in a timely manner, are quite subjective so the Council has amended the words to “in line with identified needs” this then links in with the triggers put into legal agreements for funding.</b></li> </ul>
6.0	<b>Objectives</b>
Q6	<p><b>Do you agree with the objectives for the review of the LDP?</b></p> <p>No.</p> <p><u>Objective 1 - A commitment translated into local action which adapts to and reduces the risks of climate change, including supporting the transition to a low carbon economy.</u></p> <p>ECC considers this objective could be more ambitious given the climate change emergency declared by MDC in February 2021, the MDC Climate Action Strategy approved in December 2021, the ECAC report <a href="#">Net Zero: Making Essex Carbon Neutral (July 2021)</a> and the <a href="#">ECC Response</a> (November 2021), which set out recommendations for Essex to be a net zero County by 2050 along with some immediate actions which have secured funding for the next 4 years to 2025/26. Consequently, should the aim be to be ‘<i>net zero</i>’ rather than ‘<i>as energy efficient</i>’, and to be consistent with bullet 5.</p> <p>ECC recommend amending bullet 1 to read:</p> <p><i>Ensure that new development will be <u>net zero</u> <del>as energy efficient as possible</del> in its design, materials and local <u>renewable/low carbon energy sources</u> in order to reduce emissions of carbon and other greenhouse gases.</i></p> <p>ECC support the principle in bullet 4 of the role renewable energy can play in achieving net zero and that a renewable energy study is in</p>

Document Reference	MDC Question and ECC Response
	<p>preparation. Any study should refer to the <a href="#">Essex Baseline and Pathway to Net Zero</a> report which presents the baseline of emissions in Essex and a future emissions pathway by modelling the impact of the recommended actions of the ECAC.</p> <p><u>Objective 2 - A network of sustainable, inclusive and healthy communities where all residents are able to enjoy a high quality of life, and where new housing and economic development balances the needs of communities, the economy and the environment.</u></p> <p>The objective should refer to mainstream health provision, namely identifying and securing the facilities needed for primary, secondary and tertiary care, and the wider health and care system (e.g. Maldon Health Hub) and the wider aspects of healthy communities, as reference in PPG (Paragraph: 001 Reference ID:53-001-20190722). These include the design and use of the built and natural environments, including green infrastructure for health and wellbeing. Please refer to the response to Question 3 – Health with regards the need for an overarching Health and Wellbeing policy; HIAs and the potential proliferation of hot food takeaways.</p> <p>ECC considers that sustainable, inclusive and healthy communities are achieved by a Local Plan providing the right types of homes for all residents including older people and adults with disabilities and those with particular vulnerabilities such as Care Leavers and people stepping down from MH Recovery accommodation and recommend this approach. Furthermore, accessible and adaptable general needs housing enables people to live more independently, whilst also saving on health and social costs in the future. It is better to build accessible housing from the outset rather than have to make adaptations at a later stage – this is true in terms of cost (it's cheaper to put in measures when housing is constructed), disruption (adaptation works may mean the occupier has to move temporarily), and in effectiveness (homes which are designed for those with mobility issues are inevitably more suitable for them than retrofitted inaccessible homes).</p> <p><u>Objective 3 - A diverse and competitive economy which supports the existing employment base but also delivers growth opportunities across a range of sectors that reduces the need for out-commuting, attracts and retains people of working-age and raises overall levels of aspiration and attainment for young people.</u></p> <p>Bullet 3 refers to encouraging development that supports the enhancement of education, skills and employment opportunities for all residents. Bradwell B is expected to employ around 3,000 potentially local people in construction and other jobs. It will provide an opportunity to tackle unemployment and provide career pathways for young people. Prior to the project being placed on hold, ECC and other stakeholders were working to develop an Employment, Skills and Education Strategy for the scheme, and this should be progressed to maximise benefits and opportunities for the local and wider population.</p> <p>Bullet 6 highlights that new employment land allocated in the LDP has not been built out as quickly as planned. As MDC planning is subject to the 'presumption' these sites could be at risk of being lost to other land uses. ECC considers MDC should include an additional objective which seeks to address the low delivery rates of employment land and seeks to protect them as far as possible from other uses. For example, a policy could include the requirement for evidence demonstrating that the employment unit has been vacant and actively marketed to the satisfaction of the council for at least one year and that there is no prospect of employment uses occupying the unit (for</p>

Document Reference	MDC Question and ECC Response
	<p>example <a href="#">Harlow Local Development Plan - Policy PR1 - Development within Employment Areas</a>).</p> <p><u>Objective 4 - A high-quality environment that protects the special merits of the District, particularly the historic environment, open landscapes, protected natural environment including nationally significant areas and unique biodiversity and geodiversity.</u></p> <p>ECC recommend the following amendment to Objective 4 to be consistent with the suggested amendments to Part 4 of the Vision, as outlined in Question 5.</p> <p><i>A high-quality environment that protects <u>and enhances</u> the special merits of the District, particularly the <u>natural, built and historic</u> environment, open landscapes, <del>protected natural environment</del> including nationally significant areas <u>and multifunctional green infrastructure including the unique biodiversity and geodiversity.</u></i></p> <p>ECC consider bullet 1 and 2 could be amalgamated and reference made to be consistent with the suggested amendment to the vision.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Protect and enhance the distinctive <del>and</del> natural, built <u>and historic</u> environment which includes the coastal, <u>built and</u>, rural <del>and the historic</del> environment of the District <u>and ensure that the impact of any development is offset by mitigation opportunities.</u></li> <li>• <del>Improve and manage the natural, historic and coastal/rural environment of the District to ensure that the impact of any development is offset by mitigation opportunities.</del></li> </ul> <p>ECC recommend reference is made to 'multifunctional' GI in bullet 3 to be consistent with the suggested amendments to the Vision.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support the linking of areas of biodiversity and geodiversity importance to assist in the preservation of habitats and provide an improved network of <u>multifunctional</u> green infrastructure.</li> </ul> <p>ECC note reference is made to the protection of '<i>strategic gaps</i>' in bullet 4. Any policies regarding strategic gaps and their identification on the policies map will need to be evidenced with regards their purpose and function and demonstrate why they require a separate landscape designation when compared to the surrounding landscape including existing local and national policy designations.</p> <p>ECC recommend the following amendments to bullet 5 to be consistent with the NPPF and PPG, and to provide clarity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Work with owners, partners and developers to conserve and enhance <u>designated and non-designated</u> heritage assets and their settings.</li> </ul> <p>ECC recommend MDC should also consider adding an additional bullet regarding the reference to the built environment particularly given the consultation document poses key questions regarding making effective use of land and density (Questions 18 – 24).</p>

Document Reference	MDC Question and ECC Response
	<p><u>Objective 5 - Joined-up infrastructure in the right place and at the right time to increase overall connectivity, accessibility and mobility for the needs of both residents, business and visitors.</u></p> <p>ECC recommend the following amendments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Work with partners to maintain, improve and provide <u>more frequent and reliable</u> <del>co-ordinate</del> public transport provision, and promote sustainable <u>and active</u> modes of transport and movement where all users feel equally safe.</li> <li>2) Facilitate and work in partnership with commissioners and <u>infrastructure</u> providers for the delivery of new infrastructure to meet the needs of all residents, business and visitors <u>in a timely manner</u>.</li> <li>3) Ensure that the residents of new development can safely access education and health services, <u>key services</u> and facilities.</li> </ol>
<b>COUNCILS RESPONSE S</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>The Council are content at the present time with the first climate change objective, it is meant to be broad</b></li> <li>• <b>Agreed that objective 2 should mention the provision of health services – insert a sentence to identify this.</b></li> <li>• <b>The term “differing needs” in terms of the housing need of residents covers everyone and there is no need to list them individually. The Council has added some words around adaptive housing to accommodate residents needs whatever their circumstances. However, this is an issue in terms of the high level of disabled facilities grant the Council receives and should be inserted in the issues section of the Plan.</b></li> <li>• <b>Objective 3 will be reviewed once the Employment Land Study has been assessed.</b></li> <li>• <b>Objective 4 – designated and non designated heritage assets has been added into the last bullet point. The Council is content with the rest of the objective.</b></li> <li>• <b>Objective 5 – agreed that the words around bus services should be changed so that the council are supporting more frequent services, there is no evidence to support that they are unreliable, this has not been raised in the consultation.</b></li> <li>• <b>Objective 5 – agree with the insertion of the words “active travel” in the first bullet point.</b></li> <li>• <b>Objective 5 – agree to add the word “infrastructure” in the second bullet point. At the end add the words “in line with identified needs” as set out above in the issues section.</b></li> <li>• <b>Objective 5 – the last bullet point, the other consultees have raised some points on this and it has been amended to read “Ensure that the residents of new development can safely access key services including education, health services and sport and leisure facilities either by public transport, cycle or by a footway</b></li> </ul>
Q7.	<p><b>Are there other objectives that the LDP needs to aim to achieve?</b></p> <p>No.</p>

Document Reference	MDC Question and ECC Response
8.0	<b>Meeting the Housing Needs for the Future</b>
Q8	<p><b>Do you agree with the Council using the standard methodology in the calculation of its housing target for the period 2023 – 2043?</b></p> <p>Yes. MDC has reviewed recent demographic information and do not consider there is a need to move away from the standard method figure of 308 homes per annum at this stage. ECC recommended that MDC keep this requirement under review, particularly with regards any changes in current and future demographic trends and market signals and any requirement to accommodate unmet needs from within neighbouring areas.</p> <p>ECC seek clarification as to why the base date for the plan has been set in the future at 2023, which corresponds with the LDPR adoption date, and not consistent with the latest monitoring year to which details are known on housing delivery (e.g. 1 April 2021) or the base date used in the evidence base supporting the Plan. This issue was considered by the Inspector into the Babergh and Mid Suffolk Local Plan and the LPAs' response can be viewed <a href="#">here</a> in paragraphs 2.01 and 2.02. The base date received no objections at the examination from participants.</p>
<b>COUNCILS RESPONSE</b>	<b>The base date for the plan will be inserted most likely at preferred options stage of plan-making, it does depend on how long the process will take and which monitoring year it is.</b>
Q9	<p><b>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?</b></p> <p>Yes. The NPPF and PPG require an appropriate buffer (moved forward from later in the Plan period) to be added to the supply of specific deliverable sites if a five year supply cannot be identified. At present MDC cannot demonstrate a five year housing supply (3.26 years) and is therefore subject to the 'presumption', as set out in paragraph 11 d) of the NPPF and a 5% buffer should be added to the supply to help provide choice and competition. MDC has passed the Housing Delivery Test for 2021 (154%) and hence a 20% buffer is not required.</p> <p>A 'whole plan buffer' of 20% is being applied in paragraph 10.4 and Table 1 - Proposed Housing Figure for the Period 2023 – 2043 on top of the minimum housing need identified through the standard method. ECC supports this approach as it will ensure that a range of different types of sites, large, medium and small is provided and a continuous supply of housing over the plan period. This will ensure flexibility in delivery and help significantly boost housing supply over the Plan period, as per NPPF, paragraph 60. In future iterations of the Plan MDC should clearly state and evidence reasons for the level of any buffer as this will be examined at examination.</p>
<b>COUNCILS RESPONSE</b>	<b>NOTED</b>

Document Reference	MDC Question and ECC Response
Q10	<p><b>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?</b></p> <p>Don't know. ECC considers it is really for MDC to set out and determine its Plan period so it can plan for its long-term development needs. The consultation document is unclear with regards MDC's preference on this matter as there are inconsistent references throughout the published document, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the table supporting paragraph 1.3 states that the LDPR will provide the planning policy framework for the district up to 2038, which is the minimum 15 years from the date of adoption (NPPF, paragraph 22);</li> <li>• the supporting paragraph refers to 'at least 2038';</li> <li>• paragraph 7.3 outlines the 'Vision' for the district as covering the period to 2043; and</li> <li>• paragraph 10.2 identifies the plan period as being from 2023 – 2043 with the future new housing sites of some 4,500 homes being required between 2023 – 2043.</li> </ul> <p>The Plan period may depend on the spatial strategy being progressed in terms of the scale of specific development including any strategic infrastructure requirements. For example, Option 5 refers to new satellite settlement and Options 1 – 3, 6 and 7 to urban extension to an existing town/village. The plan may require the strategic policies to be set within a vision looking 30 years ahead given the timetable for delivery (build rates), lead in times for development and to enable the alignment of the necessary infrastructure and investment, as recommended by NPPF, paragraph 22.</p> <p>The development of Bradwell B and its associated development may well require MDC to select a longer Plan period in order to ensure a strategy is progressed to secure sustainable development served by the necessary infrastructure.</p> <p>ECC strongly considers there is no scope to further expand the Plume Academy at Maldon beyond existing expansion plans identified in the <a href="#">School Organisation ECC 10 Year Plan for Essex school places (2022 to 2031)</a>. Any future strategy will need to consider the alternatives for secondary school provision including the scale of growth to deliver a new school (approx. 4,500 homes); review priority admission areas, and potential expansion of other secondary schools adjacent to the district. MDC may select an option that will deliver a new secondary school via a single allocation and this may well require development to cover separate plan periods or a longer period.</p>
<b>COUNCIL RESPONSE</b>	<p><b>NOTED – Given the present situation with Bradwell B, it is unlikely that the plan period will be influenced by it. It is noted that there appears to be a need for a secondary school in the District the details of this will have to be clarified in terms of delivery timescales and detail.</b></p>

Document Reference	MDC Question and ECC Response
9.0	<b>Options For Growth</b>
Q11	<p data-bbox="277 325 2168 363"><b>Do you agree with the updated Settlement Pattern and how the settlements in the District have been grouped together?</b></p> <p data-bbox="277 395 2168 501">No. Any Settlement Hierarchy Study should be a starting point to ascertain the current role played by various settlements and an overview of their existing level of sustainability. The NPPF provides some important messages with regards achieving sustainable development, which is a key objective in the NPPF (paragraphs 7 and 16 a)):</p> <ul data-bbox="293 507 2168 724" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• should take local circumstances into account, to reflect the character, needs and opportunities of each area (NPPF paragraph 9);</li> <li>• in rural areas to enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities to enable villages to grow and thrive, especially where this will support local services. Where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby (NPPF paragraph 79); and</li> <li>• focused on locations which are or can be made sustainable, through limiting the need to travel and offering a genuine choice of transport modes (NPPF paragraph 105).</li> </ul> <p data-bbox="277 756 2168 1107">The <a href="#">Rural Facilities Study and updated Settlement Pattern for Maldon District 2022</a> and <a href="#">Updated Rural Facilities survey 2021</a> has informed the draft settlement pattern in the district. It is unclear whether the Study has also considered the actual role and function of these settlements with regards nearby settlements. Paragraph 1.2 of the Study states that a survey was undertaken to assess the connectivity of settlements with its main towns of Maldon/Heybridge and Burnham on Crouch, as well as the towns/ villages of South Woodham Ferrers (in Chelmsford City) and Witham and Tiptree (in Braintree District) in terms of vehicle connectivity and train services. ECC consider this should also have been undertaken at a more local level to ascertain the ‘role’ of some settlements in relation to nearby settlements. For example, paragraph 5.7 defines the ‘Larg Villages’ tier as providing a range of facilities for their own needs and providing for some of the needs of smaller villages within their immediate sphere of influence. The Study should make it clear how any assessment has considered and scored the role and function of settlements to those referenced in paragraph 1.2 but also to those villages within their sphere of influence.</p> <p data-bbox="277 1145 2168 1426">Further work is required to identify which settlements have existing infrastructure deficits/service shortages and available capacity to accommodate potential growth. Whilst population by settlement is identified in paragraph 2.2 of the Rural Facilities Survey it does not appear that it has been a consideration in the assessment in paragraph 5.4 with regards where any settlement should be positioned in the settlement pattern. The population of a settlement population can be a good indicator of a settlement’s location in the resulting settlement pattern. ECC understands that any assessment should be based on any sustainability ranking, however, other contextual information such as population size should be considered to amend this where appropriate to prevent any settlement. This would prevent any settlement presently over provided with services given its population being placed in a higher category and susceptible to inappropriate levels of growth.</p>

Document Reference	MDC Question and ECC Response
	<p>ECC notes the considerable difference in the 'Large Villages' category with regards Southminster (220 points) and Purleigh (70 points). ECC would like to understand further whether any further assessment has been undertaken to consider the wider role and function Southminster plays compared to Purleigh. As presented, the seven 'Growth Options' refer to settlement categories in the hierarchy in terms of future provision of growth. At present, Southminster and Purleigh are treated on the same basis for accommodating future growth and achieving sustainable development, but from the information presented Southminster would seem to have greater potential to accommodate growth than Purleigh. For example, whilst Southminster has its own railway station, the village of Purleigh is located 7.3m from Althorne, 4.5m from North Fambridge and 9.8m from Southminster stations and is not served by a regular bus service. Whilst both are within the 'Larger Villages' category and are treated the same in the 'Growth Options' they differ considerably in sustainability terms.</p> <p>ECC seek clarification as to the reasons why certain settlements have moved up the hierarchy from that identified in the approved LDP. For example, Latchingdon, Tillingham, Tolleshunt D'Arcy, Cold Norton and Purleigh have moved from 'Small' to 'Large' villages. Is this implying that these settlements are considered more sustainable and able to accommodate future growth?</p> <p>The Sustainable Accessibility Mapping exercise to be undertaken by ECC following this round of consultation will provide MDC with a better understanding of the connectivity of potential sites and/or locations to existing urban centres, employment areas and to key services. MDC will be able to consider these outputs alongside other emerging evidence base, to identify a preferred spatial option of development sites in the district. The outputs, alongside other evidence base, will enable a re-assessment of the draft settlement pattern either to support the draft pattern or to identify appropriate amendments.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.2 and the supporting table identifies the criteria contained within the survey. ECC notes that the survey identified whether a primary school was located in the village with no reference to the existence or proximity to a secondary school. A common issue for village locations is the lack of a primary or secondary school within a reasonable walking distance. Where suitable schools are beyond 'statutory walking distance', which is two miles for children under the age of 8 and three miles for older children via a safe route, ECC must bear the long term revenue cost of school transport. ECC will resist developments or potential site allocations that are unsustainable in school transport terms</p>
<b>COUNCILS RESPONSE</b>	<p><b>The settlement pattern is a broad assessment of the services and facilities in the settlements across the District. Evidence does have to be proportionate and at this stage in the process it is not proportionate to go into minute detail regarding every settlement in the district, also infrastructure providers such as the utility companies will not engage with the local plan process until a growth option is chosen, so at this stage any assessment has to work with the information the council can obtain. The Council has gone through the responses submitted in the Issues and Options consultation and made factual alterations to the settlement pattern. The settlement pattern is very different from the last one in the approved plan because last time the work carried out was not as robust, there were not site visits carried out and large villages with a number of services with villages that had hardly any services at all. This matter has now been addressed. The settlement pattern is just a list of services and facilities it is not as assessment of whether growth should go in settlements if a settlement has no primary school then they do not get the points allocated for one.</b></p>

Document Reference	MDC Question and ECC Response
Q12	<p><b>If you do not agree, how should they be grouped on what basis?</b></p> <p>Please see comments in the response to Question 11.</p>
Q13	<p><b>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?</b></p> <p>Please see response to Question 11.</p>
Q14	<p><b>Do you agree with the approach set out above for major infrastructure projects?</b></p> <p>No. ECC acknowledge that the Bradwell B NSIP has been paused since January 2021 and it is uncertain when the project will resume. ECC considers the potential impact of Bradwell B on the future planning of the district, the potential need for development contrary to any preferred 'Growth Option' and the cross border strategic impacts are significant and warrant a commitment by MDC to undertake a full LDPR of any spatial strategy and Plan. This is supported by PPG, Paragraph: 062 Reference ID: 61-062-20190315 which states there are '<i>occasions where there are significant changes in circumstances which may mean it is necessary to review the relevant strategic policies earlier than the statutory minimum of 5 years, for example, where new cross-boundary matters arise</i>'. The <a href="#">PAS Local Plan Route Mapper (October 2021)</a>, paragraph 36 states that '<i>if local circumstances suggest that a different strategy or strategic policy approach is required you are likely to need to update your local plan</i>'.</p> <p>Whilst paragraph 12.17 sets out what the high level aims of the policy seeks to achieve, there is no indication of the detail on how these aims will be achieved in policy terms. ECC considers it is unclear how any major infrastructure policy would be implemented or the criteria that it would include, and ECC reserves the right to comment on any specific policy wording. ECC considers that the potential impact of Bradwell B on the future planning of the district, the potential need for development that may be contrary to the preferred 'Growth Option' and the cross border strategic impacts are significant to warrant a commitment by MDC to undertake a full LDPR of any spatial strategy and the Plan.</p> <p>ECC acknowledges that MDC is preparing an evidence base to incorporate potential implications arising from Bradwell B, namely the Housing Needs Assessment Part 2 and the Employment Study. Will this be a requirement for all evidence supporting the Plan? It is our understanding that the Plan and the 'Growth Options' have been identified on this basis that Bradwell B will come forward in the Plan period.</p>
<b>COUNCILS RESPONSE</b>	<p><b>At this stage there is no detail available, the policy is under construction and will be shared with ECC at the appropriate time.</b></p>
Q15	<p><b>Which growth option do you consider to be the most appropriate for the District of Maldon? Please set out your reason for this view (please clearly set out which option (s) 1 to 7 you are discussing).</b></p> <p>ECC considers it is too early to provide detailed comments on the 'Options for Growth' or state any preferred 'Growth Option', as there is</p>

Document Reference	MDC Question and ECC Response
	<p>the need to undertake additional infrastructure and service assessments. These will need to be informed by further details provided by MDC with regards the overall scale of growth; its distribution by individual settlement and identification of specific site allocations (including their capacity). This level of detail will also be required to undertake the Sustainability Appraisal of the preferred option (s) as part of the Regulation 18 Plan. ECC notes that an Integrated Assessment (SA/SEA/HRA/HIA &amp; EQIA) is to be commissioned and this will need to include a Scoping Report to be consulted upon with statutory bodies and consultees.</p> <p><u>Comments relevant to all Growth Options</u></p> <p>The impacts of growth and future development will need to be assessed, including infrastructure requirements, any mitigation, and how they will be funded and delivered. In respect of larger scale developments, and in particular Option 5 (new satellite settlement) consideration will need to be given to planning beyond the Plan period for up to 30 years ahead as set out in the NPPF, paragraph 22. ECC welcome and support the identified need to plan for housing, economic growth and retail and in particular the need to plan for the right amount of growth with regard to infrastructure. However, this consultation is the starting point, and ECC will work with MDC to refine the infrastructure and service requirements as the growth options are refined using the <a href="#">ECC Developers' Guide to Infrastructure Contributions (2020)</a>, where appropriate.</p> <p>ECC consider all Growth Options will have cross boundary implications arising from development, but in particularly Option 5 proposing growth adjacent to the district boundary and Option 6 to link into the service and facilities available in Tiptree and Witham may have more direct cross boundary impacts. ECC would expect to be fully engaged in any relevant discussions to ensure the consideration on ECC's infrastructure and services, such as education and transportation and highways are considered. ECC would further expect any Growth Option to meet identified needs in a sustainable way considering the opportunities presented by existing or planned investment in infrastructure, the area's economic potential and the scope for net environmental gains.</p> <p>As outlined in the response to Question 2, ECC consider the limited space available for the district's two secondary schools to expand is a significant constraint that must be addressed by the plan. A full housing scenario test will be required to determine if, and where, the spatial strategy can deliver land for new provision in accordance with the <a href="#">ECC Local and Neighbourhood Planners Guide to School Organisation</a> and/or the <a href="#">Garden Communities and Planning School Places Guide</a>.</p> <p>All Growth Options seek to promote new employment opportunities within the urban areas of the settlement hierarchy, which is supported, subject to further work being undertaken as required by NPPF, paragraph 82. The preferred spatial strategy will need to identify a clear economic vision and strategy which positively and proactively encourages sustainable economic growth; set criteria, or identify strategic sites, for local and inward investment to match the strategy and to meet anticipated needs over the plan period; seek to address potential barriers to investment, such as inadequate infrastructure, services or housing, or a poor environment; and be flexible enough to accommodate needs not anticipated in the plan, allow for new and flexible working practices (such as live-work accommodation), and to enable a rapid response to changes in economic circumstances. ECC consider the economic vision and strategy will also need to consider the rural and tourism economy, as set out in NPPF, paragraph 84.</p>

Document Reference	MDC Question and ECC Response
	<p>ECC recommend that all Growth Options make reference to 10% of the district's housing allocation coming forward on small sites in accordance with NPPF, paragraph 69. Any plan not incorporating this requirement is required to demonstrate strong reasons why this 10% target cannot be achieved. At present, this is only referenced in Option 1.</p> <p>In the early stages of Plan preparation, ECC as the LLFA would welcome engagement regarding a high level assessment of potential development sites in terms of our responsibilities, particularly their relationship to CDAs. It should be noted that whether or not a new development is located within a revised CDA, does not impact on the need for this to have a suitable SuDS strategy, that will need to be approved by the LLFA.</p> <p>A common issue for village locations is the lack of a primary or secondary school within a reasonable walking distance. This is relevant to all the Growth Options. A reasonable walking distance is defined in the Essex Design Guide as 600 metres for primary and 1500 metres for secondary school pupils. Where suitable schools are beyond 'statutory walking distance', two miles for children under the age of 8 and three miles for older children via a safe route, ECC must bear the long term revenue cost of school transport. Developments that are unsustainable in school transport terms should be resisted. The suitability of individual development sites, in school place planning terms, should be judged using the method set out in section 3.3. of the <a href="http://cfassets.net">Essex local and neighbourhood planners guide to school organisation (cfassets.net)</a>.</p> <p>Growth Options 1 – 3, 5, 6 and 7 refer to growth being provided through '<i>urban extensions on greenfield sites</i>', although no scale or specific towns/villages are specified for where this growth will be located. The scale and pattern of growth should be informed by the infrastructure required and balanced to ensure there is the necessary scale of development to secure the developer funding for necessary infrastructure including provision of a new secondary school which is only likely to be possible on a larger site allocation. The following principles and approaches should be considered when looking at growth options and suitable locations, particularly where urban expansions may be proposed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cross boundary engagement with ECC, neighbouring authorities and partners to ensure the potential development sites are considered in the wider strategic context, for both ECC's own cross boundary infrastructure and service provision; and for the relationship with neighbouring local plans;</li> <li>• Develop an integrated transport package to support communities where growth responds to and supports the local economy;</li> <li>• To be at a scale to provide a new primary school co-located with a 56 place nursery on 2.1ha of suitable land. Any new primary school (420 places) is likely to be generated by approximately 1,400 new houses or a mixed development approaching 2,000 dwellings. It is not always possible to expand existing schools due to land size constraints;</li> <li>• Actively promote modal shift through active and sustainable travel and passenger transport provision, promoting walkable and liveable neighbourhoods, traffic free areas and traffic free school zones and school streets;</li> <li>• Essex Design Guide principles, aligning with active design principles, garden community principles, the ECAC Report to deliver "Net Zero Future", and promote health and well-being;</li> <li>• A high delivery of multi-functional GI and biodiversity net-gain - to align with the nine principles to delivering good GI and the</li> </ul>

Document Reference	MDC Question and ECC Response
	<p>emerging Essex GI Standards Guidance prepared in consultation with Natural England;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provision of a mix of employment uses and retail provision, seeking opportunities for skills and training integrated within the development, and provision of range of community uses;</li> <li>• Apply the Minerals (2014) and Waste Local Plan (2017) policy requirements including exploring the potential for prior extraction of minerals, protection of existing infrastructure and procurement of sustainable construction practices and site waste management plans Minerals Local Plan Review regarding proposed amendments to Policy S6 – Provision for sand and gravel extraction should also be considered;</li> <li>• Long term stewardship and social responsibility: an organisation, such as a community trust or similar, should be set up and funded to maintain and develop community assets over the long term. Any new community will be empowered from the start and secure community benefits in perpetuity and provided with sufficient financial resources to deliver on this role.</li> <li>• A master planning approach should be applied to any medium to large developments; and</li> <li>• Mechanisms to be put in place, to plan for funding (e.g. developer contributions, CIL and Government investment) and delivery, to manage phasing, implementation and delivery of new development and to explore approaches such as forward funding investment for the provision of strategic infrastructure.</li> </ul> <p>ECC notes that the <a href="#">Maldon District Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) 2021</a>, paragraph 6.2 has identified through the 'Call for Sites' suitable land for residential development amounting to approximately 1,400 homes to North of the District (north of Heybridge); 1,800 in Central Maldon - Maldon/Heybridge (west of Maldon); and 8,345 homes in the South of the District (south of Maldon). Table 7 in the HELAA demonstrates that there is the potential capacity in terms of broadly suitable sites for the District to provide 9,978 units of housing over the next 20-year period. Paragraph 5.2 identifies suitable land for employment use (115.4 ha); leisure use (6.85 ha) and tourism use (78.6 ha). The approved LDP identifies employment land for some 94.21 ha. As the LDPR is progressed, it is understood MDC will undertake further assessment to identify the overall amount, type and location of employment land to be allocated. This implies that there is only land that has come forward in the south of the district that may be capable of providing for a new secondary school which is generally considered viable at a scale of approximately 4,500 homes. It is acknowledged that ECC is not party to the detailed sites information and in particular the scale and size area of any submitted sites. Any option would also need to consider the potential to review priority school admission areas and potential expansion of other secondary schools adjacent to or in the vicinity of the district boundaries.</p> <p>With regards the potential impact of the Growth Options, consideration will need to be given to the following road corridors and rail capacity of the Southminster Branch Line, as described in detail within Growth Option 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Growth Options 1 – 6 would need to consider the proposed realignment of the A12 on local and wider vehicle movements and in particular movements along the B1019 corridor and the B1019 Maldon Rd / B1137 Duke of Wellington mini roundabout as well as any potential new A120 route;</li> <li>• Growth Options 1 – 6 and to a lesser degree Option 7 need to consider the proposed impact of growth along the A414</li> </ul>

Document Reference	MDC Question and ECC Response
	<p>through Danbury to the A12, Junction 18 corridor in terms of local and wider vehicle movements;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Growth Options 1 – 5 and 7 would need to consider the proposed impact of growth along the B1012 Lower Burnham Road to the A132 South Woodham Ferrers to the A130 including key junctions, Ferrers Road and Rettendon Turnpike in terms of local and wider vehicle movements</li> <li>• Option 7 will need to consider the capacity of the Southminster Branch Line and onward connectivity to London via Wickford in particular.</li> </ul> <p>Growth Options 1 – 3, 5, 6 and 7 seek to restrict development in the countryside to that which supports the local economy and tourism. ECC considers this approach is not consistent with NPPF, paragraphs 84 and 85. Policies should seek to support a prosperous rural economy but should also acknowledge that development needs to be sensitive to its surroundings and recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside (paragraph 174 b)). In drafting policies, MDC should refer to the <a href="#">PAS Local Plan Route Mapper</a> (paragraphs 83 – 87), which states policies need to be clear and robust and underpinned by evidence (paragraph 83) and need to be in general conformity with national policy and any departure from national policy is required to be evidenced. ECC recommend a more criteria based approach to '<i>sustainable development</i>' in the countryside is followed recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside (NPPF, paragraph 174 b)) but enabling some flexibility to enable the sustainable growth and expansion of rural businesses and enterprises for a wider range of uses consistent with NPPF, paragraph 79.</p> <p>Option 7 refers to increasing 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. This approach is supported and should refer to all Growth Options.</p> <p>ECC consider there is an inconsistency between the definition of settlements and villages used in Growth Options 1, 2, 4 and 5 compared to the draft settlement pattern. Consequently, it is unclear which areas are actually included within particular growth options. The inconsistencies include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Option 1 – reference should be to the 'towns of Maldon/Heybridge and Burnham on Crouch and not '<u>settlements</u>';</li> <li>• Option 2 – clarification is necessary as to whether '<u>larger sustainable villages</u>' is a subset of 'Large villages';</li> <li>• Option 4 – clarification is necessary as to the definition of '<u>all the sustainable settlements</u>' in the district;</li> <li>• Option 5 – clarification is necessary as to the definition of '<u>Larger villages</u>' and/or '<u>settlement</u>' adjacent to the district boundary;</li> </ul> <p><b>Option 1 - Retain the option in the LDP approved in 2017 - focus growth in the settlements of Maldon/Heybridge and Burnham on Crouch;</b></p> <p><u>Secondary school provision</u></p>

Document Reference	MDC Question and ECC Response
	<p>In advance of any full housing scenario test being undertaken, ECC, as the lead authority for education, consider that Growth Option 1, is unlikely to provide critical mass (i.e. 4,500 homes) in a single area, to make a new secondary school viable. Paragraph 12.17 states that all options are reliant on the fact that there will be sufficient land in the areas for delivery of the strategic growth target. For a new secondary school to be provided in this option, ECC would need to be satisfied that there is sufficient land being submitted through the 'Call for Sites' by which a new secondary school could be delivered and funded. Any option would also need to consider the potential to review priority admission areas and potential expansion of other secondary schools adjacent to the district. Option 1 makes reference to growth at Maldon/Heybridge, which is unlikely to incorporate growth at the scale necessary to deliver a new secondary school. If significant growth were to be allocated at Maldon/Heybridge for a new secondary school then the relationship to The Plume Academy would need to be considered. ECC strongly considers there is no scope to further expand the Plume Academy at Maldon as referenced in Question 3 and 15. Any spatial option should seek to minimise the need for school transport. Spatial options unable to deliver the overall number of additional secondary school places required should be dismissed.</p> <p><u>Primary school provision</u></p> <p>A new 420 place primary school (2fe) equates approximately to developments of approximately 1,400 new houses or a mixed development of approaching 2,000 dwellings and would incorporate a 56 place early years and childcare nursery. A full housing scenario test will be required to assess the impact of and suitability of individual development sites using the method set out in section 3.3. of the <a href="#">Essex local and neighbourhood planners guide to school organisation</a>, particularly in terms of available capacity, need for new schools, expansion of existing schools, and any need for school transport. Any development that places a burden on ECC to fund school transport costs will be resisted.</p> <p><u>Early Years and Childcare</u></p> <p>ECC plays an active role in ensuring there is sufficient, sustainable and flexible EYCC and that new EYCC facilities are based on the places generated by any new development. This would include the need for breakfast / afterschool and holiday clubs, as well as provision for children aged 0-5. Younger children (0-2) have additional requirements for sleep rooms and although it is appreciated some preschool services may run successfully from a community buildings, ECC needs to look at the whole age range and also consider children with additional needs.</p> <p>ECC will need to work collaboratively with MDC in assessing the requirements for EYCC based on the preferred spatial distribution of growth, including by settlement and specific site allocations. Further details are contained in the <a href="#">ECC Developers' Guide to Infrastructure Contributions (2020)</a> in Section 5.1, page 26. The <a href="#">Essex Childcare sufficiency assessment (Autumn 2020)</a> has been published. The EYCC assessment will consider the number of places generated by each development site and cumulatively within wards; availability of existing childcare provision in the parish/ward; infrastructure requirements generated in terms of any new 26 place pre-school or 30/56 place nursery be it stand-alone and/or co-located with a new primary school and any necessary developer contributions towards places. Any new primary school (420 places/2fe) would be expected to incorporate a co-located 56 place nursery on 2.1ha of suitable land. Often,</p>

Document Reference	MDC Question and ECC Response
	<p>early years providers also deliver afterschool / breakfast club services for older children who attend the school offering further support for working families who may not wish to have separate arrangements with different childcare providers.</p> <p>Partnerships between the Early Years provider and the school can also be of benefit to families and children, as it can support transition for young children into school. In addition to the school based and stand-alone provision, local childcare may also be delivered through the flexible use of commercial centres. However, ECC would be keen to see how spaces could be retained for sole use and also offer the long term assurance that these places would remain available as a nursery or preschool as demand for use by alternative community groups would be significant. In addition, without designated space, they may become 'pack away' provisions which may have restrictions on the hours that are available, days of delivery or ages of children that could attend – this may lead to the continued lack of high quality childcare options to support the need of working families.</p> <p><u>Highways and Rail</u></p> <p><u>A12 Chelmsford to A120 widening scheme</u> – any growth arising in Option 1 and the future traffic from the North Heybridge Garden Suburb will need to consider its impact along the B1019 and at the junction of the B1019 Maldon Rd / B1137 Duke of Wellington mini roundabout. This is the preferred main access between the proposed road linking the new southern roundabout of junction 21, A12 to Hatfield Peverel accessing areas to the south and west, including Hatfield Peverel. There is minimal highway land available to implement significant mitigation measures at the junction unless the compulsory purchase of land is progressed. ECC together with MDC have aspirations for a new Maldon Link Road which would connect into the new Junction 21 at Hatfield Peverel allowing for the existing Maldon Road to be enhanced with measures from an active and sustainable travel point of view but also to allow strategic trips travelling from Maldon to the A12 to have enhanced connectivity. ECC has requested further conversations with National Highways (NH) to ensure that designs for Junction 21 are able to accommodate such a link road in the future (see response to Q3).</p> <p>Any growth arising in this option would need to consider its impact on the proposals to close Junction 23 and provide a new Junction 24 to link from the Inworth Road (B1023) relieving Inworth (a 'Small' village) of traffic coming from Tiptree on the B1023 (within Colchester Borough) and relieve Kelvedon High Street. It would also need to consider any implications on the design of Junction 22 (Coleman's Bridge) in consideration of access to and from the A12 within the Maldon District via Little Braxted Lane which is a single lane route with passing places and single lane bridge crossing (Grade II Listed). Little Braxted Lane is suitable for cars and small vans only and not HGVs.</p> <p>Any implications to movements on the wider local highway network arising from the potential new A120 Braintree to A12 route with connection near Kelvedon by National Highways may need to be considered in determining any growth option. The scheme is identified as a 'pipeline project' in RIS2 (2020 – 2025) and will undergo more analysis and design work by NH ahead of being considered for potential future investment and inclusion in RIS3 (2025 – 2030).</p> <p><u>A414 through Danbury to the A12, Junction 18</u></p> <p>The impact of growth on the link and junction capacity and safety along the A414 to A12 junction 18 at Sandon will need to be included within any future highway modelling. Pre-signals have been installed at the Eves Corner junction to manage approved LDP growth to 2029</p>

Document Reference	MDC Question and ECC Response
	<p>and will need to be subject to review to assess whether they are still satisfactory mitigation at higher levels of growth. Consideration should also be given to the nature of the A414 route in terms of the free flow of traffic. An AQMA was designated in October 2018 (post LDP adoption) between Gay Bowers Lane and Danbury Village Green, adjacent to Eves Corner. An Action Plan is being prepared by Chelmsford City Council.</p> <p><u>B1012 Lower Burnham Road to the A132 South Woodham Ferrers to the A130 including key junctions, Ferrers Road and Rettendon Turnpike.</u></p> <p>The impact of growth on the link and junction capacity and safety along the B1012 Lower Burnham Road to the A132 South Woodham Ferrers to the A130 including key junctions, Ferrers Road and Rettendon Turnpike will need to be included within any highway modelling. The planned growth to the north of South Woodham Ferrers (around 1200 homes) is already providing improvements to the B1418/Burnham Road Junction involving the signalisation of the junction; increasing the extent of the taper on the A132 west of the Burnham Road/Ferrers Road/Willow Lane Junction; and upgrades to the A130/A132 Interchange; pedestrian and cycle crossings; potential speed limit reduction along the A132 and travel plan and other sustainable measures. Any additional traffic growth arising from the new Plan and potentially Bradwell B would need to be considered.</p> <p><u>A120 Braintree to A12 route</u></p> <p>Any implications to movements on the wider local highway network arising from the potential new A120 Braintree to A12 route with connection near Kelvedon by NH may need to be considered in determining any growth option. The scheme is now identified as a 'pipeline project' in the Highways England (now NH) Road Investment Strategy 2 (2020 – 2025) (RIS2) and will undergo more analysis and design work by NH ahead of being considered for potential future investment and inclusion in RIS3 (2025 – 2030).</p> <p><u>Southminster Branch Line Capacity</u></p> <p>The line offers a key sustainable mode of travel in the south of the district with onward connection via Wickford to London Liverpool Street. New trains do provide significant additional passenger seating capacity of some 66% in the off peak and at peak times a new 10 car train has about 12% additional seating capacity than the old 12 car train. However, given the imposed speed limits and number of crossings on the line the one train every 40 minutes is the best timetable that can presently be offered. Any improvement to provide 2 tph (trains per hour) would require significant investment in the track and platforms, which it is unlikely to be funded by LP growth to 2043. Other issues include connectivity issues at Wickford and onwards via Bow Junction to London Liverpool Street; and the case for investment for improvements in terms of benefits and affordability.</p> <p>Options 5 and 6 in particular would be required to consider the connectivity (primarily by sustainable modes), transport interchange and station facilities at Hatfield Peverel and Witham stations.</p> <p>The connectivity (primarily by sustainable modes) between settlements in the hierarchy by safe and quality walking, cycling and passenger</p>

Document Reference	MDC Question and ECC Response
	<p>transport will need to be explored given the location and scale of growth. Any new cycling provision will need to be LTN 1/20 compliant.</p> <p>This Growth Option would continue with the existing LDP policy of defining settlement boundaries around towns and villages and being defined on the policies maps. Please see ECC response to Question 25.</p> <p><b>Option 2 - A strong focus on the towns and larger sustainable villages;</b></p> <p><u>Secondary school provision</u> - Please see comments under Growth Option 1. In advance of any full housing scenario test being undertaken ECC, as the Education Authority, consider that 'Growth Option' 2, is unlikely likely to provide critical mass, in a single area, to make a new secondary school viable. ECC strongly considers there is no scope to further expand the Plume Academy at Maldon as referenced in Question 3 and 15.</p> <p><u>Primary school provision</u> - See comments under Option 1.</p> <p><u>Early Years and childcare</u> - See comments under Option 1.</p> <p><u>Highways and Rail</u> - Please see comments under Option 1 and comments relevant to all growth options.</p> <p>This Growth Option is proposed to implement a windfall policy for housing for the towns, large, medium and small villages. Please see the ECC response to Question 26 regarding a windfall policy.</p> <p><b>Option 3 - Growth generally focused on the towns Maldon/Heybridge and Burnham on Crouch and all the large villages of the Settlement Hierarchy</b></p> <p>ECC advises that the option to proportion growth between settlements is not considered appropriate and is unlikely to secure delivery of viable and sustainable infrastructure at a scale necessary for the level of growth to be planned for and is unlikely to be an approach ECC could support. This option is likely to increase demand on existing provision with limited capacity to expand; and for patterns of growth to be too small a scale to secure sufficient developer funding for new schools and other infrastructure. The dispersed approach is also unlikely to encourage all types of sustainable travel including walking and cycling connections and reliable and funded passenger transport services. In accordance with NPPF paragraph 20, the scale and pattern of growth to be planned for needs to be informed by the capacity of existing services to expand and that the level of growth is at a scale to secure delivery of viable and sustainable infrastructure required to support the new communities. ECC acknowledges that some growth in smaller villages can enhance or maintain the vitality of those rural communities and levels and types of growth should be considered on a case by case basis.</p> <p><u>Secondary school provision</u></p> <p>Please see comments under Growth Option 1. In advance of any full housing scenario test being undertaken ECC, as the Education</p>

Document Reference	MDC Question and ECC Response
	<p>Authority, consider that 'Growth Option' 3, is unlikely likely to provide critical mass, in a single area, to make a new secondary school viable. ECC strongly considers there is no scope to further expand the Plume Academy at Maldon as referenced in Question 3 and 15.</p> <p><u>Primary school provision</u> - See comments under Option 1.</p> <p><u>Early Years and childcare</u> - See comments under Option 1.</p> <p><u>Highways and Rail</u> - see comments under Option 1 and comments relevant to all growth options.</p> <p>This Growth Option is proposed to implement a windfall policy for housing for the towns, large, medium and small villages. Please see the ECC response to Question 26 regarding a windfall policy.</p> <p><b>Option 4 - Pepper pot growth throughout the Settlement Hierarchy (Spread the growth across all the sustainable settlements in the District)</b></p> <p>ECC consider this would not deliver the necessary scale of growth, particularly through 'major' site allocations, to secure the viable and sustainable delivery of local or strategic infrastructure and services (most notably a secondary school and school transport costs) and would not be supported.</p> <p>ECC advises that this option which means that all settlements would get some growth based on a percentage proportion of the number of homes in each settlement, so larger settlements will receive more growth. is unlikely to secure delivery of viable and sustainable infrastructure at a scale necessary for the level of growth to be planned for and is unlikely to an approach ECC could support. This option is likely to increase demand on existing provision with limited capacity to expand; and for patterns of growth to be too small a scale to secure sufficient developer funding for new schools and other infrastructure. In accordance with NPPF paragraph 20, the scale and pattern of growth to be planned for needs to be informed by the capacity of existing services to expand and that the level of growth is at a scale to secure delivery of viable and sustainable infrastructure required to support the new communities. ECC acknowledges that some growth in smaller villages can enhance or maintain the vitality of those rural communities and levels and types of growth should be considered on a case by case basis.</p> <p><u>Secondary school provision</u></p> <p>ECC do not support Option 4 as it does not provide any opportunity for the provision of a new secondary school given the limited scale of growth likely to be allocated at individual settlements and the likely need for significant school transport costs. A new secondary school is generally considered viable at a scale of approximately 4,500 homes. Paragraph 12.17 states that all options outlined are reliant on the fact that there will be sufficient land in the areas for delivery of the strategic growth target. Spatial options unable to deliver the overall number of additional secondary school places required should be dismissed. ECC strongly considers there is no scope to further expand</p>

Document Reference	MDC Question and ECC Response
	<p>the Plume Academy at Maldon as referenced in Question 3 and 15.</p> <p><u>Primary school provision</u> - See comments under Option 1.</p> <p><u>Early Years and childcare</u> - See comments under Option 1.</p> <p><u>Highways and Rail</u> - See comments under Option 1 and comments relevant to all growth options.</p> <p>This Growth Option is proposed to implement a windfall policy for housing for the towns, large, medium and small villages. Please see the ECC response to Question 26 regarding a windfall policy.</p> <p><b>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</b></p> <p>This Growth Option will have significant cross border implications with regards to Braintree District, Chelmsford City and Colchester Borough areas and will necessitate detailed duty to cooperate discussions with those authorities and ECC.</p> <p>For example, if Option 5 is progressed with regards a new satellite settlement or those options including a significant urban extension to an existing town/village then any strategic policies may need to be set within a vision looking some 30 years ahead given the timetable for delivery (build rates), lead in times for development and to enable the alignment of the necessary infrastructure and investment, as recommended by NPPF, paragraph 22. The new LDP needs to identify a range of sites so that the annual requirement of new dwellings may be delivered over the whole plan period. This may be achieved by phasing of allocations (adding dates to the allocations policies) so that some will not come forward until a certain year. Timing of development may also be affected by the nature of the allocations themselves and their infrastructure requirements. Larger developments are likely to require more strategic infrastructure to accommodate growth. Large sites will take several years to be completed. A range of site types in a variety of suitable locations in keeping with the needs of the area is required.</p> <p>Any employment strategy/vision is likely to depend on the scale of development proposed and hence Option 5 may provide an opportunity for a more ambitious economic strategy.</p> <p><u>Secondary school provision</u></p> <p>A new secondary school is generally considered viable at a scale of approximately 4,500 homes. Paragraph 12.17 states that all options outlined are reliant on the fact that there will be sufficient land in the areas for delivery of the strategic growth target. Prior to any support being provided for Options 5, ECC would need to be satisfied that there is sufficient land being submitted through the 'Call for Sites' through which a new secondary school could be delivered and funded. Consideration will need to be given to the capacity of schools in</p>

Document Reference	MDC Question and ECC Response
	<p>neighbouring authorities, namely William de Ferrers in South Woodham Ferrers, Thurstable School in Tiptree and secondary schools in Witham. Any potential solution would also need to consider the potential to review priority admission areas and potential expansion of other secondary schools adjacent to the district. ECC strongly considers there is no scope to further expand The Plume Academy at Maldon as referenced in Question 3 and 15.</p> <p>ECC notes that the <a href="#">Maldon District Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) 2021</a>, paragraph 6.2 has identified through the 'Call for Sites' suitable land for residential development amounting to approximately 1,400 homes to the north of the district (north of Heybridge), which is below the requirement of 4,500 homes to provide a new secondary school . At present, it is unclear whether this is in a single location or distributed throughout the north of the district, and hence not providing the necessary critical mass.</p> <p><u>Primary school provision</u> - See comments under Option 1.</p> <p><u>Early Years and childcare</u> - See comments under Option 1.</p> <p><u>Highways and Rail</u> - See comments under Option 1 and comments relevant to all growth options.</p> <p>This Growth Option is proposed to implement a windfall policy for housing for the towns, large, medium and small villages. Please see the ECC response to Question 26 regarding a windfall policy.</p> <p>Paragraph 12.14 refers to the satellite settlement or large urban extension accommodating all allocated growth except the 10% and 20% buffer allocated to the remaining towns and large villages. It is unclear what these buffers refer to – is it 10% for small sites and a whole plan 20% buffer? If these percentages were to be distributed to settlements on a percentage proportion of the number of homes in each settlement or as a general percentage, it is unlikely to secure delivery of viable and sustainable infrastructure and is unlikely to be an approach ECC could support. Moving forward it will be necessary to identify which settlements have existing infrastructure deficits/service shortages and existing available capacity to accommodate potential growth. MDC and ECC will need to engage and work closely together to help inform site selection, both individually and cumulatively, to ensure they are at the right location and scale to deliver viable and sustainable infrastructure provision.</p> <p>With reference to Table 1 – Proposed Housing Figure for the Period 2023 – 2043 (page 21), if the buffer referenced is to the 'whole plan buffer' then it is implied that the actual buffer of approximately 1,230 homes will be distributed around the main towns and large villages, implying that any new satellite town/large urban extension would be approximately 3,260 homes (i.e. 4492 – 1232) if full housing needs were to be met. It is acknowledged that MDC may decide on a longer plan period to accommodate any new settlement. This is below the 4,500 homes at which a new secondary school is generally considered viable.</p> <p>Reference should be made to the ECC response to Question 9 regarding the whole Plan and five year buffer.</p>

Document Reference	MDC Question and ECC Response
	<p><b>Option 6 - Focus growth in the north of the District to link into the service and facilities available in Tiptree, Witham and Maldon/Heybridge</b></p> <p>This spatial option will have significant cross border implications with regards Braintree District and Colchester Borough areas and will necessitate detailed duty to cooperate discussions with those authorities and ECC.</p> <p>Option 6 should be more positive in requiring employment opportunities in the northern villages (definition consistent with hierarchy), but will depend on the scale of development proposed at particular villages.</p> <p><u>Secondary school provision</u></p> <p>Option 6 makes reference to growth at Maldon/Heybridge, which is unlikely to incorporate growth at the scale necessary to deliver a new secondary school. If significant growth were to be allocated at Maldon/Heybridge for a new secondary school then the relationship to The Plume Academy would need to be considered. ECC strongly considers there is no scope to further expand The Plume Academy at Maldon as referenced in Question 3 and 15.</p> <p>A new secondary school is generally considered viable at a scale of approximately 4,500 homes. Paragraph 12.17 states that all options outlined are reliant on the fact that there will be sufficient land in the areas for delivery of the strategic growth target. Prior to any support being provided for Option 6, ECC would need to be satisfied that there is sufficient land being submitted through the 'Call for Sites' through which a new secondary school could be delivered and funded. Consideration will need to be given to the capacity of schools in neighbouring authorities, namely Thurstable School in Tiptree and secondary schools in Witham. Any potential solution would also need to consider the potential to review priority admission areas and potential expansion of other secondary schools adjacent to or within the vicinity of the district.</p> <p><u>Primary school provision</u> - See comments under Option 1.</p> <p><u>Early Years and childcare</u> - See comments under Option 1.</p> <p><u>Highways and Rail</u> - See comments under Option 1 and comments relevant to all growth options.</p> <p>This Growth Option is proposed to implement a windfall policy for housing for the towns, large, medium and small villages. Please see the ECC response to Question 26 regarding a windfall policy.</p>

Document Reference	MDC Question and ECC Response
	<p><b>Option 7- Focus growth along the rail line to Althorne, North Fambridge and Southminster</b></p> <p>Reference is made to Burnham-on-Crouch requiring a period of time in order for planned infrastructure to be delivered without additional pressure from new strategic growth. ECC seek further clarification from MDC with regards what outstanding infrastructure exists at Burnham on Crouch to delay additional growth coming forward as an option. ECC considers that development at the appropriate scale may well enable sufficient infrastructure to be provided.</p> <p><u>Secondary school provision</u></p> <p>A new secondary school is generally considered viable at a scale of approximately 4,500 homes. Paragraph 12.17 states that all options outlined are reliant on the fact that there will be sufficient land in the areas for delivery of the strategic growth target. Prior to any support being provided for Option 7, ECC would need to be satisfied that there is sufficient land being submitted through the 'Call for Sites' through which a new secondary school could be delivered and funded. Any potential solution would also need to consider the potential to review priority admission areas and potential expansion of other secondary schools adjacent to the district. ECC strongly considers there is no scope to further expand The Plume Academy at Maldon as referenced in Question 3 and 15.</p> <p>The Planning Group for secondary school provision at Burnham-on-Crouch includes Ormiston Academy and William de Ferrers in South Woodham Ferrers in the Chelmsford City administrative area. The current forecasts suggest an additional 2fe (300 places) is required to meet peak demand but maybe only one form entry on average. Some feasibility work has been undertaken at Ormiston Academy with 1fe expansion planned to open in 2022/23 as identified in the <a href="#">School Organisation ECC 10 Year Plan for Essex school places (2022 to 2031)</a>. William de Ferrers will increase its admission number by 30 places within its existing accommodation in 2023/24. William de Ferrers will increase its admission number by 30 places within its existing accommodation in 2023/24. The school has capacity to expand by 1FE (150 places) within its existing accommodation and this is likely to be necessary from 2023. A further 1FE expansion is feasible but would be expensive given site constraints, and is not supported by the school.</p> <p><u>Primary school provision</u> - See comments under Option 1.</p> <p><u>Early Years and childcare</u> - See comments under Option 1.</p> <p><u>Highways and Rail</u> - See comments under Option 1 and comments relevant to all growth options</p> <p>This Growth Option is proposed to implement a windfall policy for housing for the towns, large, medium and small villages. Please see the ECC response to Question 26 regarding a windfall policy.</p>

Document Reference	MDC Question and ECC Response
<b>COUNCILS RESPONSE</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key matters that the Council agree with</li> <li>• All the growth options will have cross boundary issues particularly option 5 and option 6.</li> <li>• There will be the need to provide a new secondary school, possibly two new primary schools and co located 56 place early years nursery. The Plume Academy has reached capacity and cannot be expanded any further after the planned expansion, William De Ferrers and Ormiston Rivers schools will most likely be unable to expand further after present planned expansions. This will require clarification though and further details to be discussed.</li> <li>• All the growth options should reflect that 10% of the housing requirement as a minimum should be on smaller sites of less than 1.0 hectare.</li> <li>• Developments that are unsustainable in terms of school transport should be resisted (two miles for the under 8`s and 3 miles for secondary school – The council would comment that in terms of site allocations, it would be essential for the Council to engage with ECC and if a settlement is chosen for growth then the developments coming forward may have to provide education facilities. The 3 miles for secondary school is not going to be able to be implemented in the District because the catchment for these is wider than 3 miles so wherever the new secondary school is going to go it is inevitable that it will draw in pupils from more than 3 miles away.</li> <li>• Impact on road corridors – Options 1 to 6 will need to consider the proposed realignment of the A12 and movements along the B1019 corridor and the B1019 Maldon Road/B1137 Duke of Wellington mini roundabout as well as any potential A120 route.</li> <li>• Growth options 1 to 6 and to a lesser degree option 7 need to consider the impact of growth along the A414 through Danbury.</li> <li>• Growth options 1 to 5 and 7 would need to consider the impact of growth along the B1012 Lower Burnham Road to the A132 Woodham Ferrers.</li> <li>• Option 7 will need to consider the capacity of the Southminster Branch Line. The line offers a key sustainable mode of travel in the south of the District. New trains do provide significant passenger seating capacity – approx. 66%</li> <li>• Option 7 refers to increasing new housing and business in the more sustainable villages – this approach should be applied to all the options</li> <li>• Option 4 pepper-potting would not deliver the necessary scale of growth to secure viable and sustainable infrastructure – most notably a secondary school and school transport costs and would not be supported.</li> <li>• Option 5 will have significant cross border implications – if this is pursued then a 30 year strategy will be required.</li> <li>• Option 6 will have significant cross border implications</li> <li>• Option 7 – Development at an appropriate scale may enable sufficient infrastructure to be provided. Within the secondary school catchment it may need 2 fe (300 places) to meet peak demand but on average this could be 1fe. William De Ferrers has the capacity to increase by a further 1FE within its existing accommodation and this is likely to be necessary from 2023.</li> </ul>

Document Reference	MDC Question and ECC Response
	<b>The Council are considering the next steps in the LDP Review and will be producing an amended LDS and timetable shortly.</b>
Q16	<p><b>Do you believe that there is another suitable growth option for the District, perhaps a combination of any of the above?</b></p> <p>Don't know. ECC considers it is too early for ECC to provide detailed comments on the 'Options for Growth' or state any preferred 'Growth Option', as there is the need to undertake additional infrastructure and service assessments. These will need to be informed by further details provided by MDC with regards the overall scale; distribution by individual settlement and specific site allocations. This level of detail will also be necessary to inform any Sustainability Appraisal of the preferred option (s) as part of the Regulation 18 Plan. It is noted that an Integrated Assessment (SA/SEA/HRA/HIA &amp; EQIA) is to be commissioned and this will need to include a Scoping Report to be consulted upon with statutory bodies and consultees. It is likely that a hybrid of Growth Options 1 – 7 is likely to be progressed.</p>
<b>COUNCILS RESPONSE</b>	<b>Noted</b>
Q17	<p><b>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?</b></p> <p>Yes. Please see comments made in response to Question 14.</p> <p>Given the significant local and wider impact of Bradwell B, and its potential to make any preferred strategy undeliverable or superseded, ECC would wish to see due consideration given to the inclusion of a commitment to commencing a LDPR and full update of the local plan in 12.17, and any other necessary amendments necessary.</p>
<b>COUNCILS RESPONSE</b>	<b>Noted- the idea of having a major infrastructure projects policy is that the Council will not necessarily have to review its plan if Bradwell B should start to come forward and there are other NSIPs which may come forward which could impact the district.</b>
10.0	<b>Effective Use of Land</b>
Q18	<p><b>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?</b></p> <p>Don't know. Since 6 April 2018, agricultural buildings in England can now be changed to residential use for up to five homes under permitted development rights (was previously 3 homes), but prior approval is required from the local authority, particularly if there are transport and highways or noise concerns, contamination or flooding risks on site.</p> <p>With regards derelict land within villages, as per the response to Q24, ECC supports the ambition to promote the effective use of land</p>

Document Reference	MDC Question and ECC Response
	<p>within settlements but considers the approach in NPPF, paragraph 119 that <i>'makes as much use as possible of previously-developed land or brownfield land'</i> is preferred. ECC support the benefits of developing on brownfield sites as they reduce the need for greenfield sites; in urban locations are in close proximity to key services accessible by active modes of travel; often require less new infrastructure and utilities than greenfield sites and smaller derelict sites can provide opportunities for small-medium housebuilders and improve local landscape. Any proposals would need to address issues regarding its scale, massing and design in relation to the character of the surrounding area.</p> <p>With regards the redevelopment of derelict land or disused agricultural buildings adjacent to a village consideration would need to be given to any adverse impact upon the recognised character of the area and recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside. Housing developments in isolated locations are unlikely to meet the sustainability objectives of the plan. The development of sites adjacent to existing villages would need to be considered within the context of the overall spatial strategy and not simply where land has become available and consider matters including physical barriers, proximity to and capacity of local facilities and services (including schools), access to public transport and walking and cycling links to services and green infrastructure. The appropriateness of any housing development would need to be considered with regards where it sits within the settlement hierarchy and the ability of local infrastructure, including schools, to accommodate that growth or whether it can be satisfactorily mitigated through planning conditions and developer contributions.</p>
<b>COUNCILS RESPONSE</b>	<b>Comments noted</b>
Q19	<p><b>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?</b></p> <p>Yes. ECC considers that any development density should make efficient use of land and relate to the specific opportunities and constraints of proposed development sites. Consequently, a flexible approach to housing densities is more appropriate to reflect site-specific considerations and ensure an appropriate density and massing reflecting the character, accessibility and provision/capacity of exiting services in individual settlements within the draft settlement pattern. ECC would support development at higher density at appropriate locations as long as the considerations in NPPF, paragraph 124 have been considered. Reference should be made to the <a href="#">The Essex Design Guide - higher-density-development</a> provides detailed guidance on a wide range of density matters.</p> <p>ECC anticipate that MDC would prepare design guides or codes either as part of the plan or as supplementary planning guidance consistent with the principles set out in the <a href="#">National Design Guide.2019</a> and <a href="#">National Model Design Code 2021</a>. Guidance should be at the most appropriate level, set out a clear design vision and expectations, so that applicants have as much certainty as possible about what is likely to be acceptable. Consistency is key and with consistency with these documents is key. ECC recommend the MDC adopt and seek to use /align to the <a href="#">Essex Design Guide</a>, and defer to appropriate principal local statutory standards and guidance such as <a href="#">ECC SuDS Design Guide</a>; ECC's <a href="#">Highways Development Management Policies (2011)</a> or <a href="#">Essex Parking Standards Design and Good Practice (2009)</a> for example</p>

Document Reference	MDC Question and ECC Response
	<p>Appropriate densities can be identified using area-based character assessments, design guides and codes and masterplans (NPPF, paragraph 125). The Local Plan should consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• optimising the use of land using minimum density standards for city and town centres and other locations that are well served by public transport unless there are strong reasons why this would be inappropriate;</li> <li>• ensuring the adequacy of the access and the local road network to accommodate the traffic generated as well as the scope to enhance walking and cycling to local amenities and public transport;</li> <li>• the use of minimum density standards may be appropriate to reflect the accessibility and potential of different areas, rather than one broad density range;</li> <li>• having regard to adequate open space and public realm and the existing landscaping, trees and hedgerows and need for further landscaping;</li> <li>• the character of the site and its immediate surroundings, and wider locality, including where applicable the setting of important heritage assets;</li> <li>• enabling the refusal of applications that fail to make efficient use of land, taking into account the policies in the NPPF.</li> <li>• the provision of appropriate parking to serve the development in accordance with the relevant standards</li> <li>• an appropriate mix and type of housing.</li> <li>• the provision of appropriate on-site amenities to serve the development and the provision of open space and sustainable drainage facilities where suitable; and</li> <li>• an adequate standard of residential accommodation.</li> </ul>
<b>COUNCILS RESPONSE</b>	<b>Comment noted, the Council are considering whether to fully incorporate the Essex Design Guide into its design policy.</b>
Q20	<p><b>Do you agree with building at higher densities in all settlements. What would you think was appropriate in terms of housing and higher densities?</b></p> <p>No. See response to Question 19</p>
<b>COUNCILS RESPONSE</b>	<b>Comment noted, the Council are considering whether to fully incorporate the Essex Design Guide into its design policy.</b>
Q21	<p><b>Would you support minimum density standards to uplift the delivery of housing and ensure land in Maldon District was used as efficiently as possible, or do you think design, or other factors should dictate density on housing sites?</b></p> <p>No. See response to Question 19.</p>
<b>COUNCILS RESPONSE</b>	<b>Comment noted, the Council are considering whether to fully incorporate the Essex Design Guide into its design policy.</b>
Q22	<p><b>Would you consider higher density housing appropriate in large, medium and small villages, if the design was to a higher standard and the character of the settlement was still respected?</b></p>

Document Reference	MDC Question and ECC Response
	Yes. See response to Question 19.
<b>COUNCILS RESPONSE</b>	<b>Comment noted, the Council are considering whether to fully incorporate the Essex Design Guide into its design policy.</b>
Q23	<p><b>Is it appropriate to develop land for housing that has been previously used for commercial uses such as employment and retail which is otherwise vacant, underused and derelict?</b></p> <p>Yes. See response to Question 45.</p>
<b>COUNCILS RESPONSE</b>	<b>Comment noted. The Council understands that you can not safeguard employment land if there is evidence that it is not required anymore, the present policies do not set out clearly what applicants have to do in order to demonstrate this and this is a matter which will need to be rectified in the LDP Review.</b>
Q24	<p><b>It is difficult for Maldon District to have a policy that states that brownfield land should be developed first for housing because of the lack of brownfield land sites in the District. This could also inadvertently lead to the redevelopment of active employment land to residential the consequences of this could lead to job losses and a decline in employment sites.</b></p> <p><b>Therefore, instead of 'brownfield land first', should the Council instead place a <i>greater emphasis</i> on encouraging the development of brownfield land for housing? This may mean less affordable housing and other benefits comes forward, but it could redevelop sites which are an eyesore and blight on settlements and residents.</b></p> <p>No. ECC notes that MDC has undertaken a 'Call for Sites' and <a href="#">Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (January 2022)</a>. The purpose of the assessment is to identify a future supply of land which is suitable, available and achievable for housing and economic development uses. This process should be undertaken consistent with NPPF, paragraph 82 a – d.</p> <p>ECC supports the ambition of the Plan to promote the effective use of land but considers that the suggested approach placing a <i>greater emphasis</i> on encouraging the development of brownfield land for housing is not consistent with national policy, as stated in NPPF, paragraph 119 above. This has a stronger emphasis requiring strategic policies to accommodating housing needs that '<i>makes as much use as possible of previously-developed land or brownfield land</i>'. Developing on brownfield sites has many advantages in that they are often in urban locations in close proximity to key services and often accessible by active modes of travel. These sites often require less new infrastructure and utilities reducing developer costs and potential timescales for delivery. Smaller derelict sites can also provide opportunities for small-medium housebuilders and improve the local landscape. The more development on brownfield land clearly reduces the amount required on greenfield sites.</p>

Document Reference	MDC Question and ECC Response
<b>COUNCILS RESPONSE</b>	<b>It is not possible to identify all land in the HELAA, there will always be other land coming forward for development and it is better to have a positive policy to support this if it's a blight on an area.</b>
<b>11.0</b>	<b>Housing in the Medium and Small Villages</b>
Q25	<p><b>Should the medium and small settlements retain some form of a settlement boundary, albeit more flexibly drawn?</b></p> <p>Yes. ECC seek clarification as to why this question refers to 'medium' and 'small' settlements within the hierarchy. Is there a reason it is not to be applied to 'Large' villages? ECC seek further clarification with regards the meaning of settlement boundaries being 'flexibly drawn'. All other Local Plans in Essex define a settlement boundary using a set of criteria and incorporating local circumstances and knowledge, including lines of communication; physical features; planning history; village enhancements; recent development; important amenity areas; any allocated land for housing, employment or other uses should be included within the boundary; and settlement boundaries should be drawn to facilitate an appropriate level of proportional growth within the Plan period.</p> <p>ECC support the use of settlement boundaries as a policy tool reflecting the area where plan policies are to be applied. ECC consider this is reinforced by <a href="#">Regulation 9 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012</a> which prescribes that adopted policies maps should '<i>illustrate geographically the application of the policies in the adopted development plan</i>'. This is reinforced by Planning Practice Guidance (Paragraph: 002 Reference ID: 61-002-20190315) and NPPF, paragraph 23 which refer to land-use designations and allocations being identified on a policies map. ECC consider this would provide more certainty with regards specific site allocations and the policies which apply to those sites/areas. This will ensure that the requirements of ECC infrastructure and services are met to secure their sound, viable and sustainable delivery at the right scale, location and time, that is commensurate with housing needs and growth aspirations.</p> <p>ECC considers there are a number of generic advantages to having a settlement boundary including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• clear definition between the 'settlement' from 'open countryside';</li> <li>• locally, settlement boundaries are an understood and accepted planning tool for guiding and controlling developments between all parties;</li> <li>• ensuring a more plan-led and controlled approach to future housing growth, allowing for allocating sites within the village rather than windfalls;</li> <li>• protects the countryside from unnecessary development and prevents ribbon development;</li> <li>• Provides a co-ordinated and consistent approach providing a firm basis for refusing planning applications which are unacceptable in planning terms;</li> <li>• allows for more certainty to developers/land owners with sites/land within the boundary, as long as they adhere to all other plan policies; and</li> <li>• allows the development of small sites which cannot be identified as allocations.</li> </ul>

Document Reference	MDC Question and ECC Response
	<p>ECC acknowledges that settlement boundaries may result in cramming within a village as every available area of land competes for development resulting in a potential reduction in the landscape quality and character of that village, unless other policies are in place. It may be possible to implement a 'criteria based' policy to guide decisions on where it would be likely to be appropriate to allow development, and would need to consider how appropriate forms of development (such as meeting a local housing need or new community facilities) can be accommodated whilst protecting settlements from 'excessive' development; outline the relationship with existing built form; respecting the settlements distinctive character; its scale in relation to the existing settlement; and sensitivity to landscape setting.; need to differentiate between settlement and isolated dwellings. An alternative approach maybe to rely on a written definition providing a more flexible approach.</p>
<b>COUNCILS RESPONSE</b>	<p><b>There is nothing in the NPPF or the planning guidance that Councils have to have settlement boundaries. They have caused some of the issues in the District with regard to the continuous supply of housing in the District. They can also be used as a reason to refuse housing applications which in all other regards are acceptable. They effectively push development into infill areas in rural villages which ultimately over time causes a degeneration of the very key characteristics that residents really support and want to protect. The alternative would be to allocated down to one units in the smaller settlements which the Council can consider or have a clear policy which sets out what the Council will support in terms of smaller rural settlements, this is also being considered.</b></p>
Q26	<p><b>Should the Council develop a windfall policy for all or specific settlements, potentially capping the number of units for each site coming forward and ensuring the protection for key views, green infrastructure gaps and the historic environment in each village.</b></p> <p><b>Please click here to view Large, Medium &amp; Small Villages</b></p> <p>No. Paragraph 14.1 of the consultation acknowledges that housing will come forward and be developed in the large, medium and small villages, either through site allocations or as windfall development. NPPF, paragraph 71 allows a windfall allowance as part of anticipated supply so long as there is compelling evidence that they will provide a reliable source of supply. It is noted that all the spatial options make reference to some development coming forward in the towns, large, medium and small villages through a windfall policy.</p> <p>ECC would prefer as much of the housing growth required in the Plan period to be identified through specific site allocations. ECC would urge that a detailed assessment is undertaken of sites identified in the <a href="#">Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (January 2022)</a> in order that a definitive position is attained regarding sites suitability and achievability. This will enable the scale and quantity of housing development proposed to come forward in proportion to the size of the settlement concerned and the level of services present. This will ensure that the requirements of ECC infrastructure and services are met to secure their sound, viable and sustainable delivery at the right scale, location and time, that is commensurate with housing needs and growth aspirations. ECC would be keen to engage with MDC to inform site selection and the range of preferred sites both individually and cumulatively.</p> <p>ECC is unable to provide a detailed response on this matter without having sight of any detailed policy wording including the specific</p>

Document Reference	MDC Question and ECC Response
	<p>criteria. ECC would expect MDC to provide evidence supporting why and identifying which specific settlements to which any windfall applies. MDC may wish to consider the following considerations in drafting any policy, namely layout, design and appearance compatible with the character and density of the surrounding area; impact on the amenity of existing residents; impact or significant harm to the landscape, heritage assets or biodiversity interests; safe access from the local road network and the traffic generated can be accommodated on the local and wider road network; the need for infrastructure or other facilities to support it; and, impact upon active use of sites such as employment, leisure or community facility.</p> <p>ECC does not consider a `cap` should be placed on specific sites. The NPPF and PPG require that LPAs promote sustainable development in rural areas to support the vitality of rural communities. ECC considers policies restricting housing development in settlements and/or capacities should be avoided unless clearly supported by evidence. Most Local Plan Inspectors recommend the use of `around` in relation to site capacities as these will be set following more detailed site assessments through the masterplanning and planning application process.</p> <p>Across the district there are a number of settlements which play a service centre role in that they contain a number of services such as a primary school; a GP service; a community venue (such as a pub or a village hall); shops which are able to meet a range of daily needs and a commuter-friendly bus or train service. There are also a number of rural settlements which are smaller and play a more `secondary` role, yet they still have a limited number of community facilities and services. These settlements often rely on the services of the nearby primary settlements or the towns of Maldon/Heybridge and Burnham and are therefore relatively `accessible` in a rural context. Any windfall policy would need to consider the position of each settlement within the settlement hierarchy and the local services provided at that settlement or nearest settlement, preferably accessible via sustainable modes, which may not be the case given the nature of the district.</p>
<b>COUNCILS RESPONSE</b>	<p><b>The Council has noted the details around a cap on the amount of development and could you use the term “around” in any policy to allow for a flexible approach. The Council would need to allocate all its housing requirement and will have to meet the requirement of 10% of allocations on sites of less than 1.0 hectare. At the present time the Council does not have enough land of less than 1.0 hectare to fill the allocation requirement and therefore as per national planning policy will have to seriously consider having a windfall policy in order to conform. In terms of infrastructure funding if the Council adopts CIL or its replacement it would not be relevant where development goes because all relevant development would be remitting funding.</b></p>
12.0	<p><b>Future Homes for Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople</b></p>
Q27	<p><b>In the event of an increase of need, should the Council look to establish both private and public sites for Gypsies and Travellers in the future, recognising that not all needs can be catered by one tenure of provision?</b></p> <p>Yes. ECC anticipate MDC would plan to meet and deliver the provision of additional Gypsy and Travelling Showpeople’s accommodation needs identified for the plan period in accordance with the revised NPPF and Planning Policy for Traveller Sites. This includes the need to maintain a 5 year supply. In doing so ECC would anticipate that MDC would include the allocation of permanent sites, as appropriate,</p>

Document Reference	MDC Question and ECC Response
	<p>based on sound evidence, including a call for sites. ECC would anticipate the development of a relevant criteria and site allocation requirements to be based on best practice and guidance. ECC can provide further guidance and advice on this matter.</p> <p>ECC notes that MDC has commissioned an update to the Maldon District Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Accommodation Assessment. The evidence will be used to determine whether any additional pitch/plot needs are required by 2043, extending by over a decade the forecast period for existing Maldon District evidence. This will help ensure the council can determine whether site allocations are needed to support the delivery of new and/or expanded pitches and support the review of relevant planning policies (eg. Policy H6 – Provision for Travellers) to ensure they meet national policy (Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (2015) and local guidance (<a href="#">Gypsy, Traveller and Showpeople Guidance   Essex Design Guide</a>)).</p> <p>ECC consider the approach to the provision for temporary Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation to be a cross boundary matter and suggest that the approach is explored in co-operation with Essex authorities, through the EPOA.</p>
<b>COUNCILS RESPONSE</b>	<b>Comment noted, the Council is a member of the EPOA and will raise any issues or evidence regarding transit Gypsy and Traveller sites with that group.</b>
Q28	<p><b>In the event of an increase of need, should the Council seek to intensify or expand existing Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople sites as much as possible, where it is suitable to do so?</b></p> <p>Yes. See response to Question 27.</p>
<b>COUNCILS RESPONSE</b>	<b>Comment noted, the Council is a member of the EPOA and will raise any issues or evidence regarding transit Gypsy and Traveller sites with that group.</b>
Q29	<p><b>In the event of an increase of need, should the Council consider how it could use its Settlement Pattern, Rural Exception Sites and/or Windfall Policy (if implemented) to support the increased provision of new sites in sustainable locations that can serve the community's needs better?</b></p> <p>No comment.</p>
Q30	<p><b>Is the anything else the Council should be considering for homes for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople?</b></p> <p>No comment.</p>
13.0	<b>Self Build/Custom Build Housing Plots</b>
Q31	<p><b>Should the Council seek a proportion of self-build/custom build plots on larger housing sites.</b></p> <p>Yes.</p>
<b>COUNCILS RESPONSE</b>	<b>Comment noted</b>

Document Reference	MDC Question and ECC Response
Q32	<p>In addition to the above, should the Plan also allocate specific sites in the LDP Review exclusively for self-build/custom build, either put forward by people who want to self-build or caveated by policy that they can only be brought forward by self-builders?</p> <p>No comment.</p>
Q33	<p>Should the Council in the development of a self-build/custom build policy consider ensuring that smaller low cost housing units are encouraged to come forward?</p> <p>No comment.</p>
14.0	<b>A Beautiful Built Environment</b>
Q34	<p><b>Designing beautiful spaces and buildings, how important do you think it is that we should actively plan to create beautiful spaces and buildings?</b></p> <p>Yes. See response to Question 19 regarding design matters.</p> <p>The revisions to NPPF (2021) and National Model Design Code reflect the Government's commitment to making 'beauty' and place making a strategic theme in national planning policy. NPPF has revised the social objective that fosters '<i>well designed, beautiful and safe places</i>'. These places are required to incorporate high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings. The concept of '<i>beauty</i>' also relates to large scale residential developments, which are expected to contain a variety of '<i>well-designed and beautiful homes to meet the needs of different groups in the community</i>'.</p> <p>In addition, all major and strategic development sites should be designed around green and blue infrastructure to inform and shape the development. Particularly within denser developments, green infrastructure and open space should be approached from a multifunctional perspective, combining uses such as sustainable drainage, public open space, walking and cycling routes and biodiversity conservation to combine functional uses with amenity benefits. These features should be strategically located to provide green infrastructure and landscaping in prominent spaces to maximise the benefits to site users and increase the usability of multifunctional space.</p>
<b>COUNCILS RESPONSE</b>	<b>Comment noted</b>
Q35	<p><b>What do you think about the design policy in the LDP 2017 and the Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2018? Do they need amending? If so, how and why?</b></p>

Document Reference	MDC Question and ECC Response
	<p>Yes. See response to Question 34 regarding the concept of 'beauty' in national planning policy.</p> <p>Please see response to Question 19.</p>
<b>COUNCILS RESPONSE</b>	<b>Comment noted</b>
Q36	<p><b>Should the Council seek to endorse the Essex Design Guide with a Maldon District supplementary section? Would this be a more flexible approach to design?</b></p> <p>Yes. See response to Question 34 regarding the concept of 'beauty' in national planning policy.</p> <p>Please see response to Question 19.</p> <p>ECC would urge MDC to endorse the <a href="#">Essex Design Guide</a> as it contains new sections that provides a much wider scope than previously, including a <a href="#">Highways Technical Manual</a>; <a href="#">Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS)</a>; <a href="#">Garden Communities</a>; <a href="#">Ageing Populations</a>; and <a href="#">Health and Wellbeing</a>. Work is progressing for further additions to the Guide, including Solar Farms. The Essex Climate Action Commission's report <a href="#">Net Zero: Making Essex Carbon Neutral (July 2021)</a> also recommended that the Essex Design Guide (<a href="http://essexdesignguide.co.uk">essexdesignguide.co.uk</a>) be updated to reflect best environmental practice in net zero and resilience.</p> <p>The Guide also includes supplementary guidance including the Essex Quality Charter and Quality Panel; Essex Planning and Viability Protocol; Home Quality Mark; Health Impact Assessments; Livewell Development Accreditation; Gypsy, Traveller and Showpeople Guidance; School Design Guidance; Commercial, Industrial and Larger Footprint Building Guidance; Secured by Design; Engaging with the Emergency Services; Building with Nature; Air Quality; Higher Density Development; and Planning for 5g.</p> <p>The Guide also includes a series of design principles that provide an insight into how best to support people to live in adaptable homes; enabling independent living by ensuring homes and communities are flexibly designed and can adapt to user needs; providing options for self-care and self-support through digital connectivity; and supporting general health and wellbeing through the delivery of high-quality, considered design.</p>
<b>COUNCILS RESPONSE</b>	<p><b>Comment noted, the Essex Design Guide is iterative and evolves as national matters change and it could be a way of ensuring that the design considerations of development keep pace with national considerations, the Council is considering making it a key requirement of development that is should be incorporated into policy.</b></p>
Q37	<p><b>Should the Council in its design policy encourage support for modern innovative design and design to counter the effects of climate change?</b></p> <p>Yes. Please see response to Question 19, 34 and 39 (Climate Change).</p>

Document Reference	MDC Question and ECC Response
	<p>Everyone's Essex emphasises the promotion of sustainable growth and development with a commitment to meeting the challenges of a net zero carbon future. The <a href="#">Essex Design Guide</a> includes a section on climate change including the following themes SuDS &amp; the Essex SuDS Design Guide; Layout; Influences Upon Sustainability (integrates innovation in design); Renewable Energy for Developments; Electric Vehicles; Densities for Sustainable Developments; Housing Layout &amp; Design – Plots &amp; Internal Spaces; Movement; Mixed Uses; Landscape and Green Spaces; and -Solar orientation. The <a href="#">Essex Design Guide - Quality Review Panel</a> has been established through the EPOA in partnership with Place Services and is consistent with NPPF, paragraph 133.</p> <p>The Essex Climate Action Commission's report <a href="#">Net Zero: Making Essex Carbon Neutral (July 2021)</a> also recommended that the <a href="#">Essex Design Guide</a> be updated to reflect best environmental practice in net zero and resilience.</p> <p>Paragraph 17.1 refers to the Building Better, Building Beautiful Commission and the importance of considering beauty at three scales during the planning process, and namely '<i>Beautiful buildings (windows, materials, proportion, space)</i>'. ECC considers it important that the new Local Plan recognises that good design goes beyond simply the look of buildings. The Plan should not restrict itself to purely visual considerations. The Plan should support this wider understanding of good design by requiring that development proposals make reference to the sustainable planning of building materials as well as the management of waste arising during construction. ECC recommends that the Local Plan includes reference to MLP Policy S4 – Reducing the use of mineral resources which seeks to minimise waste through promoting waste reduction, re-use and recycling, sustainable building design and the use of sustainable materials, including in relation to their procurement, in the construction of new development or redevelopment.</p>
<b>COUNCILS RESPONSE</b>	<p><b>Comment noted, the Essex Design Guide is iterative and evolves as national matters change and it could be a way of ensuring that the design considerations of development keep pace with national considerations, the Council is considering making it a key requirement of development that is should be incorporated into policy. The LDP should not really repeat adopted policy from elsewhere, though a reference could be made in the descriptive wording of the policy.</b></p>
Q38	<p><b>Please provide comments below on design matters you consider to be particularly important. We would be especially interested in your views on whether we should include general design guidance on relevant site allocations?</b></p> <p>Please see response to Question 19, 34 and 39 (Climate Change).</p> <p>NPPF, paragraph 128 states that '<i>all local planning authorities should prepare design guides or codes consistent with the principles set out in the National Design Guide and National Model Design Code, and which reflect local character and design preferences</i>'. These can be prepared on an area-wide, neighbourhood or site-specific scale either as part of the local plan, or as a supplementary planning document following the statutory process and, importantly, with community engagement. Applicants can also prepare design codes in support of a planning application for specific sites.</p> <p>ECC welcomes the assertion that MDC would work towards endorsing the <a href="#">Essex Design Guide</a>. The Guide makes specific reference to</p>

Document Reference	MDC Question and ECC Response
	<p>planning and designing new developments with regard to the needs of the ageing population. The Guide seeks to identify how minor changes at the outset of the design process can support and meet the needs of the ageing population, creating the conditions that allow older people to remain independent and in their own home. The guide includes a series of design principles that provide an insight into how best to support people to live in adaptable homes as they age. However, these principles should not be seen as being of benefit exclusively to the ageing population. Rather, they represent opportunities to positively impact the lives of older people and people with a range of health conditions including dementia, encouraging and enabling independent living by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ensuring homes and communities are flexibly designed and can adapt to user needs;</li> <li>• providing options for self-care and self-support through digital connectivity; and</li> <li>• supporting general health and wellbeing through the delivery of high-quality, considered design.</li> </ul> <p>ECC would welcome MDC producing general design guidance on relevant site allocations which sets out how the development would be made accessible and inclusive for all regardless of disability or impairment as well as the consideration of dementia friendly principles and autism friendly communities in the development of public and community spaces.</p> <p>In designing developments and places, design matters should also be considered for those individuals with sensory impairments. This may include increasing contrast (edge of steps; use of illumination or lighting contrasts to identify risk; adding illumination to ground for contrast after dark; using contrasting textures; and use of tactile paving to indicate changes designated for pedestrians, cyclists etc.); utilising sounds (minimising echoes and use of sound cues at important areas); and creating barriers to help individuals with vision impairment discern where they are and where they should or should not be.</p>
<b>COUNCILS RESPONSE</b>	<b>Comments noted – relevant site allocations will have policy attached to them if it is considered appropriate.</b>
15.0	<b>Tackling Climate Change</b>
Q39	<p><b>Should the LDP Review make climate change one of its key priorities?</b></p> <p>Yes. ECC recognise that action is needed now, to address the scale and magnitude of climate change and a holistic approach is necessary. It is also recognised that in developing the emerging Local Plan and addressing the need for growth within Essex and MDC areas, consideration and change needs to be included to ensure that climate change action is delivered by all. It is recognised that how we build future social and community infrastructure will need to consider mitigating future climate change. Section 1.2 identifies that the LDP needs to be reviewed as many of the policies do not provide the best foundation from which to help manage and mitigate the effects of climate change. MDC also declared a Climate Emergency in February 2021.</p> <p>NPPF, Chapter 14 (paragraph 152 – 157) identifies one of the purposes of the planning system is mitigating and adapting to climate change, including moving to a low carbon future, taking into account the long-term implications for flood risk, coastal change, water supply,</p>

Document Reference	MDC Question and ECC Response
	<p>biodiversity and landscapes and policies should support appropriate measures to ensure the future resilience of communities and infrastructure to climate change impacts.</p> <p>ECC as an advocate for climate change and this response promotes the findings of the Essex Climate Action Commission's report and the <a href="#">ECC's Response</a>. The latter includes specific schemes and projects to be funded in the short term to 2025/26 with regards land use and green infrastructure; energy; built environment; transport and waste. These immediate actions will be taken directly and in concert with partners to drive effective progress against the ECAC recommendations. ECC is keen to work alongside MDC to secure the highest standards required to address climate change and net carbon zero development and to embed these standards within the policies in the emerging Plan and its development management policies.</p>
<b>COUNCILS RESPONSE</b>	<b>Support noted</b>
Q40	<p><b>What do you consider to be important in terms of development and climate change? Are on-site renewables such as photovoltaics, ground source heat pumps, etc as important/more important as off-site renewable energy projects such as on-land wind farms, solar farms, district heating networks, etc?</b></p> <p>Please see response to Question 39.</p> <p>ECC considers all types of on site and off site renewable projects are important if we are to reach net zero by 2050. ECC recommend reference is made to the ECAC <a href="#">Essex Baseline and Pathway to Net Zero</a> energy report on pathways to net zero and the roles decentralised small-scale vs. large-scale renewable generation will play. Both are vitally important if we are to significantly increase our generation of renewable energy. MDC should have an ambition to generate enough renewable energy to meet its own needs. On site generation will be vitally important in enabling energy resilience, but it needs to be complemented by off-site renewables to generate sufficient power to meet needs.</p> <p>Essex is experiencing a significant number of planning applications for solar farms at a range of scales. ECC and its partners in EPOA are preparing some overarching 'Guiding Principles' to inform proposals of a consistent set of minimum requirements to be considered by future planning applications, including NSIPs. They will sit within the Essex Design Guide and be referred to by local authorities in preparation of SPDs and other policy documents. There is draft national guidance on Solar Farms in the draft NPS for Renewable Energy (EN-3), which is yet to published as national policy.</p> <p>ECC recommends that new developments are required to retain the existing tree stock and introduce new trees within new development sites. New tree planting will assist in meeting the statutory 10% biodiversity net gain targets and help contribute to the ECC target of achieving net zero by 2050 as per the Essex Climate Action Commission's report <a href="#">Net Zero: Making Essex Carbon Neutral (July 2021)</a>, levelling up the environment and greening the environment. Reference to tree planning is also included in responses to Questions 4, 20 and 21.</p>

Document Reference	MDC Question and ECC Response
<b>COUNCILS RESPONSE</b>	<b>The Council notes the need for additional tree planting and would support this as a contribution to biodiversity net gain.</b>
Q41	<p><b>Should we plan for net-zero carbon from plan adoption in 2023? This would require all new development to be net-zero carbon upon adoption of the plan. If yes, would the Council need to bring forward any additional guidance to support this?</b></p> <p>No. Please see response to Questions 39 and 40.</p> <p>It is recommended that MDC require developers to secure all Low Carbon Sources and that all new developments are planned net zero from the outset.</p> <p>The ECAC has an ambitious programme to reach zero carbon buildings by 2050. The Association of South Essex Local Authorities (ASELA) are aiming to make the area carbon zero by 2040 and that requirements to achieve this are being reflected in reviews of local plans. It is acknowledged that any targets for zero carbon within policies would need to be sufficiently evidenced. Many local plans reference using Building Regulations as a minimum and to strive towards zero carbon buildings as soon as possible, partly because they have not yet prepared the evidence on zero carbon targets to support policy.</p> <p>Emerging local plan policies need to be more ambitious if Government targets and the ECAC recommendations are to be met. The ECAC acknowledged that the UK Government has brought in a new Future Homes and Buildings Standard and from 2025 new build homes will be required to have low carbon heating such as heat pumps, and much higher levels of energy efficiency. However, the Commission also noted that every building we build today that is not net zero will need to be updated and retrofitted before 2050. Each new building added below a net zero standard is adding to the retrofit challenge and increasing costs for future residents and business owners.</p> <p>The <a href="#">Essex County Council's Response to Net Zero: Making Essex Carbon Neutral</a> (November 2021) includes specific schemes and projects to be funded in the short term to 2025/26 with regards land use and green infrastructure; energy; built environment; transport and waste. ECC is also seeking to ensure that all new schools commissioned to be carbon zero by 2022 and carbon positive by 2030; All new schools and expansions built by ECC are designed to achieve net zero carbon and are therefore able to support any ambitious target. ECC has recently completed its first Net Zero Carbon Building at Sweyne Park School, Rayleigh. The new structure comprises six classrooms, a staff room and extra storage space. This was part of the Modular Innovation Project with parts of the structure being built off site, as this proved more sustainable. The design includes enhanced building fabric, solar panels, a heat pump and other technologies to come to a sustainable design in line with recommendations in the climate action commission report. This new building also has enhanced acoustic properties so that it is fully inclusive for children who have a hearing impairment.</p>
<b>COUNCILS RESPONSE</b>	<b>The council notes the comments and will have to consider the viability impacts of having net zero carbon from 2023 and its impact on the ability of other infrastructure to be funded.</b>

Document Reference	MDC Question and ECC Response
Q42	<p><b>Should we plan for net-zero carbon from a specific future date? This would require all new development to achieve net zero carbon from a future date in the plan process, set out in policy. It could allow time for the development industry to adjust to the higher standards and may mean we can secure more affordable housing and community benefits from development, earlier on in the plan process.</b></p> <p>See responses to Questions 39 – 41.</p> <p>It is recommended that MDC require developers to secure all Low Carbon Sources and that all new developments are planned net zero from the outset.</p>
<b>COUNCILS RESPONSE</b>	<b>The council notes the comments and will have to consider the viability impacts of having net zero carbon from 2023 and its impact on the ability of other infrastructure to be funded.</b>
16.0	<b>Enhancing and Growing The Economy</b>
Q43	<p><b>Should the local plan policies strongly support the economy in terms of a transition to a low carbon economy, ensuring development and growth opportunities are supported through this process?</b></p> <p>Yes. Everyone's Essex sets out a strategic aim for a strong, inclusive and sustainable economy. ECC includes a commitment to promoting green growth through developing Essex as a centre for innovation, supporting new technologies and business models to enable the economy to grow. ECC consider that a focus should be given to enhancing green skills for individuals in all jobs and sectors through the identification of local sectors with higher numbers of 'green jobs' (as explained in ECAC skills report and action plan), and increased support for training residents for these roles. ECC as an advocate for climate change and established the Essex Climate Action Commission which has published its report <a href="#">Net Zero: Making Essex Carbon Neutral (July 2021)</a>. <a href="#">ECC's Response</a> includes specific schemes and projects to be funded in the short term to 2025/26 with regards land use and green infrastructure. Some initial actions up to 2025/2026 include establishing a Net Zero Innovation Network (NZIN); facilitate Green Business Growth in Essex; supporting Essex Small and medium sized enterprises (SMEs) with green projects and reducing their carbon emissions.</p>
<b>COUNCILS RESPONSE</b>	<b>Support noted. The present LDP economic policies are not very clear and could be more positively focused, this could assist in developing the Districts economy.</b>
Q44	<p><b>Should the local plan allocate employment land so that it extends existing employment premises / areas in the District by working with existing businesses to ascertain their future need?</b></p> <p>Yes. MDC is required by NPPF, paragraph 82 a) – b), to include planning policies that set out a clear economic vision and strategy which</p>

Document Reference	MDC Question and ECC Response
	<p>positively and proactively encourages sustainable economic growth and sets criteria, or identifies strategic sites, for local and inward investment to match the strategy and to meet anticipated needs over the plan period. MDC has undertaken a Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (January 2022) (HELAA) covering a 20 year period. The requirement of a HELAA is to assess the suitability of sites and broad locations for housing and/or economic development and the likelihood and timing of development coming forward. Consequently, MDC should be able to ascertain the suitability of its existing employment sites and identify any requirement for additional and type of land to be allocated to meet plan growth. The Plan should set out these as site allocations where necessary. Existing Local Plan employment sites should not simply be rolled forward into the new LDP particularly where there is no reasonable prospect of particular sites being used for such purposes.</p>
<b>COUNCILS RESPONSE</b>	<p><b>Support noted. The Council is having an Employment Land Study undertaken and will develop its economic policies around the evidence base that this piece of work will develop including the need for additional employment land allocations.</b></p>
Q45	<p><b>Should the Council contain a policy preventing the redevelopment of employment premises to residential units? If so, should the scope of such a policy be limited in any way?</b></p> <p>No. The General Permitted Developments Order already includes Class MA which allows Class E (commercial, business and service) to be converted into dwellings subject to prior approval and criteria, which includes the building needs to have been vacant for three months prior to the application and has been in commercial use for at least two years. Any policy would have no influence over this use class.</p> <p>As part of the HELAA (January 2022), MDC has assessed the suitability of existing employment site allocations and identified others considered suitable and deliverable for employment use and may be allocated to support the necessary housing growth. This process should be undertaken consistent with NPPF, paragraph 82 a) – d).</p> <p>ECC would seek to alert you to the comments made by the Inspector in the <a href="#">Tendring Local Plan Inspectors Report</a> with regards <a href="#">Tendring Local Plan - Policy PP 6 - Protecting Employment Sites</a> and <a href="#">Main Modifications MM23.1 and MM23.2</a>. The Inspectors were clear that sites should not be safeguarded for employment use through overly onerous criteria for assessing their change of use which where there was no prospect of them being used for that purpose. An approach is to include with policy a requirement for evidence to be provided demonstrating that the employment unit has been vacant and actively marketed to the satisfaction of the council for at least one year and that there is no prospect of employment uses occupying the unit (for example <a href="#">Harlow Local Development Plan - Policy PR1 - Development within Employment Areas</a>).</p>
<b>COUNCILS RESPONSE</b>	<p><b>Comment noted – the Employment Land Study should assist the Council in developing its economic policies.</b></p>
Q46	<p><b>How important is the rural economy? How do you believe the rural economy can be supported through policy?</b></p> <p>Very important. NPPF, paragraphs 84 a) – d) and 85 - set out the requirements for planning policies and decisions with regards the rural economy. It is acknowledged that sites to meet local business and community needs in rural areas may have to be located adjacent to or beyond existing settlements, and in locations that are not well served by public transport. Any decisions will need to ensure that</p>

Document Reference	MDC Question and ECC Response
	development is sensitive to its surroundings, does not have an unacceptable impact on local roads and exploits any opportunities to make a location more sustainable (for example by improving the scope for access on foot, by cycling or by public transport). The use of previously developed land, and sites that are physically well-related to existing settlements, should be encouraged where suitable opportunities exist.
<b>COUNCILS RESPONSE</b>	<b>Support noted – the rural economic policy will be updated in the review it is at present not that clear or positive in its support.</b>
Q47	<p><b>Should the Council support the development of live/work housing units?</b></p> <p>Yes.</p>
<b>COUNCILS RESPONSE</b>	<b>Support noted</b>
Q48	<p><b>Should the nature, size and type of policy support for Maldon and Burnham-on-Crouch`s High Streets` change? How would you like the high street to change?</b></p> <p>Yes. The Government has published its future vision for the high street in the document `<a href="#">Build Back Better High Streets</a>. It sets five key priorities for the high street namely; breathing new life into empty buildings; supporting high street businesses; improving the public realm; creating safe and clean spaces; and celebrating pride in local communities.</p> <p>The demand for office space within town centres is likely to decline with the increase in home working and less days being spent in the office resulting in less financial spend to support cafes, gyms, childcare centres etc. However, there is the opportunity for consumers to buy local and thereby supporting the community and may lead to the rebirth of independents selling new products, goods and services.</p> <p>In November 2021, ECC held an Essex High Street Business Summit covering a wide range of topics aimed at helping our high streets and town centres recover and build back better in the wake of the pandemic. The summit sought to understand the challenges facing the high street and seek to future proof the high street in the light of the impact of the pandemic. Any recommendations arising from this summit will need to be considered as part of the LDPR. ECC notes that MDC has commissioned a retail needs assessment which will need to consider the potential impact of the pandemic and the future role of high streets.</p> <p>The Government has introduced significant flexibilities introducing the ability for commercial, retail and certain leisure businesses to change use without needing planning permission, through the use class E. It is also now permitted to change use between Commercial, Business and Service (Class E) to residential (C3) subject to certain conditions being met. ECC is concerned that the increased use of permitted development rights will lead to a reduction in design quality, reduce the potential for mitigation measures to accommodate the impact of development and a decrease in developer contributions, particularly in relation to education. Such proposals are no longer subject to Local Plan development management policies with the only safeguards through the limited prior approval process, which are inadequate. It is unclear how town centres and high streets will be plan-led as the permitted development rights now undermine the ability</p>

<b>Document Reference</b>	<b>MDC Question and ECC Response</b>
	of Local Plans and their development management policies to manage the development of places and to manage Town Centre and Regeneration Strategies appropriately.
<b>COUNCILS RESPONSE</b>	<b>Comment noted. The Council is not having a retail needs assessment undertaken, because with covid the High Street is facing uncertainty at the present time. The Council will be looking at the town centre boundary and the active primary and secondary shopping frontages.</b>
17.0	<b>The Visitor Economy</b>
Q49	<p><b>Do you believe this policy (E5 in LDP 2017) requires modification? If so how would you like to see it changed?</b></p> <p>Yes. Policy E5 refers to tourism irrespective of its location be it within an urban area, the rural environment or at the coast. MDC could consider whether the policy should be separated out into tourism that relates to these separate locations as they may need to be considered against different criteria.</p> <p>ECC would recommend the following amendment to paragraph 1 to read:</p> <p><i>The Council will support developments which contribute positively to the growth of local tourism in a sustainable manner and realise opportunities that arise from the District's landscape, heritage, <u>coastal</u> and built environment.</i></p> <p>Paragraph 4.42 of the approved LDP acknowledges the opportunities for tourism related development along the coast, but highlights the potential for proposals having an adverse effect on sensitive wildlife sites through increased recreational disturbance, on internationally significant wildlife sites. Any new policy should make reference to the <u>Essex Coast Recreational Disturbance Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy</u> (Essex RAMS) as referenced in response to Question 4.</p> <p>ECC would recommend an additional paragraph to read:</p> <p><i>Contributions will be secured from development towards mitigation measures in accordance with the Essex Coast Recreational disturbance Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy 2018 – 2038 (RAMS)</i></p> <p>Criteria 2 should be amended to refer to '<i>multifunctional</i>' green infrastructure.</p> <p>2) <i>Where possible, there are good connections with other tourist destinations, the <u>multifunctional</u> green infrastructure network and local services, preferably by walking, cycling or other sustainable modes of transport;</i></p>
<b>COUNCILS RESPONSE</b>	<b>Comment noted, consideration will be given to the recommended changes to the tourism policy. The whole tourism policy is going to be reviewed it does not presently conform to national planning policy in that it should be positively prepared.</b>

Document Reference	MDC Question and ECC Response
Q50	<p><b>Do you believe this policy (E5 LDP 2017) encourages tourism or is it too restrictive?</b></p> <p>No comment.</p>
Q51	<p><b>How could planning policy encourage more visitors to the District other than day visitors?</b></p> <p>ECC published <a href="#">A Recovery Plan for the Essex Tourism and Hospitality Industry</a> in response to the pandemic. It is acknowledged that new opportunities have arisen to boost the Essex visitor economy.</p> <p>Bradwell B may have a positive and negative impact on tourism, as outlined in paragraphs 5.5.14 and 5.5.15 of the <a href="#">Stage One consultation</a> through improved accessibility to the Dengie Peninsula through local road improvements, and the potential for a visitors' centre at the power station. Tourist accommodation (hotels and caravan sites) may also see demand from construction workers. This could increase occupancy and profitability, and potentially encourage increased supply of such accommodation in the area. Mitigation to protect tourist accommodation from over-demand by construction workers would also need to be considered.</p>
<b>COUNCILS RESPONSE</b>	<p><b>Comment noted, consideration will be given to the recommended changes to the tourism policy. The whole tourism policy is going to be reviewed it does not presently conform to national planning policy in that it should be positively prepared.</b></p>
18.0	<p><b>Protecting and Enhancing the Environment</b></p>
Q52	<p><b>Should the Council consider having protected landscape views in the District, even though this may place development pressure elsewhere?</b></p> <p>Yes. NPPF, paragraph 174a and b requires planning policies and decisions to contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by '<i>protecting and enhancing valued landscapes</i>' and '<i>recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside including the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land, and of trees and woodland</i>'. Any landscapes and views will need to be evidenced in accordance with requirements outlined in PPG, Paragraph: 037 Reference ID: 8-037-20190721, namely through a landscape character assessments to complement Natural England's National Character Area profiles (see NE guidance on undertaking <a href="#">assessments</a>). To help assess the type and scale of development that might be able to be accommodated without compromising landscape character, a Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment would also be required. To demonstrate the likely effects of a proposed development on the landscape, a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment should be used.</p> <p>Paragraph 21.1 infers that future development will only have an impact, which will be required to be mitigated, on the natural landscape and that it is the natural landscape and its distinctive characteristics that attracts visitors. NPPF, paragraph 190 requires plans to set out a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, including heritage assets most at risk through neglect, decay or other threats. ECC recommend this section should include the historic environment, referencing the Registered Parks and Gardens, Registered Battlefield and other areas of equal natural and historic significance, such as the Chelmer and Blackwater Navigation and the historic grazing-marshes at Tollesbury Wick and Old Hall Marshes.</p>

<b>Document Reference</b>	<b>MDC Question and ECC Response</b>
<b>COUNCILS RESPONSE</b>	<b>Comment noted – it will difficult to pick out key landscape views to protect but the Council will look at the places mentioned in the comment to see if that is possible – they would have to be better than all other landscape areas in the District in order for them to stand out and be protected. The areas mentioned in the comment are already protected in terms of there are and setting and therefore may not need any further protection.</b>
19.0	<b>Access and Sustainable Transport</b>
Q53	<p><b>In terms of access and sustainable transport in the District, what is most important to you?</b></p> <p>ECC would seek a greater emphasis being placed on promoting integrated sustainable transport (particularly in relation to new road options); encourage the use of Travel Plans; provision of suitable linkages for pedestrians and cyclists; enabling passenger transport options in new developments; and the connectivity between housing and employment areas. The provision and delivery of active and sustainable travel infrastructure including dedicated links and priority measures for walking, cycling and passenger transport in Local Plan policies should make sustainable modes favourable in comparison to the private car, to promote modal shift; and refer to the findings of the <a href="#">ECAC Report 2021</a>. This is further supported by the <a href="#">ECC Safer Greener Healthier (SGH)</a> campaign and the national <a href="#">Bus Back Better Strategy</a> (2021).</p> <p>The SGH campaign seeks to make it as easy as possible for Essex residents to travel more sustainably, especially for shorter journeys by walking, cycling, e-scootering or taking the bus or train for longer journeys. The SGH campaign is also seeking to support the creation of School Streets and Liveable Neighbourhoods. A LCWIP is being prepared and will help co-ordinate potential walking and cycling schemes identified in the Cycling Action Plan (2018); proposals within MDC adopted masterplan documents (e.g. Maldon and Heybridge Central Area; Maldon Central; Causeway Regeneration Area and the Leisure Quarter) and to new development.</p> <p>The <a href="#">ECC Bus Service Improvement Plan (2021 - 2026) (BSIP)</a> outlines that ECC is to follow the Enhanced Partnership (EP) approach between the Local Transport Authority (LTA) and Bus Operators to provide a new, high quality and reliable bus network. Essex, including Maldon, is a challenging area to run bus services given its large geographic footprint with dispersed settlements connected by semi-rural and small town networks leading to lengthy and complex journeys. ECC is to adopt a more proactive role in collaboration with the commercial bus sector.</p> <p>To meet the aims of the BSIP and the objectives of Bus Back Better, ECC has commenced a review of its highways and transportation policies to concentrate on moving people around the network and they include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Reviewing and updating the Local Bus Service Priority Policy 2015 to 2022</a> – including more priority to the planning and development of bus infrastructure in the proposed new Local Transport Plan (LTP 4) and a revised ECC road hierarchy that recognises the importance of bus as a mode and sets out ECC’s approach to road-space allocation for bus services; and reviewing ECC’s Highways Planning Guidance Notes (HPGN) to recognise the importance of bus services across the highways network, including their funding;</li> <li>• <a href="#">Transport modelling</a> – to better incorporate passenger transport modes, cycling and walking activity within base and forecasting modelling packages to identify the potential modal shift from car to bus and train;</li> </ul>

Document Reference	MDC Question and ECC Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Route hierarchy</u> – to reconsider the functional route hierarchy to reflect changing Government priorities and the new Essex Transport vision, <i>Safer, Greener, Healthier</i> with more focus on the function of a place, as well as the movement function, to ensure the most appropriate activities for different areas and routes can be prioritised;</li> <li>• <u>School zones</u> – to have distinct zones encouraging active travel prioritising walking, scooting and cycling; and</li> <li>• <u>Network reviews</u> – MDC is being assessed to identify the key characteristics of the existing bus network services and its supporting infrastructure; identify the issues creating barriers to passenger growth, connectivity or accessibility; identify measures to over-come the barriers and promote bus passenger growth which will become a legally binding District-based EP Scheme. This will commit the LTA and bus operator to take the agreed actions including identifying funding opportunities.</li> </ul> <p>As these new policy approaches and guidance emerge they will need to be considered within the context of the MDLDPR.</p> <p>ECC will continue to work with MDC and has commenced initial work regarding transportation and highway impact assessments and modelling, as inferred in paragraph 22.6. ECC welcomes the opportunity to work with MDC to explore and understand new highway and sustainable travel options, any implications arising from the A12 widening scheme on the local highway network, the integration of sustainable travel with any road proposals, and any transport hubs to support sustainable growth. However, the wider effect of any such new infrastructure will need to be fully assessed through the transport evidence, to ensure they are funded, viable and deliverable, meet the challenges of decarbonising transport and any negative impacts such as induced traffic, increased carbon emissions and exploring land take. ECC will continue to seek funding through bids to Government, Transport East, SELEP and through section 106 (planning) and section 278 (highways) agreements, as appropriate.</p> <p>ECC welcome reference in paragraph 22.2 to MDC support, in principle, to integrating the 15/20 minute neighbourhood concept where appropriate and the importance of active and sustainable travel to inform a long term integrated transport solution, and a reduction on the reliance of private vehicles in 19.6. These approaches align with ECC and national campaigns.</p>
<b>COUNCILS RESPONSE</b>	<b>The Council is committed to active sustainable travel options, the 15/20 minute neighbourhood is most likely not possible in the District given that most of the settlements are rural and the use of the private car is key to many people accessing key services such as health facilities.</b>
Q54	<p><b>Should the Council focus future growth on those areas with higher levels of commuter access either by bus or train?</b></p> <p>Yes, where appropriate. NPPF, paragraph 105 requires the planning system to actively manage patterns of growth with significant development being focused on locations which are or can be made sustainable, through limiting the need to travel and offering a genuine choice of transport modes.</p> <p>Please see response to Question 53 with regards the <a href="#">ECC Safer Greener Healthier</a> campaign and the <a href="#">ECC Bus Service Improvement Plan (2021 - 2026)</a> and Question 15 with regards rail provision to the south and north of the district.</p>

Document Reference	MDC Question and ECC Response
	<p>ECC is to undertake Sustainable Accessibility Mapping and Analysis to identify the level of sustainable accessibility of individual Local Plan sites/locations and then collectively assess the sustainable accessibility of sites within each spatial option. The Sustainable Accessibility Mapping exercise will provide MDC with a better understanding of accessibility, or potential accessibility, of potential sites and/or locations to both alternative transport modes and to local services. MDC will be able to consider these outputs alongside other emerging evidence base, to identify a preferred spatial option of development sites in the district. The outputs, alongside other evidence base, will enable a re-assessment of the draft settlement pattern either to support the draft pattern or to identify appropriate amendments.</p>
<b>COUNCILS RESPONSE</b>	<b>Comment noted.</b>
Q55	<p><b>Should all new development be linked to its settlement by a footpath wide enough to accommodate a wheelchair or double buggy/pram?</b></p> <p>No. It is expected that all new development should be accessible by walking and cycling to accord with current guidance contained in LTN 1/20. When identifying development sites an appropriate audit or appraisal of the existing and proposed cycling and walking facilities should be undertaken.</p>
<b>COUNCILS RESPONSE</b>	<b>The question was aimed at establishing what consultees think about development and should it be linked with a footpath, the comments are noted, most sites can be accessed by cycling using the roadway but walking does need a footpath</b>
Q56	<p><b>Should development have to demonstrate that it can provide safe footpath/cycle links/connections, which incorporate green infrastructure and support active travel choices?</b></p> <p>Yes. NPPF, paragraphs 106 b), c) and d) and 92 c) all seek to ensure that strategies and investments for supporting sustainable transport and development patterns are aligned, protect sites and routes which could be critical in developing infrastructure, are attractive and well-designed and incorporate safe and accessible provision of green infrastructure.</p> <p>ECC support the principle of establishing multifunctional greenways to promote sustainable and active travel movements and contribute to health and wellbeing. Their design will depend on whether they are to be within an urban or rural environment and their function (recreational; commuting). Most should be designed with a hard, permeable surface which is accessible in all weathers and for people with mobility impairments, those in wheelchairs, use for leisure and fitness pursuits such as skateboarding and rollerblading, for commuting journeys to work and to school and to provide new leisure opportunities from development into the countryside. Where possible these routes should be funded by developers where they directly relate to development.</p> <p>The <a href="#">Essex Design Guide</a> includes Walkable Neighbourhoods to promote the use of walking, cycling and sustainable transport including a mix of uses, green spaces and facilities to support new development where all key facilities are within a 15-20-minute walk. The ECAC recommends bringing forward 10 walkable neighbourhoods by 2021 and then 20 schemes each year between 2022-2030. ECC is developing a Walkable Neighbourhood Development Model.</p>

Document Reference	MDC Question and ECC Response
	<p>ECC is progressing schemes known as ‘school streets’ through the Active Travel Fund, which aim to facilitate improvements to make these areas more accessible and attractive to those who may want to arrive on foot or by bike. More information can be viewed <a href="#">here</a>.</p> <p>The <a href="#">Developers' Guide, Appendix D</a> provides an Exemplar Layout for Education and Community Facilities promotes the provision of a safe environment around school entrances, with them being traffic free, well connected to the areas the school will serve via safe and direct walking and cycling routes and set within a pleasant environment. A generous public realm where parents can meet and younger siblings can play in safety, at either end of the school day, should be included.</p> <p>A common issue for village locations is the lack of a primary or secondary school within a reasonable walking distance. Where suitable schools are beyond ‘Statutory Walking Distance’, two miles for children under the age of 8 and three miles for older children via a safe route, ECC must bear the long term revenue cost of school transport. Developments that are unsustainable in school transport terms should be resisted.</p>
<b>COUNCIL RESPONSE</b>	
Q57	<p><b>Should the council continue to explore and support complementary projects delivered outside the planning system that can support travel choice and a shift away from the use of the car in the District?</b></p> <p>Yes. Please see comments in the response to Question 53 regarding the <a href="#">ECC Safer Greener Healthier</a> campaign and the <a href="#">ECC Bus Service Improvement Plan (2021 - 2026)</a>.</p> <p>Maldon experiences a large number of trips to Chelmsford in terms of commuting and for the higher order services and onward connections on the Great Eastern railway line, particularly through the Army and Navy gateway. Consequently, MDC should acknowledge the benefits arising from the significant investment regarding the <a href="#">Army and Navy Sustainable Transport Package</a>. The new Beaulieu Park station is due to open in 2025/2026 and will attract trips from the district for onward trips to London and East Anglia.</p> <p>Additional complementary measures which should be considered include the preparation of a Maldon Transport Strategy; the update of the EPOA Parking Standards; the <a href="#">Decarbonisation transport - a better, greener Britain (July 2021)</a>; commissioning and implementing of the Local Cycling and Walking Implementation Plan (LCWIP), and the <a href="#">Draft Transport Strategy prepared by Transport East</a>.</p>
<b>COUNCILS RESPONSE</b>	<b>Support noted</b>
20.0	<a href="#">Securing Infrastructure</a>

Document Reference	MDC Question and ECC Response
Q58	<p><b>Should the Council take into account the advantages of locations which stand to offer the better chance of securing new infrastructure due to critical massing of development?</b></p> <p>Yes. Everyone's Essex, ECC's new organisation strategy, includes a commitment to deliver and maintain high quality infrastructure to support a growing economy and the delivery of new homes and communities. Achieving this requires ECC to ensure that the development, planning and infrastructure delivery is aligned with the Local Plans that are being prepared across the county, at its borders and beyond. This is to ensure that the planned growth includes provision for the delivery of ECC's infrastructure and services commensurate with the growth being planned, and to support existing and future residents and businesses. MDC and ECC will need to engage and work closely together to help inform site selection, both individually and cumulatively, to ensure they are at the right location and scale to deliver viable and sustainable infrastructure provision.</p> <p>ECC and MDC are working collaboratively on an IDP Update to agree a baseline position with regards completed projects supporting the approved LDP, the secured developer contributions by scheme, the outstanding contributions and their triggers for payment in order to identify any existing funding gap. This will inform the baseline of any updated IDP supporting the LDPR and to inform any future CIL.</p> <p>ECC will work with MDC as it prepares an update to the IDP. All new development will be required to be supported by the required local and strategic infrastructure, where the IDP will reflect up to date costings, is aligned with development phasing and requirements are appropriately reflected in Local Plan policy and site allocations policies. It is important to acknowledge that the IDP is a 'living document' with the information provided therein regarding necessary infrastructure and their costs being a 'snapshot' in time. The information within the IDP will be subject to further review as part of the detailed planning application process, where further details will become known about the land use mix, housing mix, site and wider infrastructure requirements and their detailed costings (including indexation).</p> <p>It is recommended that MDC consider the preparation of site specific planning documents as appropriate and adopt a master planning approach for major developments / growth areas with the emphasis on implementation and delivery to ensure the necessary infrastructure requirements, funding, phasing and delivery are fully addressed. MDC may also need to prepare individual Implementation Delivery Strategies, for major developments or where the need for the delivery of significant infrastructure is proposed.</p> <p>ECC strongly considers there is no scope to further expand The Plume Academy at Maldon as referenced in Question 3 and 15. Any future strategy will need to consider the alternatives for secondary school provision including the scale of growth to deliver a new school (approx. 4,500 homes). With regards primary education, a new 420 place primary school equates approximately to developments of approximately 1,400 new houses or a mixed development of approaching 2,000 dwellings.</p>
<b>COUNCILS RESPONSE</b>	<b>Support noted, it is noted that the Plume Academy will have reached its capacity after the present planned extension and there is a need for a new secondary school in the District though this will need to be looked at in more detail to establish a clear evidence base for this piece of infrastructure.</b>

Document Reference	MDC Question and ECC Response
Q59	<p><b>Affordable housing is often the biggest influence on viability, so should the Council continue to prioritise this policy requirement over other infrastructure contributions or design quality across the District?</b></p> <p>No. NPPF, paragraph 7 states that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. Paragraph 9 states that planning policies and decisions should play an active role in guiding development towards sustainable solutions, but in doing so should take local circumstances into account, to reflect the character, needs and opportunities of each area. PPG, Paragraph: 001 Reference ID: 10-001-20190509 states that plans should set out the contributions expected from development. This should include setting out the levels and types of affordable housing provision required, along with other infrastructure (such as that needed for education, health, transport, flood and water management, green and digital infrastructure). These policy requirements should be informed by evidence of infrastructure and affordable housing need, and a proportionate assessment of viability that takes into account all relevant policies, and local and national standards, including the cost implications of the CIL and section 106.</p> <p>In determining a planning application a planning balance is required to be undertaken to ensure that any development is sustainable and viable in planning terms and should be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. This will assist in enabling the requirements of ECC infrastructure and services are met to secure their sound, viable and sustainable delivery at the right scale, location and time, that is commensurate with housing needs and growth aspirations.</p>
<b>COUNCILS RESPONSE</b>	<b>Comments noted – the whole plan viability assessment will be updated to assess the viability of infrastructure which it is evidenced that there is need.</b>
Q60	<p><b>Should we consider spare capacity within our existing infrastructure when we determine where new development should go?</b></p> <p>Yes. Please see response to Question 58.</p> <p>ECC welcome the acknowledgement of ECC's role in the provision of local and strategic infrastructure and agree that infrastructure is critical to support sustainable growth, to accommodate future new jobs and homes. Given the importance of infrastructure provision and funding (all funding streams), delivery evidence should be considered as part of the assessment of all spatial options to ensure the preferred strategy is viable and deliverable. This will assist in enabling the requirements of ECC infrastructure and services are met to secure their sound, viable and sustainable delivery at the right scale, location and time, that is commensurate with housing needs and growth aspirations.</p> <p>The scale and pattern of growth should be informed by the infrastructure required and balanced to ensure there is the necessary scale of development to secure the developer funding for necessary infrastructure including provision of a new secondary school which is only likely to be possible on a larger site allocation. ECC strongly considers there is no scope to further expand The Plume Academy at Maldon as referenced in Question 3 and 15.</p> <p>In considering where new development should be located consideration should be given to both spare capacity and where existing</p>

<b>Document Reference</b>	<b>MDC Question and ECC Response</b>
	<p>capacity has limited or no additional capacity. There are a number of village primary schools in the district which have unfilled capacity and could benefit from additional pupils. As MDC seeks to identify its preferred spatial option, within which the scale and distribution of growth at particular towns and villages in the settlement hierarchy is identified, ECC will assist in undertaken a full housing scenario test to determine if, and where, the spatial strategy can deliver land for new school provision in accordance with the <a href="#">ECC Local and Neighbourhood Planners Guide to School Organisation</a>. A common issue for village locations is the lack of a primary or secondary school within a reasonable safe and direct walking distance. Where suitable schools are beyond 'statutory walking distance', which is two miles for children under the age of 8 and three miles for older children via a safe route, ECC must bear the long term revenue cost of school transport. ECC will resist developments or potential site allocations that are unsustainable in school transport terms.</p>
<b>COUNCILS RESPONSE</b>	<b>Comment noted</b>