



**REPORT of  
DIRECTOR OF SERVICE DELIVERY**

---

**to  
COUNCIL  
14 SEPTEMBER 2023**

**GROWTH OPTIONS FOR THE REVIEW OF THE LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

**1. PURPOSE OF THE REPORT**

- 1.1 This report follows an All-Member Workshop on 12 July 2023 whereby attending Members discussed the detail of the seven high-level Options of Growth as consulted on in the Maldon District Local Development Plan (LDP) Review: Issues and Options Consultation, which ran from 17 January to 14 March 2022. This report sets out recommendations to approve which Growth Options should proceed to be subject to further evidence testing and evaluation.

**2. RECOMMENDATIONS**

That Members agree to:

- (i) pursue further testing for Option 3 – Growth generally focused on the towns Maldon and Heybridge and Burnham-on-Crouch and all the large villages of the Settlement Pattern;
- (ii) pursue further testing for Option 5 – A large urban extension bolted onto the existing settlements in the District and adjacent to the District boundary in combination with Option 3 - Growth generally focused on the towns Maldon and Heybridge and Burnham-on-Crouch and all the large villages of the Settlement Pattern;
- (iii) pursue further testing for Option 7 - Focus growth along the rail line to Althorne, Burnham-on-Crouch, North Fambridge and Southminster in combination with Option 1 - Retain the option in the LDP approved in 2017 – focus growth in Maldon and Heybridge. (Burnham-on-Crouch is part of Option 7)
- (iv) not pursue Option 4 – Pepper pot growth throughout the Settlement Pattern (Spread the growth across all the sustainable settlements in the District);
- (v) not pursue Option 6 – Focus growth in the north of the District to link into the services and facilities available in Tiptree, Witham and Maldon and Heybridge.

**3. SUMMARY OF KEY ISSUES**

- 3.1 Attached at **APPENDIX 1** is the paper distributed to all Members and presented to Members at an All-Member Workshop on 12 July 2023.

- 3.2 In the Issues and Options Consultation which ran from 17 January to 14 March 2022 the Council set out seven high level options for growth in the District, these were:
- OPTION 1 – Retain the option in the LDP approved in 2017 – focus growth in the settlements of Maldon/Heybridge and Burnham-on-Crouch;
  - OPTION 2 – A strong focus on the towns and larger sustainable villages;
  - OPTION 3 – Growth generally focused on the towns Maldon/Heybridge and Burnham-on-Crouch and all the large villages of the Settlement Pattern;
  - OPTION 4 – Pepper pot growth throughout the Settlement Pattern (Spread the growth across all the sustainable settlements in the District);
  - OPTION 5 - Create a new satellite settlement or large urban extension bolted onto one of the towns, larger villages and/or settlement adjacent to the District boundary;
  - OPTION 6 - Focus growth in the north of the District to link into the service and facilities available in Tiptree, Witham and Maldon/Heybridge;
  - OPTION 7 – Focus growth along the rail line to Althorne, North Fambridge and Southminster.
- 3.3 As already presented to Council as an outcome of the Issues and Options consultation the Plan Period for the review of the LDP Review is going to be 20 years. It is therefore important that options chosen to go forward for further testing should be able to accommodate 20 years' worth of growth. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out in paragraphs 60 and 61:
- “60. To support the Government’s objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes, it is important that a sufficient amount and variety of land can come forward where it is needed, that the needs of groups with specific housing requirements are addressed and that land with permission is developed without unnecessary delay.
61. **To determine the minimum number of homes needed, strategic policies should be informed by a local housing need assessment, conducted using the standard method in national planning guidance** – unless exceptional circumstances justify an alternative approach which also reflects current and future demographic trends and market signals. In addition to the local housing need figure, any needs that cannot be met within neighbouring areas should also be taken into account in establishing the amount of housing to be planned for.”
- 3.4 In accordance with the NPPF, the District’s Housing Requirement is calculated using the national Standard Method. The Standard Method is calculated every year and can change every year as the affordability ratio used in the calculation for each area can and does change annually. At the present time, July 2023, the Standard Method calculation for Maldon District’s Housing Requirement is 279 homes per year. Whilst there may be changes to the way the housing requirement is calculated in the next iteration of the NPPF, these are not present at the moment and even if they were, as the consultation draft of the NPPF was set out, the Council has no evidence it can move away from the Standard Method as a means of calculating its housing requirement. This figure is a minimum not a maximum, so it is only the minimum amount of housing the District has to provide each year and the Council can, if it chooses, provide additional homes in a Local Plan, if for instance it had the evidence that they were needed to fund infrastructure, boost the economy, or enable other things to happen.

- 3.5 For the purposes of choosing the District's Growth Options to conduct further tests and evaluations on, it is important to work out the land supply based on an uplifted amount of housing. This is because, the affordability ratio changes annually and could increase again for the District, prior to the Plan's submission to the Secretary of State, and it is important that all the work and testing carried out by not only Maldon District Council (MDC) officers, but also strategic partners is not carried out on a figure that could actually come up short. Therefore, for the purposes of testing and appraising options, 10% has been added onto the 279 per annum bringing it back up to 310 homes as set out in the present approved LDP per annum and a further 20% would bring the requirement up to 334 per annum.
- 310 x 20 years = 6,200 homes
  - 334 x 20 years = 6,680 homes
- 3.6 Existing commitments must then be deducted from a housing requirement in a Local Plan. The first five years will nearly be built-out by the time of submission, so these have not been counted. The amount of housing with permission outside of five years at the present time is 1,003 homes; it should be noted this figure will change as the LDP Review advances. All the calculations for land supply of the options have included these commitments.
- 3.7 There is a risk that must highlighted to the Council which concerns secondary education provision. As already reported to the Council on 30 March 2023, Essex County Council (ECC) in the Issues and Options Consultation response has indicated that there will be the need to fund the capital development of a new secondary school in the District within the next plan period, which the LDP Review will cover. A new secondary school needs approximately 4,500 homes to fund it and 10 hectares of land. A few applications granted before the LDP Review is adopted could undermine any headroom between what is to be allocated and what already has planning permission very quickly unless the Council can negotiate contributions, or land towards a secondary school. At the moment any highway improvement costs are unknown as they need to be modelled.
- 3.8 In order to try and build in some kind of 'safety net' for the options testing that can cope with the uncertainties present, officers advise and have predicated the analysis work on adding the 20% onto the present Standard Method housing requirement figure of 279, which would bring the overall minimum requirement up to 334 per annum or 6,680 over 20 years as set out above. This allows a safety net for testing and will help avoid abortive work before the plan is submitted for Examination. This would give the Council flexibility to (if the Standard Method allows) go either below the 279, or up to 334 per annum in the final LDP. By not building in this flexibility at testing stage, the Council could have to abort or repeat testing in the future, before submission, which is not budgeted for in terms of officer time or financial cost. Only Options 3 and 4 could, on their own, provide the sufficient land to accommodate the growth necessary to ensure that there were economies of scale for the potential infrastructure required for the District going forward.
- 3.9 The NPPF requires Local Plans to ensure 10% of the housing requirement is delivered on sites of less than 1.0 hectare. Based on the Maldon District Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) data, none of the options can supply enough land to provide 10% of the housing requirement on sites of less than 1.0 hectare. This is even the case if we add in sites of 1.0 hectare or less which already have planning permission. There is a shortfall in every case. This effectively means that the decision on whether the Council takes forward a Windfall Policy, or not is effectively being made for us by the lack of small sites in our land supply. The NPPF is clear and says at paragraph 69 (emphasis added in bold):

*“Small and medium sized sites can make an important contribution to meeting the housing requirement of an area and are often built out relatively quickly. To promote the development of a good mix of sites local planning authorities should:*

- a) identify, through the development plan and brownfield registers, land to accommodate at least 10% of their housing requirement on sites no larger than one hectare; unless it can be shown, through the preparation of relevant plan policies, that there are strong reasons why this 10% target cannot be achieved.*
- b) use tools such as area-wide design assessments and Local Development Orders to help bring small and medium sized sites forward.*
- c) support the development of windfall sites through their policies and decisions – giving great weight to the benefits of using suitable sites within existing settlements for homes; and*
- d) work with developers to encourage the sub-division of large sites where this could help to speed up the delivery of homes”*

3.10 The Windfall matter will need to be discussed in more detail at a future Planning Policy Working Group meeting and/or all Member Workshop and officers and Members will have to consider what a Windfall Policy could look like for the LDP Review along with which settlements it could affect. At the present time, the medium and small villages have not been included in the recommended options unless they have a potential large urban extension in them or are part of Option 7. Any Windfall Policy could seek to provide a small amount of growth, controlled by policy, in these smaller settlements in order to assist their continued sustainability and meet very localised needs.

### 3.11 **Brownfield Land**

3.11.1 There is very little brownfield land in the District for development, not enough to make any meaningful contribution to the site allocation numbers and reduce the need to use greenfield sites. However, where there is suitable brownfield land in settlements within the options for growth, this land will be considered first in terms of potential site allocations.

### 3.12 **Affordable Housing**

3.12.1 Only Options 3 and 4 could go some way to meeting the affordable housing target of 174 homes per year. This is not unusual because affordable housing is calculated as a percentage for each site, and this is worked out via a district wide Local Housing Needs Assessment and tested by a Whole Plan Viability Assessment. The figures have been calculated using the present LDP's affordable housing requirements and therefore may change as the work on the LDP Review progresses.

3.13 Option 4 was the only option which could bring forward the affordable housing target. However, as set out in **APPENDIX 1**, Option 4, pepper-potting, would in effect allocate land in the small and medium villages, some of which do not have access to a railway station or bus services, and it may not be possible to provide a bus service if a settlement is particularly isolated. Therefore, this option could increase the effects of rural isolation for more people and would have to come with a comprehensive funded transport strategy - part of an Infrastructure Delivery Plan, to ensure that future residents could access higher-order settlements for their essential needs. ECC is likely to be reluctant to fund this scale of intervention if other options were available for the Council to choose from that present more affordable, deliverable or sustainable transport solutions. There is a risk, albeit unknown in likelihood at this time, that the cost of this kind of provision alongside other infrastructure provision

could make the whole LDP Review unviable, which would mean it would be found unsound at Examination and unable to proceed in the format it was submitted. There is also a risk that taking forward this option would result in objections from the Council's other Duty to Co-operate partners at the Examination; objections which the Inspector would, given that sustainability is a key tenet of national planning policy, most likely support as a questionable approach. Failure of the Duty to Co-operate is not recoverable once the LDP Review is submitted and the LDP would need to be withdrawn, its cost written-off and then repurchased.

- 3.14 Option 3 is actually a combination of Options 1 and 2 but with all the large villages included in it, whereby growth would be focused in the towns / principal settlements of Maldon, Heybridge, Burnham-on-Crouch and the large villages, Southminster, Tollesbury, Mayland, Latchingdon, Tolleshunt D`Arcy, Wickham Bishops, Tillingham and Great Totham South.
- 3.15 There is enough land in Option 3 to allocate the residual housing requirement for a 20-year plan period and it may also be possible to bring forward the funding needed for a secondary school. It could also potentially bring forward the land required as well. The option still comes up short in terms of the delivery of affordable housing target only delivering 89% of the target. This is one of the best options with regard to this. The option may offer better chances for economies of scale to deliver other infrastructure and does allow for development to be located in the most sustainable settlements which could support the delivery of services provided by both the NHS, ECC and emergency services. On the other side of this argument though is the growth could be spread out over too many settlements, thus stretching the capacity of key services providers. Overall, the option allows for a wider choice of sites to be considered at a future date by the Council, than either Options 1 or 2 across a number of settlements. This is an important consideration, because some sites will inevitably fail at testing stage and some of the settlements may, through the evidence work of the LDP Review also be shown to have constraints which will impact on the amount of growth they can take.
- 3.16 Option 5 on its own cannot bring forward enough land to accommodate the growth required. This option examined whether a new settlement or large urban extension could fulfil the growth requirements for the District. No land came forward for a new stand alone settlement in the District and therefore the Option has had to examine the possibility of bringing forward a large urban extension instead. This means that there would have to be sites which are contiguous with one another so that when they are built on, they fit into the existing spatial townscape of the settlement they are being 'bolted' onto. The only way to assess this option is to have a number of the larger contiguous sites in different places in the District making up the total housing requirement. This would mean a number of urban / village extensions across the District. From those sites submitted into the HELAA so far, the following could be considered:
- There is land in the Maldon District for approximately 1,556 homes adjacent to the new approved edge of South Woodham Ferrers.
  - There are sites in Althorne which could accommodate 750 homes.
  - There are sites in Maldon which could accommodate 1,614 homes
  - There is a site in Southminster which could accommodate 1,050 homes
- 3.17 By combining Option 5 with Option 3, this allows the Council to explore the possibility of larger strategic sites coming forward still but with a wider choice of sites across more settlements in the District. It also provides in terms of delivery of growth across the Plan period the possibility of ensuring a continuous Five-year supply of housing

because larger sites, as demonstrated in the present LDP, take longer to come forward than smaller sites and this can mean a lag in supply. It must also be pointed out that in the work that is to be done on testing this proposed option, the Council will have to better understand the impact on the rest of the District in terms of its housing market (supply / demand / house prices / site allocations) particularly if a large site was to be developed on the edge of the District. In this scenario, it could also mean that investment in infrastructure is not contained within the District but has to occur in a neighbouring area.

### 3.18 **Option 6**

- 3.18.1 With regard to Option 6 - despite a further extension to the Call for Sites which informs the HELAA ending on 15 August 2023, including placing an advert in the national Estates Gazette; no further land of any size has come forward in the north of the District. Even with 10% of growth directed to the remaining large villages and towns, there would still not be enough land to accommodate the housing requirement. Most of the District's protected wooded areas and local wildlife sites are in the north and the Great Braxted Estate takes up approximately 200 hectares of land, which is more wooded or managed under positive land management including for biodiversity net gain.
- 3.18.2 There were also concerns raised from National Highways concerning the impact on the operation of the A12, part of the Strategic Road Network, as it has advised that even with the widening project it has not taken into account any further growth from local authority areas along the route. Option 6 is the only option that it has commented on.
- 3.18.3 Colchester City Council has objected to Option 6 as well because of the impact on the infrastructure in and around Tiptree; it has commented that settlements between each District could coalesce and there could be a disproportionate amount of affordable housing in one area. The last two reasons are currently unsubstantiated as there are no plans or discussions about the coalescence of settlements which are not already in this position, and it is unclear how that could happen or why it would impact on Colchester City Council's area when the evidence suggests the Housing Market Area for Maldon District is shared with Chelmsford and Braintree. With regard to the comment on affordable housing they may be concerned that there would be a disproportionate distribution of housing, focusing it all in one part of the District to the detriment of the rest of their area. However, the impact on Tiptree is a cause for consideration as is the impact on Witham which Braintree District Council are concerned about because both settlements are already planned for in terms of growth and infrastructure under other Local and Neighbourhood Plans. This effectively means that any infrastructure impact on those settlements would have to be funded from developer contributions in Maldon District which would mean it would not be available to be spent in the Maldon District itself.
- 3.18.4 Option 6 could not even be delivered in tandem with another of the options as has been explored elsewhere because effectively by doing that it would have to include settlements which were not in the north of the District and in actuality would become one of the other options therefore by default. This option therefore carries a significant risk in that it is unlikely to provide sufficient land to deliver the housing requirements and there are Duty to Co-operate risks of an unknown quantum at present. It is therefore recommended that this option is not pursued further.

### 3.19 Option 7

- 3.19.1 There is not quite enough land for this option on its own to deliver the housing requirement. There are some sites large enough to accommodate a secondary school in this option, though they would be unable to also fund it fully. There would also be a question mark over the economies of scale to fund other needed infrastructure. The NHS advocate growth on strategic developments that are well related to larger settlements as it would support their model for delivering health services in the future in that there is a connection with Burnham-on-Crouch, Southminster, and South Woodham Ferrers via the rail and road network; albeit one to be explored further and it would also assist in the delivery of other strategic partners services such as ECC and emergency services.
- 3.19.2 The option did not propose strategic allocations in Burnham-on-Crouch even though it does have a railway station. This was because there was a local perception of a lag in infrastructure coming forward in the town. However, there is a view from the Issues and Options consultation that it undermined that perception, because the County Council has asked for clarification, because this is not how they perceive the situation, which would indicate that despite residents' concerns, there is not a lag in infrastructure coming forward, or rather not anymore of a lag than anywhere else in the District/Essex. Therefore, given that Burnham-on-Crouch is a main town in the Settlement Pattern already, to remove it from this option at this point in the process on what is an assumption, without any key evidence could undermine the robustness of any options appraisal going forward. Taking Burnham-on-Crouch out will also certainly be noted in the Sustainability Appraisal of the options, particularly as it is a main town with a number of key services and facilities including a secondary school and railway station. This could also undermine the LDP when it gets to examination because this is a reasonable alternative scenario that needs to be considered further. The assessment has therefore included Burnham-on-Crouch, and it should be for the evidence to determine whether it should be removed as first proposed not assumptions.
- 3.19.3 As a standalone option with Burnham-on-Crouch in it, Option 7 however still does not provide the housing requirement. There is not enough headroom to provide for any shortfall in the analysis work, nor is there a large enough choice of sites. If Maldon and Heybridge were added into this option, in effect it would become a combination of Options 1 and 7 then the quantum of housing would be sufficient. This would be more than adequate to cover the housing requirement and provide more choice of sites. It would also raise the potential of delivering affordable housing to 75% of the target. It would mean that growth could be assessed in the towns, as the most sustainable settlements, linking in with key services, facilities and also along the railway line, in keeping with the key tenet of this option which was about exploring growth potential and constraints in line with an available sustainable travel choice.

## 4. CONCLUSION

- 4.1 Only three of the options; Options 2, 3 and 4 can meet the housing requirement on their own, without combining with any other option. Though Option 3 is actually a combination of Options 1, 2 and 3 in itself, as was consulted at Issues and Options stage in 2022. Given that Option 4 has received objections from all of the key statutory infrastructure providers and surrounding local authorities it is recommended that this not be taken any further for testing. It is considered that in the presence of other options, Option 4 would be an unusual choice in planning terms to follow and is likely to be hard to defend at Examination.

- 4.2 Option 6, growth in the north of the District, does not have enough land in it to be a sustainable option to test, even with the addition of Maldon/Heybridge and Burnham-on-Crouch (Option 1) there would still not be enough land. The potential pressure on Tiptree and Witham could mean there may be Duty to Cooperate objections from neighbouring authorities which could be justified, and that infrastructure funding would have to be spent outside of the District to provide additional infrastructure in both those places, may leave a shortfall on what is spent for infrastructure inside the District. There also may be continued objections from National Highways regarding the impact on the A12 and the possibility that further contributions would need to be spent on the strategic road network to receive unplanned growth. Overall, the questions and issues raised by Option 6 are too many to comfortably consider this as a suitable alternative option to take forward.
- 4.3 Option 3 can provide enough land, has sufficient sites in it to provide choice when site selecting and has sites in it which could potentially accommodate a secondary school. It can accommodate not the whole affordable housing target but a good proportion of it, it would be assessing growth in the most sustainable settlements which have some services and facilities and a good base on which potential improvement could be made on the back of additional growth. There is enough land for economies of scale in the determination of what infrastructure is required and how it is going to be funded. The locations for growth may be appropriate in terms of the capacity for strategic infrastructure providers to service their functions sustainably, though this would be for future discussion with them to clarify should the option be taken forward for testing.
- 4.4 This then leaves Options 5 and 7. Both of these only really work as options if they combine with other options; rather than on their own. For Option 5 it would have to include the larger sites and contiguous sites around settlements within the District and combining them with what is effectively Option 3. So that it is clear, in this option the Council would be analysing and carrying out further work on the following settlements Maldon, Heybridge, Burnham-on-Crouch, Althorne, Southminster and South Woodham Ferrers (in Chelmsford City Council area) and the other large villages. The Council would also have to consider the formulation of a Windfall Policy to ensure support for delivery across the Plan Period.
- 4.5 Option 7 once again does not work as a viable option on its own but in combination with Option 1 it could be achievable, giving a choice of sites. Having an analysis of the railway line and how it could interact with future growth in an option is a suitable alternative option and given the Climate Change emergency the Council has declared, the need to maximise the use of transport alternatives to the car.
- 4.6 Assuming the Council approves the recommendations presented, the three options will go forward for testing. For information, this means that a substantial amount of work and expense will be carried out on all three of them including the following along with any other work that arises as officers go through the testing and appraisal process. The results of this testing will be brought back to Members for discussion so that the Council can reduce the three options down to one Preferred Option, which will then be consulted on to wider stakeholders and the public.

<b>Work to be undertaken</b>	<b>How the work is to be carried out</b>
Transport Model the options	External Specialists
Transport Model any major sites	External Specialists
After transport modelling reassess the options (it might knock out some)	



<b>Work to be undertaken</b>	<b>How the work is to be carried out</b>
Work with Strategic Delivery Partners on Infrastructure requirements across the options	Strategic partners
Heritage impact assessments (as required)	In house
Apply the results of the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) to sites/settlements	In house
Apply the results of the wildlife study to the sites	In house
Revisit all the relevant HELAA sites	In house
Relook for connectivity	In house
Consult Anglian Water	In house
Integrated Assessment (IA) of the sites/settlements	External Specialists
Determine in more detail site numbers/constraints	In house
Assess the sites for any site-specific policy that should be applied/master planning needed to positively influence outcomes	In house
Engage with developers	In house
Set out a draft delivery trajectory for each site linked to the above	In house
Set out if any site should provide specialist older persons/ extra care housing or Gypsy and Traveller provision	In house
Set out the amount of affordable housing each site could provide	In house
Produce and agree at Council at Preferred Options Document	In house

## **5. IMPACT ON PRIORITIES AS SET OUT IN THE CORPORATE PLAN 2023 - 2027**

### **5.1 Supporting our communities**

- 5.1.1 By ensuring that growth is placed in the most sustainable places in the District it will help to reduce rural isolation, link up with the important infrastructure provision provided by our key strategic partners and ensure it is provided where the majority of people can access it.

### **5.2 Enhancing and connecting our place**

- 5.2.1 Connectivity is a key objective of the review of the LDP. Ensuring growth is placed in the most sustainable places allows the Council to work with ECC to ensure access, transport and mobility can be built into the plan as a priority.

### **5.3 Helping the economy to thrive**

- 5.3.1 Ensuring growth is in the most sustainable places links up with economic growth and the allocation of land for employment, meaning that housing is placed near to where employment is located, this should help to strengthen the local economy and increase the number of businesses in the District.

### **5.4 A greener future**

- 5.4.1 Reducing the need to use the car for essential journeys is a key tenet of a greener future so growth should be located in the most sustainable places where other

transport options can be provided. The growth options chosen for further consideration allows the Council to explore this fully.

## 6. IMPLICATIONS

- (i) **Impact on Customers** – The work to be done on the three growth options will enable the Council to distil them down to one preferred option which will be consulted on with customers of the Local Planning Authority including the public, statutory consultees, special interest groups, landowners, developers and agents.
- (ii) **Impact on Equalities** – The Integrated Assessment includes an Equality Impact Assessment along with the Health Impact Assessment that will help to ensure that the Council understands the potential effects of policy by assessing the impacts on different groups both external and internal. The Council understands any adverse impacts and how they are identified, and actions identified to remove or mitigate them. It will make decisions which are transparent and based on evidence with clear reasoning to comply with the Equality Act 2010.
- (iii) **Impact on Risk** – The District remains at risk from speculative development and therefore moving the LDP Review onto a new timetable, which has been delayed for various reasons, and carrying out the work needed to get to a Preferred Options stage as quickly as possible will assist the District with this matter. Prematurity is not a reason to refuse planning permission, but once a Preferred Option is agreed and consulted on then that is setting out the 'direction for travel' of how the District wishes to grow and anything outside of that will need very careful consideration to determine whether it is appropriate.
- (iv) **Impact on Resources (financial)** – Any further delay in the timetable of the LDP Review will mean evidence work that has been done already may need to be looked at again, which could have an unbudgeted financial consequence and staffing implications. The options have been reduced down in number from seven to three because of two main reasons. Firstly, the cost of carrying out the assessments of each option includes transport modelling and this would be cost prohibitive. It has been estimated that the cost of testing three options will be around £100k. Secondly, key strategic partners such as the NHS and ECC have to model the options and therefore for them there is also a cost in terms of staffing capacity, they will not commit to modelling more than three options, this includes other key providers such as Anglian Water.
- (v) **Impact on Resources (human)** – The team is fully staffed at present, and this will be monitored as a risk on the project risk register.

### Background Papers:

**APPENDIX 1** – Papers that were presented to Members at a workshop on 12 July 2023.

Enquiries to: Anne Altoft-Shorland, Head of Planning Policy and Implementation.