

**BRIEFING PAPER****ALL MEMBER BRIEFING/WORKSHOP****OPTIONS FOR GROWTH****12<sup>th</sup> July 2023****1.0 INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 A consideration for the review of the local plan is the extent and distribution of growth within the plan area. All councils have to prepare a Development Plan called a Local Plan; this document alongside the Minerals Local Plan and Waste Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plans where they have been prepared forms the "Development Plan" and is used as the starting point in the determination of planning decisions. It sets out how an area can meet its growth needs for matters such as new housing and employment development. All local plans must take into account the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) when they are prepared including having a spatial strategy which directs where this growth will go and allocates land so that it can be developed. Local Plans also contain more detailed policies to guide how councils will make decisions on planning applications. The plan covers all types of development, from housing to employment, shops, infrastructure (roads, schools, green spaces) and community facilities, with a few exceptions including how marine, waste and minerals related development will be catered for.
- 1.2 Maldon District Council's Local Development Plan (LDP) is a Local Plan and was approved following an Examination in Public by the Planning Inspectorate in 2017 and it covered the period 2014 to 2029. The present LDP applies to the whole of Maldon District. From this point on in reports the terms Local Plan Review will be used to bring the Council in line with national terminology.
- 1.3 The Local Plan (LP) Review has a number of formal statutory stages to pass through which will take place over the next few years. This includes consultation on draft versions of the Plan. The Issues and Options document was the first formal, but non-statutory consultation in the plan-making process. Its main purpose was to ensure that the Plan scoped and identified the main issues for those parts of the Plan that the Council is reviewing and that all suitable alternative options for accommodating change were considered. The consultation ran from the 17<sup>th</sup> January to the 14<sup>th</sup> March 2022. 23,400 comments were received from 490 representations including the public, statutory consultees such as neighbouring authorities, Parish Councils, Essex County Council, the NHS, Environment Agency, Marine Management Organisation and special interest groups including developers and landowners.
- 1.4 The Council put forward in the Issues and Options Consultation seven high- level growth options for consultees to consider with two specific questions that covered the growth options, these were:

**Question 15. Which growth option do you consider to be the most appropriate for the District of Maldon?**

**Question 16. Do you believe that there is another suitable growth option for the District, perhaps a combination of any of the above? Please set out your views.**

- 1.5 There were a number of responses to these questions; 327 to question 15 and 242 to question 16. 142 respondents in question 16 thought there was another option to consider, however, none of them put forward one, they were mostly combinations of the options already put forward or a repeat of the answer to question 15.
- 1.6 Many of the responses were around the fact that responders did not want any more growth either overall or in their settlement. It was apparent in the responses that more respondents made comments from the south of the District than the north and this gives the Council a challenge of ensuring it does not place bias when determining a growth option given this pattern.
- 1.7 Whilst these types of comments are important to those making them, not wishing to see a settlement grow or not wanting any more growth in general in the District is not a matter that the Council can take into account when making decisions regarding the Local Plan. When making the decision about which direction the Local Plan will take in regard to choosing a growth option, the Council has a statutory duty to produce a sound Local Plan which sets out how it is going to deliver its full identified growth. That choice needs to be made not by how many like or dislike each option but by evidence to either support or discount it. This also applies to those respondents who were using the consultation to promote a growth option based solely on the fact that there was what they deemed to be a suitable site within it to develop. This is not relevant at this stage in the process.
- 1.8 One of the main issues that arose from the responses to questions 15 and 16 was concern around infrastructure; this was a thread that ran through the whole consultation response and shows the level of concern regarding this matter within the District.
- 1.9 Whilst, we must not make decisions based on the numbers of supporters for an option, it is a matter of interest to see the number of respondents supporting the growth options, they came out in a preferential order as follows.

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

**Option 4 – Pepper pot growth throughout the Settlement Pattern (Spread the growth across all the sustainable settlements in the District)**

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

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

- 1.10 The task now is to reduce the number of options down from the original seven in the consultation document to a maximum of three. This is because the remaining options will require a substantial amount of testing and appraisal work to be carried out on them *before* Members will have enough information and evidence to discard two options and choose a Preferred Option. That work comes at a human resources and financial cost for MDC, ECC and other statutory partners such as the NHS. It is also important to reduce the number of options down because we are unable to restart the clock on the LP Review timetable until the work on them starts.
- 1.11 In the Issues and Options Consultation, we set out seven high-level concept growth options. These were based on different types of settlement that could be chosen as having a role for LP Review growth, rather than examining the scale of growth and locations for growth within each settlement. It was not possible to have options with any more detail attached to them at the time, because the evidence needed to be more precise was not available. It started instead within evidence that was available at a high-level.
- 1.12 The reduced number of options can be a combination of the seven options already presented; we do not need to choose them from those as specified in the Issues and Options Document, but they do need to relate directly back to them as they were consulted on, so we should not add in another option which is not related to them.
- 1.13 Once the number of options has been reduced to three, the remaining ones will be subject to an Integrated Assessment (incorporating the legally required Sustainability Appraisal or SA, a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) and an Equalities Impact Assessment (EqIA); these processes are a legal part of the preparation and eventual Examination of the Plan. In addition, they will be subject to a Health Impact Assessment as advocated by the Essex

Design Guide and the NHS Integrated Care Partnership to ensure the planning system has regard to health and wellbeing outcomes. The SA & SEA will also have a broad look at the options the Council is not taking forward to determine the sustainability merits of not doing so and to ensure the Council has not dismissed an option that may have other advantages not fully realised. This will ensure that the Council can show it has considered 'reasonable alternatives' for the options for its Spatial Strategy and not just dismissed one or more of the options at this stage because for example it got less support than the others, or we believed it would cause more issues or had more problems than the other options. It is through the SA/SEA report that there is a legitimate vehicle for challenge on the options at the Plan's Examination and if we do not get it right it can lead to challenges through the Judicial Review process as well.

- 1.14 In this process, Maldon District Council is the Local Planning Authority and we are considering this for the whole district. This is planning for the future, so any final option will have to be able to accommodate not only future growth, but also future infrastructure. Therefore, just because it is felt there is not infrastructure now, does not mean that the option would not be able to provide what it is required to over a plan period, so this would not be a reason to discount an option at this early stage.
- 1.15 Set out below is an analysis of each option. Accompanying each option is a RAG analysis that was discussed by the Planning Policy Working Group on the 6<sup>th</sup> September 2022. The minutes of this meeting are available on Mod.gov.
- 1.16 These have been set out in this paper for each option because some Members may find it easier to read it in a paper format rather than on a spreadsheet. At Appendix B attached to the end of this report is a table setting out the numeric details of each option.

## 2.0 HOUSING REQUIREMENT

- 2.1 The 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."

- 2.2 The Standard Method is calculated every year and can change every year as the affordability ratio for each area can 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 this 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.
- 2.3 For the purposes of choosing our growth options 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 MDC officers, but also strategic partners is not carried out on a figure that could actually come up short. Therefore, the Council could, for the purposes of testing and appraising options, add on 10% to the 279 per annum bringing it back up to 310 homes as set out in the present approved LDP per annum and 20% bringing it up to 334 per annum.
- $310 \times 20 \text{ years} = 6,200 \text{ homes}$
  - $334 \times 20 \text{ years} = 6,680 \text{ homes}$
- 2.4 Existing commitments are 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 should not be counted. The amount of housing with permission outside of 5 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 have included these commitments.
- 2.5 There is a risk which we must highlight to Members which concerns secondary education provision. ECC in the Issues and Options Consultation have already 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 Review will cover. A new secondary school needs approximately 4,500 homes to fund it and 10 hectares of land. 5,197 homes does not provide very much headroom in terms of funding for infrastructure. A few applications granted before the LDP Review is adopted could undermine that headroom very quickly unless we can negotiate contributions or land toward a secondary school. At the moment any highway improvement costs are unknown.
- 2.6 In order to try and build in some kind of 'safety net' for the options testing officers would 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. 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 Local Plan. By not building in this flexibility at testing stage, we could have to abort or repeat testing in the future, before we submit, which is not budgeted for.

### **3.0 CONSIDERATIONS THAT COVER ALL OR MOST OF THE OPTIONS**

#### **3.1 SMALLER SITES OF LESS THAN 1.0 HECTARE**

- 3.2 The NPPF requires Local Plans to ensure 10% of the housing requirement is delivered on sites of less than 1 hectare. Based on the 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 we have a windfall policy is effectively being made for us by our land supply, because national planning policy 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"*

- 3.3 This matter will need to be discussed in more detail at a future Working Group meeting and officers and Members will have to consider what a windfall policy could look like for the LDP Review.

#### **3.4 AFFORDABLE HOUSING**

- 3.5 In most of the options there is a shortfall against the affordable housing target. This target is found in the Local Housing Needs Assessment May 2021 and is 172 units per annum or 3,440 over a 20-year period. The amount of affordable housing required from development is presently set

in the Approved LDP 2017 and varies in terms of a percentage requirement of between 25% and 40% across the District. The figures for each option have been calculated using these present adopted percentages. This may alter when a critical piece of evidence is completed called the Whole Plan Viability Assessment after the Preferred Option is selected.

- 3.6 A shortfall in the affordable housing need does pose a risk to the LDP Review at Examination and consideration may have to be given to having a more relaxed rural exceptions site housing policy to try and bring forward rural affordable housing and/or the allocation of additional sites to try and meet the target. National Planning Policy Guidance states.

*"Strategic policies should provide a clear strategy for bringing sufficient land forward, and at a sufficient rate, to address objectively assessed needs over the plan period, in line with the presumption in favour of sustainable development. This should include planning for and allocating sufficient sites to deliver the strategic priorities of the area"*

- 3.7 This in effect means that where we have a clear evidenced need, in this case for affordable housing, we should be planning for and allocating enough land to deliver that need if we have it.

### 3.8 **BROWNFIELD LAND**

- 3.9 The term 'brownfield' land means land which is, or was, developed previously. As the term 'developed' has a legal meaning, there are exclusions in national policy which including agricultural buildings, mineral extraction areas, waste disposal or landfill, land in built-up areas including parks, allotments and recreation grounds and residential gardens. As Members can see, none of the options provide for very much land at all in terms of brownfield land. This was to be expected in a District like Maldon which does not have the traditional redundant industrial workings or office blocks. This lack will not impact on the Plan's soundness at Examination. We should as a matter of course however and as good practice consider suitable brownfield sites first in any of the chosen options, including whether allocating them for residential development will help them come forward.

### 3.10 **FLOOD RISK**

- 3.11 In 2021, the Council commissioned a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) for the District, to update the last assessment undertaken in 2007. It remains underway but is close to completion. The provisional flood risk maps for the updated SFRA have been checked against the settlements of the District and apart from Steeple, Heybridge Basin and Bradwell Waterside, there are no settlements which could not accommodate some level of growth. Any major sites which now fall into flood risk areas have been discounted. This has mainly affected Heybridge with land for 282 units being taken off the total available sites within the Parish as set out

in the HELAA and North Fambridge with 120 units being taken off the total available sites within the Parish.



**4.0 CONSIDERATION OF THE OPTIONS FOR GROWTH – OPTION 1**

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

Set out in the Issues and Options Consultation Document 2022 this option was described as.

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

**Rag Analysis of Option 1.**

Can the option deliver the land requirement	Can the option deliver 10% on smaller sites of less than one hectare? This includes smaller sites with existing planning permission (234 at present)	Could this option deliver land for a secondary school	Could the option offer economies of scale to deliver other infrastructure including the funds to build the secondary school	Affordable Housing can it be delivered via this option	Could the option offer/provide/improve sustainable travel options	In terms of locations for growth does this option offer/improve/ provide enough sustainable locations to accommodate the required growth	Would the option support the sustainable functioning of essential services such as health and social health, access to emergency services

**4.2 General Comments Received** - The comments received from respondents were broadly that this option would.

- protect green spaces.
- The majority of the services and facilities are in already in the main towns. Urban extensions next to towns minimises impact elsewhere.

- Helps protect the rural settlements, garden suburbs maintain infrastructure.
- The towns have publicly accessible transport facilities and more employment opportunities.
- There would be a need to allocate medium and small sites to ensure choice in the market.
- The option failed last time.
- The towns do not have the infrastructure to take more growth, they have taken their share of growth in the past.
- It would be better to allocate into the north of the District to link up with the A12.
- Move the growth into neighbouring authority areas.
- Need to ensure there is not urban sprawl and towns and villages merge.
- May place additional strain on services and facilities, it would not allow investment on infrastructure in other parts of the District.
- It would maximise sustainability in the towns.
- The existing infrastructure in the towns must be able to cope with the increase in growth.
- Easier to expand what is already there.
- It's the least unattractive option.
- Spoil the charm of Maldon.
- Will result in too much development in the same places as before, large villages can also take growth.

#### 4.3 Statutory Consultees comments.

- **Chelmsford City Council** - the growth option should be guided by transport modelling, provision of jobs close to housing. Choices should also be informed by the impact on infrastructure such as health and education in adjoining authorities. The road network is under pressure, transport modelling for the Chelmsford City adopted plan left little headroom for further growth. For Options 1 – 5 they were concerned about the A414 Maldon to Chelmsford corridor – A414 east of Chelmsford could be exacerbated by growth in the District. B1012/A132 into South Woodham Ferrers and links to the A130. The A130/A132 junction and the Rettendon Turnpike are forecast to be over capacity by 2036, and traffic modelling for Chelmsford's Local Plan identified significant constraints. This led to requirements in the Chelmsford Local Plan allocation for the development to maximise opportunities for sustainable travel, provide new public transport routes, improve pedestrian and cycle connections to the railway station, build specific junction improvements, and make contributions to strategic network improvements. In addition, the impact of additional traffic from the Maldon district on two of the Air Quality Management Areas in the City Council area should be considered - on the A414 at Danbury and the Army and Navy junction.

- **Colchester City Council** do not consider option 1 as deliverable because it did not address the issues raised previously.
- **Braintree Borough Council** consider options 1 – 3 most appropriate because they direct development to the most sustainable places.
- **Essex County Council** have stated that all the options have cross boundary issues. There is the need to provide a new secondary school in the District, the Plume Academy has, once the present expansion has been undertaken, reached capacity. There are concerns about Ormiston Rivers Academy and William De Ferrers Academy's ability to expand further. There will be a need to consider primary school and early years provision alongside growth.

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. Growth options 1 to 6 and to a lesser degree option 7 need to consider the impact of growth along the A414 through Danbury. 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.

- **Mid and South Essex Health and Care Partnership** - Priorities require healthcare hubs that can host a wider range of health and care services including diagnostics and early intervention services; support a move to improved digital services and provide capacity for drop-in and wellbeing services. These are being established through a combination of refurbishment and/or extension of existing facilities; sharing of facilities; and new build projects. The suitability of existing health provision, including ambulance stations will need to be reviewed to ensure that it meets the needs of the growing population.

The HCP's preference is for a pattern of growth that reduces travel time and hence increases the efficiency of district nursing activities and makes the best use of any potential centralised cross functional clinical community services. Closely grouped strategic housing developments rather than pepper potting of housing developments are therefore a preferred option. Pepper potting of housing would not be conducive to an efficient cost-effective district nursing service or support Patient accessibility to healthcare centres where GP, community and out-of-hospital services are offered will be better where sustainable and active modes of transport are available and attractive. This is more likely to be achievable in strategic developments that are well related to larger settlements

rather than small scale and isolated developments. In addition, a shift to active travel will have population health benefits.

- 4.4 **Summary for Option 1** - Maldon, Heybridge and Burnham-on-Crouch are settlements with a range of services and facilities including health, employment, education and sport and leisure facilities. Maldon and Heybridge are contiguous in that they form in spatial planning terms an continuous urban area which although separated by the River Chelmer is otherwise joined up and not separated by any visual or development distance. There were concerns raised in the consultation that the present spatial strategy has failed because the 2017 LDP allocated all growth on large strategic sites. The NPPF seeks to address this nationally now advocating that at least 10% should go on smaller sites of less than 1.0 hectare. This option along with the others however cannot deliver the 10% of housing requirement on smaller sites because there is a lack of smaller site land supply.

There have been issues raised around the highway network, but this was to be expected and transport modelling, which is planned as part of the LDP Review process will help the Council to determine the full impact of growth on the highway network. There could be an issue on the AQMA in Danbury and this could be fundamental, but at the present time this impact and mitigation potential is not known. The Health Authority advocate growth on strategic developments that are well related to larger settlements and this option would fit in with their model for delivering health services in the future.

Essex County Council have identified a need to provide a new secondary school in the District, with the Plume Academy once the present expansion been undertaken having reached capacity. There are concerns about Ormiston Rivers Academy and William De Ferrers Academy`s ability to expand further. There will be a need to consider primary school and early years provision as well alongside growth. To provide a secondary school, this will need at least 10 hectares of land and 4,500 homes to fund it. There is a site in the HELAA that this option could consider as part of the work on the options to accommodate a new secondary school.

- 4.5 **Analysis for Option 1** - There is not enough land in this option to allocate the residual housing requirement for a 20-year plan period; this translates to an inability to bring forward the funding needed for a secondary school. Though the option may be able to bring forward the land for both a secondary school and other infrastructure such as a primary school as there is at least one site of the appropriate size in this option that could accommodate a secondary school.

This option along with all the others has a shortfall in the ability to deliver the 10% on sites of less than 1.0ha in size, even with the addition of existing commitments on smaller sites.

The option does support the delivery of part of the affordable housing target, but only potentially delivering 37% of the target. It is unlikely,

given the shortfall in the housing requirement that the option could offer economies of scale to bring forward all the other current or future evidenced infrastructure, but it does allow for development to be located in the most sustainable settlements in the District (the towns) and this would support the functioning of the NHS, emergency services and ECC community and education services. It could also offer future residents access to the services and facilities of the towns. It may be appropriate to combine this option with one or two of the others in order to try and ensure the correct level of delivery and to offer a choice in the sites to be selected.

## **5.0 CONSIDERATIONS OF THE OPTIONS FOR GROWTH - OPTIONS 2 & 3**

### **5.1 These two options are similar so are being discussed together**

#### **Option 2 – A strong focus on the towns and larger sustainable villages**

Set out in the Issues and Options Consultation Document 2022 this option was described as.

*"This option would focus the majority of growth on the two towns in the District, Maldon/Heybridge and Burnham-on-Crouch and the larger sustainable villages. The larger sustainable villages in the context of this option will most likely be the top three/four/five (yet to be determined) large villages as set out in the settlement hierarchy with a good range of services and facilities and connectivity. This would ensure the economies of scale necessary to generate a wide range of community facilities, a supported public transport network, business and employment opportunities and a supported retail offer that could not only support their own populations but also spread benefits to their surrounding rural communities. It could also increase opportunities for small, medium building enterprises to develop housing in the District. 10% of the growth would be directed to the other large villages in the District."*

### **5.2 OPTION 3 – Growth generally focused on the towns Maldon/Heybridge and Burnham-on-Crouch and all the large villages of the Settlement Pattern.**

Set out in the Issues and Options Consultation Document 2022 this option was described as.

*"This option would focus on the most sustainable settlements within the District, with the allocated growth going in the towns Maldon/Heybridge and Burnham-on-Crouch and the large villages. The amount of growth will be proportioned out with the housing allocated being proportional to the number of houses already in each settlement. This scenario would ensure the economies of scale necessary to generate a wide range of community facilities, a supported public transport network, business and employment opportunities and a supported retail offer for anticipated population*

*growth. 10% of the growth would be directed to the medium villages in the District.”*

<b>SPREADSHEET A - OPTIONS</b>	Can the option deliver the land requirement	Can the option deliver 10% on smaller sites of less than one hectare? This includes smaller sites with existing planning permission (234 at present)	Could this option deliver land for a secondary school	Could the option offer economies of scale to deliver other infrastructure including the funds to build the secondary school	Affordable Housing can it be delivered via this option	Could the option offer/provide/improve sustainable travel options	In terms of locations for growth does this option offer/improve/ provide enough sustainable locations to accommodate the required growth	Would the option support the sustainable functioning of essential services such as health and social health, access to emergency services
<i>Option 2 - A strong focus on the towns and larger sustainable villages. Top four large villages Southminster, Tollesbury, Mayland &amp; Latchingdon 4265 and 10% would be directed to the other large villages plus the 10% from towns and top four large villages</i>	Green	Pink	Green	Green	Pink	Green	Green	Green
<i>Option 3 - Growth generally focused on the towns Maldon/Heybridge and Burnham-on-Crouch and all the large villages of the Settlement Hierarchy - Southminster, Tollesbury, Mayland, Wickham Bishops, Tillingham, Tolleshunt D'Arcy, Great Totham South, Latchingdon. 10% would be directed to the medium villages - Althorne, Cold Norton, Bradwell, Purleigh, St Lawrence, Langford, Heybridge Basin, Woodham Walter, North Fambridge</i>	Green	Pink	Green	Green	Pink	Yellow	Green	Yellow

**5.3 General Comments received on Option 2 –** These were.

- that it protects the character and landscape of the district.
- It will address the damage to Burnham-on-Crouch.
- It is the best form of sustainable development.
- Any building in the villages should focus on small sites for local builders.
- The inclusion of more settlements could help deliverability.
- Existing infrastructure could be expanded.
- The other large villages could take more growth.
- The option could encourage growth in a district with an aging population and diminishing working age population.
- The option should include the medium villages as well.
- The road connections and amenities would be unable to cope.
- It will result in too much development in the same places.
- The option is similar to option 3.

#### 5.4 Statutory Consultee Comments on Option 2

- **Chelmsford City Council** - made comment in that the growth option should be guided by transport modelling, provision of jobs close to housing. The road network was under pressure. For Options 1 – 5 they were concerned about the A414 Maldon to Chelmsford corridor – A414 east of Chelmsford could be exacerbated by growth in the District. B1012/A132 into South Woodham Ferrers and links to the A130 The A130/A132 junction and the Rettendon Turnpike are forecast to be over capacity by 2036, and traffic modelling for Chelmsford’s Local Plan identified significant constraints. This led to requirements in the Chelmsford Local Plan allocation for the development to maximise opportunities for sustainable travel, provide new public transport routes, improve pedestrian and cycle connections to the railway station, build specific junction improvements, and make contributions to strategic network improvements. In addition, the impact of additional traffic from the Maldon district on two of the Air Quality Management Areas in the City Council area should be considered - on the A414 at Danbury (its inclusion is noted at 5.1) and the Army and Navy junction.
- **Colchester City Council** – This could be a suitable option, focusing growth in the most sustainable areas.
- **Braintree Borough Council** - consider options 1 – 3 most appropriate because they direct develop to the most sustainable places.
- **Essex County Council** - have stated that all the options have cross boundary issues. There is the need to provide a new secondary school in the District, the Plume Academy has once the present expansion has been undertaken has reached capacity. There are concerns about Ormiston Rivers Academy and William De Ferrers Academy`s ability to expand further. There will be a need to consider primary school and early years provision alongside growth.

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. Growth options 1 to 6 and to a lesser degree option 7 need to consider the impact of growth along the A414 through Danbury. 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.

- **Mid and South Essex Health and Care Partnership** - Priorities require healthcare hubs that can host a wider range of health and

care services including diagnostics and early intervention services; support a move to improved digital services and provide capacity for drop-in and wellbeing services. These are being established through a combination of refurbishment and/or extension of existing facilities; sharing of facilities; and new build projects. The suitability of existing health provision, including ambulance stations will need to be reviewed to ensure that it meets the needs of the growing population.

The HCP's preference is for a pattern of growth that reduces travel time and hence increases the efficiency of district nursing activities and makes the best use of any potential centralised cross functional clinical community services. Closely grouped strategic housing developments rather than pepper potting of housing developments are therefore a preferred option. Pepper potting of housing would not be conducive to an efficient cost-effective district nursing service or support Patient accessibility to healthcare centres where GP, community and out-of-hospital services are offered will be better where sustainable and active modes of transport are available and attractive. This is more likely to be achievable in strategic developments that are well related to larger settlements rather than small scale and isolated developments. In addition, a shift to active travel will have population health benefits.

### 5.5 **General comments received on option 3**

- many of the settlements do not have enough suitable sites.
- Large villages are sustainable.
- This option is similar to option 2.
- It would focus growth in the most sustainable settlements which already have services and facilities.
- Without new housing issues of affordability could get worse.
- It would reinforce the existing settlement pattern.
- We should look to opportunities along the railway line.
- This option will assist smaller builders, allows growth to be spread more evenly.
- Levels of growth should be spread proportionately in line with populations.
- This option will achieve economies of scale.
- This could lead to an under delivery of housing.
- Distribution by population size of settlement could lead to an under delivery.

### 5.6 **Statutory Consultee Comments on Option 3**

- **Chelmsford City Council** - made comment in that the growth option should be guided by transport modelling, provision of jobs close to housing. The road network was under pressure. For Options 1 – 5 they were concerned about the A414 Maldon to Chelmsford corridor – A414 east of Chelmsford could be



exacerbated by growth in the District. B1012/A132 into South Woodham Ferrers and links to the A130 The A130/A132 junction and the Rettendon Turnpike are forecast to be over capacity by 2036, and traffic modelling for Chelmsford's Local Plan identified significant constraints. This led to requirements in the Chelmsford Local Plan allocation for the development to maximise opportunities for sustainable travel, provide new public transport routes, improve pedestrian and cycle connections to the railway station, build specific junction improvements, and make contributions to strategic network improvements. In addition, the impact of additional traffic from the Maldon district on two of the Air Quality Management Areas in the City Council area should be considered - on the A414 at Danbury (its inclusion is noted at 5.1) and the Army and Navy junction.

- **Colchester City Council** – This could be a suitable option, focusing growth in the most sustainable areas.
- **Braintree Borough Council** - consider options 1 – 3 most appropriate because they direct develop to the most sustainable places.
- **Essex County Council** - have stated that all the options have cross boundary issues. There is the need to provide a new secondary school in the District, the Plume Academy has once the present expansion has been undertaken has reached capacity. There are concerns about Ormiston Rivers Academy and William De Ferrers Academy`s ability to expand further. There will be a need to consider primary school and early years provision alongside growth.

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. Growth options 1 to 6 and to a lesser degree option 7 need to consider the impact of growth along the A414 through Danbury. 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.

- **Mid and South Essex Health and Care Partnership** - Priorities require healthcare hubs that can host a wider range of health and care services including diagnostics and early intervention services; support a move to improved digital services and provide capacity for drop-in and wellbeing services. These are being established through a combination of refurbishment and/or extension of existing facilities; sharing of facilities; and new build projects. The suitability of existing health provision, including ambulance stations

will need to be reviewed to ensure that it meets the needs of the growing population.

The HCP's preference is for a pattern of growth that reduces travel time and hence increases the efficiency of district nursing activities and makes the best use of any potential centralised cross functional clinical community services. Closely grouped strategic housing developments rather than pepper potting of housing developments are therefore a preferred option. Pepper potting of housing would not be conducive to an efficient cost-effective district nursing service or support Patient accessibility to healthcare centres where GP, community and out-of-hospital services are offered will be better where sustainable and active modes of transport are available and attractive. This is more likely to be achievable in strategic developments that are well related to larger settlements rather than small scale and isolated developments. In addition, a shift to active travel will have population health benefits.

- 5.7 **Summary for Options 2 and 3** - Both Maldon and Heybridge and Burnham-on-Crouch are settlements with a range of services and facilities including health, shopping, employment, education and sport and leisure facilities. Maldon and Heybridge are contiguous in that they form in spatial planning terms a continuous urban area which although separated by the River Chelmer is joined up and not separated by any visual distance. The large villages also have services and facilities, not as many as the towns of course but enough to warrant serious consideration as places which could grow. These settlements can also offer a positive contribution to sustainable transport solutions, whether they have them now or can accommodate them with future growth.

There were concerns raised in the consultation that the present strategy has failed because the 2017 LDP allocated all growth on large strategic sites. The NPPF now advocates that at least 10% of the housing requirement should go on smaller sites of less than 1.0 hectare. This option even with existing commitments would be unable to achieve this on its own. There have been issues raised around the highway network, but this was to be expected and transport modelling which is planned as part of the LDP review will help the Council to determine the full impact of growth on the highway network. There could be an issue on the AQMA in Danbury and this could be fundamental but at the present time this impact and mitigation potential is not known. Options 2 and 3 were quite similar and some of the respondents also pointed this out. These two options would be directing growth into the towns and large villages which have the most services and facilities already and the potential to expand these if they grow.

The Issues and Options Document did not name the large villages and going forward we would have to do this for Option 2. In the Settlement Pattern, the top four large villages with the most services and facilities are

Southminster, Tollesbury, Mayland and Latchingdon. The others in order of services and facilities are Wickham Bishops, Tillingham, Great Totham South and Tolleshunt D`Arcy. They all have primary schools except Wickham Bishops. Four of them have a doctor`s surgery. Any growth option could consider, if the evidence supported it, making it a necessity to bring an additional doctor`s surgery forward, or a primary school in Wickham Bishops (although there is not enough land in Wickham Bishops to do this at the moment). Both options 2 and 3 also bring in the railway line as a sustainable form of transport alongside potential improvements to the public bus network and other active travel options; however, there are known existing capacity/service challenges which would have to be analysed in the work following a reduction in the number of growth options.

Essex County Council - have stated that all the options have cross boundary issues. There is the need to provide a new secondary school in the District. The Plume Academy has, once the present expansion has been undertaken, has reached capacity. There are concerns about Ormiston Rivers Academy and William De Ferrers Academy`s ability to expand further. There will be a need to consider primary school and early years provision alongside growth. To provide a secondary school, this will need at least 10 hectares of land and 4,500 homes to fund it. There will also be a need to consider primary and early years provision given the level of growth. There are potential sites which could accommodate a secondary school in these options, and which could give the school access to a wider housing network. The Health Authority advocate growth on strategic developments that are well related to larger settlements and this option would fit in with their model for delivering health services in the future, these two options could also assist in the delivery of emergency services and county community services such as adult social care and education.

- 5.8 **Analysis for Option 2** - There is enough land in this option 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. Overall, there is not a great deal of difference between having the top five, four or three large villages included in the option alongside the towns, using the 310 per annum housing requirement calculation, the land could deliver in overall numbers for the option 9833, 9743 and 9167 respectively. There is plenty of headroom and a wide choice of sites; not all of which would have to be selected. The option could also potentially bring forward the land for a secondary school there are a few sites in this option which are large enough. The option does not allow for the delivery of the affordable housing target, only being able to deliver 85% of it. The option also does not allow for 10% of the housing requirement to be delivered on sites of less than 1.0 hectare, even taking into account the existing small windfall sites with planning permission. The option may offer more economies of scale to deliver other infrastructure.

The option 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; however, the option only allows for the largest large villages to be considered, but in terms of delivering services this means the concentration of growth in fewer places and less strain placed on services in terms of travel times and access. It could be a consideration to combine this option with option 3 so to expand the number of available large villages which could take growth and give the council a wider choice of settlements and sites.

- 5.9 **Analysis of option 3** - There is enough land in this option 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. 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. This option also does not allow for 10% of sites to be delivered on sites of less than 1.0 hectare even taking into account the existing small windfall sites with planning permission, its slightly improved on option 2. The option may offer economies of scale to deliver other infrastructure and it does allow for development to be located in the most sustainable settlements. The option 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 to too many settlements, thus stretching the capacity of key services providers. Overall, the option allows for a wider choice of sites to be considered than either options 1 or 2 across a number of settlements.

## 6.0 CONSIDERATIONS OF THE OPTIONS FOR GROWTH - OPTION 4

### 6.1 Option 4 – Pepper pot growth throughout the Settlement Pattern (Spread the growth across all the sustainable settlements in the District)

Set out in the Issues and Options Consultation Document 2022 this option was described as;

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

SPREADSHEET A - OPTIONS	Can the option deliver the land requirement	Can the option deliver 10% on smaller sites of less than one hectare? This includes smaller sites with existing planning permission (234 at present)	Could this option deliver land for a secondary school	Could the option offer economies of scale to deliver other infrastructure including the funds to build the secondary school	Affordable Housing can it be delivered via this option	Could the option offer/provide/improve sustainable travel options	In terms of locations for growth does this option offer/improve/provide enough sustainable locations to accommodate the required growth	Would the option support the sustainable functioning of essential services such as health and social health, access to emergency services
<i>Option 4 - Pepper-potting, spreading the growth around the towns, large, medium and small villages</i>								

## 6.2 General comments received on option 4

- It will give the opportunity for all settlements to improve,
- there is a need to consider different transport options,
- will enable settlements to grow more slowly.
- There will be an impact on infrastructure.
- There, will be an inability to pay for infrastructure.
- The option will put pressure on services, impact on the rural villages.
- Share the growth.

## 6.3 Statutory Consultee Comments on option 4

- **Chelmsford City Council** - do not support this option it is considered that growth will be placed in unsustainable locations.
- **Colchester City Council** - do not support this option as it is considered to focus growth where there would be no infrastructure to support it.
- **Braintree City Council** – does not support this option.
- **Essex County Council** - have stated that all the options have cross boundary issues. There is the need to provide a new secondary school in the District. The Plume Academy will have, once the present expansion has been undertaken, reached capacity. There are concerns about Ormiston Rivers Academy and William De Ferrers Academy`s ability to expand further. There will be a need to consider primary school and early years provision alongside growth.

They do not support this option it 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.

- **Mid and South Essex Health and Care Partnership** - Priorities require healthcare hubs that can host a wider range of health and care services including diagnostics and early intervention services; support a move to improved digital services and provide capacity for drop-in and wellbeing services. These are being established through a combination of refurbishment and/or extension of existing facilities; sharing of facilities; and new build projects. The suitability of existing health provision, including ambulance stations will need to be reviewed to ensure that it meets the needs of the growing population. The HCP's preference is for a pattern of growth that reduces travel time and hence increases the efficiency of district nursing activities and makes the best use of any potential centralised cross functional clinical community services. Closely grouped strategic housing developments rather than pepper potting of housing developments are therefore a preferred option. Pepper potting of housing would not be conducive to an efficient cost-effective district nursing service or support Patient accessibility to healthcare centres where GP, community and out-of-hospital services are offered will be better where sustainable and active modes of transport are available and attractive. This is more likely to be achievable in strategic developments that are well related to larger settlements rather than small scale and isolated developments. In addition, a shift to active travel will have population health benefits.

#### 6.4 **Summary of option 4**

There is enough land to deliver the housing requirement in this option. As with all the other options there is concern around the highway network to deliver additional growth, but transport modelling will inform the Council concerning this matter in terms of impact and mitigation.

There was a lack of support for this option from the statutory consultees, although this is not a reason in itself to discount an option because their rationale maybe guided by their organisational considerations just as ours is on occasions. However, it is important to consider what they are saying and whether it has credence, particularly given we have a legal obligation to them for strategic and cross-boundary matters under the Duty to Cooperate. Neighbouring local authorities are concerned that if the Council direct growth to all the settlements then we would be unable to provide for our own infrastructure, which then places pressure on theirs, particularly around education and health services. The County Council and NHS are concerned that spreading the growth to settlements which

are unsustainable would make it more difficult to deliver their services. Essex County Council - have stated that all the options have cross boundary issues. There is the need to provide a new secondary school in the District. The Plume Academy will have, once the present expansion has been undertaken, reached capacity. There are concerns about Ormiston Rivers Academy and William De Ferrers Academy`s ability to expand further. There will be a need to consider primary school and early years provision alongside growth.

Given the level of concern raised among many of the consultees regarding infrastructure delivery and that it is a key consideration, the question must be asked whether this option can deliver economies of scale to ensure that there is not a deficit in infrastructure. If the Council peppers the growth to all the settlements, whilst it may appear to a degree to limit the impact of that growth in terms of visual impact as well as all parts of the District taking a `share` of the growth; this is not an adequate planning reason. The risk of infrastructure not being funded is high, particularly with regard to the ability to bring forward large items of infrastructure such as schools or highway improvements. This is because there would be a watering down of the economies of scale needed to deliver large items of infrastructure. Also, Members should be aware that some settlements, even in this option will still be allocated substantial amounts of growth because pepper potting does tend to mean that growth goes where the sites are. Therefore, settlements with no land coming forward would not receive any allocations whilst those settlements with large sites, no matter how large or small they would have to be considered. Though policy could be put in place to try and bring forward additional infrastructure, it does take a significant amount of growth to bring forward a primary or secondary school or additional health services for instance and spreading the growth around would limit the Council`s ability to create the right policy conditions to ensure this happened.

- 6.5 **Analysis of Option 4** - There is sufficient land in this option to allocate the residual housing requirement for a 20-year plan period. The option does allow for the delivery of the affordable housing target delivering 101% of the target. The option can potentially bring forward the land for a secondary school but there is a question mark over its ability to bring forward the funding for it and for other larger pieces of infrastructure because growth would be spread around the District.

This option could 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 rural isolation 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 are 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

or sustainable transport solutions. There is a risk, albeit unknown at this time, that the cost of this kind of provision alongside other infrastructure provision could make the LDP unviable; which would mean it is unsound at Examination. There is also a risk that taking forward this option would result in objections from the Council`s Duty to Co-operate partners at the Examination, objections which the Inspector would, given that sustainability is a key tenant of national planning policy, most likely support. Failure of the Duty to Cooperate is not recoverable from once the LDP is submitted.

**7.0 CONSIDERATIONS OF THE OPTIONS - OPTION 5**

**7.1 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**

Set out in the Issues and Options Consultation Document 2022 this option was described as.

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

<b>SPREADSHEET A - OPTIONS</b>	Can the option deliver the land requirement	Can the option deliver 10% on smaller sites of less than one hectare? This includes smaller sites with existing planning permission (234 at present)	Could this option deliver land for a secondary school	Could the option offer economies of scale to deliver other infrastructure including the funds to build the secondary school	Affordable Housing can it be delivered via this option	Could the option offer/provide/improve sustainable travel options	In terms of locations for growth does this option offer/improve/ provide enough sustainable locations to accommodate the required growth	Would the option support the sustainable functioning of essential services such as health and social health, access to emergency services
<i>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</i>								

**6.2 General comments on option 5**



- This is a chance to integrate services and facilities in one place, could be close to the A12 and trainlines.
- The option offers an opportunity for infrastructure and will reduce pressure on communities.
- It should target a new settlement.
- It needs to include smaller sites for local builders.
- The option will have too long a lead in time and would need an interim strategy to ensure delivery of supply.
- A new garden village should be considered in the south near to a railway station.
- Climate change and infrastructure needs to be considered.
- The option would be very damaging and would require substantial amounts of infrastructure.
- It would work well with options 6 and 7.
- It would protect the countryside.
- The option would create similar problems to the existing strategy. The road networks and other infrastructure would need substantial improvement.

### 6.3 Statutory Consultee Comments

- **Chelmsford City Council** - made comment in that the growth option should be guided by transport modelling, provision of jobs close to housing. The road network was under pressure. For Options 1 – 5 they were concerned about the A414 Maldon to Chelmsford corridor – A414 east of Chelmsford could be exacerbated by growth in the District.
- **Colchester City Council** - strongly objects to this option, it could lead to pressures on services and facilities in an adjacent authority and the merging of settlements.
- **Braintree Borough Council** - do not support this option, it is undeliverable because no suitable site has come forward. They are concerned that there will be a negative impact on Witham and its surroundings. Any further growth in the north of the District seeking to make use of the services of Witham would have to provide in terms of infrastructure improvements.
- **Essex County Council** - have stated that all the options have cross boundary issues. There is the need to provide a new secondary school in the District. The Plume Academy will have, once the present expansion has been undertaken, reached capacity.  
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. Growth options 1 to 6 and to a lesser degree option 7 need to consider the

impact of growth along the A414 through Danbury. 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. Option 5 is considered to have significant strategic cross boundary issues and would probably require a 30-year plan time.

- **Mid and South Essex Health and Care Partnership** - Priorities require healthcare hubs that can host a wider range of health and care services including diagnostics and early intervention services; support a move to improved digital services and provide capacity for drop-in and wellbeing services. These are being established through a combination of refurbishment and/or extension of existing facilities; sharing of facilities; and new build projects. The suitability of existing health provision, including ambulance stations will need to be reviewed to ensure that it meets the needs of the growing population. The HCP's preference is for a pattern of growth that reduces travel time and hence increases the efficiency of district nursing activities and makes the best use of any potential centralised cross functional clinical community services. Closely grouped strategic housing developments rather than pepper potting of housing developments are therefore a preferred option. Pepper potting of housing would not be conducive to an efficient cost-effective district nursing service or support Patient accessibility to healthcare centres where GP, community and out-of-hospital services are offered will be better where sustainable and active modes of transport are available and attractive. This is more likely to be achievable in strategic developments that are well related to larger settlements rather than small scale and isolated developments. In addition, a shift to active travel will have population health benefits.

- 6.4 **Analysis and Summary for option 5** - As with all the options, issues were raised regarding the highway network, transport modelling will be assessing the matter, and this will help inform the Council further into the process.

The Council did not name a settlement in this option. For a large urban extension there has to be sufficient land to accommodate the needs of future residents, so there would have to be enough land to develop the housing, employment, and community services and facilities necessary to form a viable new settlement. Despite the Call for Sites being open since 2021, including promotion in local newspapers and industry press via Estates Gazette, no land of sufficient scale and similar location has come forward that could be considered for a new settlement in its own right. Therefore, this leaves the Council with the consideration of urban extensions onto existing settlements to deliver this Option.

- 6.5 As stated in 6.4 above, any land to be considered has to be large enough to not only accommodate the housing requirement, but also potential

employment, retail, education and health uses and include open space. It also has to be viable to fund any potential off-site highway works. Any development in the areas discussed would have to consider the provision of this and the council can expect to be tested on this at Examination.

6.6 A large urban extension would have to have sites which are contiguous with one and another so that when they are built on, they fit into the existing spatial townscape of the settlement they are being bolted onto. In terms of the sites that have come forward, there is no one site, or group of sites, in broadly one place in the District which could achieve this. 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 extensions across the District. From those submitted into the HELAA, the following could be considered:

- There is land for approximately 1,556 homes adjacent to 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

6.7 This would total 4,970 homes. This still leaves a shortfall on the housing requirement and the affordable housing target. It also leaves no headroom and if one site falls by the wayside then there is almost no chance of achieving the housing requirement; which will be a resilience test in the Examination. If Burnham-on-Crouch and the rest of the sites in Maldon and Heybridge were to be added, effectively merging this option with option 1, the total amount of housing it could bring forward would rise to 8488; that is considered to give sufficient headroom if sites were not suitable and had to fall out. This would also provide a wider choice of sites.

There could be an issue however with the long lead in times expected for the delivery of urban extensions, as raised by some of the consultees in that in the interim period whilst the urban extensions were coming forward through planning or enabling infrastructure, other sites would have to be allocated to ensure a continuous supply of housing. In effect this could create the same issues as occurred with the present approved LDP. To get around this issue it would mean considering allocating additional housing (over and above the housing requirement) to ensure a supply or having a more relaxed windfall policy which clearly sets out where and how growth could support the supply. Some of this may be mitigated by the addition of the Burnham-on-Crouch and the rest of the Maldon and Heybridge sites. Essex County Council - have stated that all the options have cross boundary issues. There is the need to provide a new secondary school in the District, The Plume Academy will have, once

the present expansion has been undertaken, reached capacity. There are concerns about Ormiston Rivers Academy and William De Ferrers Academy's ability to expand further. There will be a need to consider primary school and early years provision alongside growth. The option could however accommodate a secondary school and fund it. There is a question mark over whether this option would assist the statutory infrastructure providers such as the NHS and ECC or emergency services as well as other options. This would have to be assessed as part of any further work on the options alongside discussions with the relevant partners. This option to go forward would have to be considered to be combined with one or more of the other options to be able to bring forward the growth required and provide the choice of sites to ensure supply. Given the climate change emergency the Council has declared, this option, though less than option 7 brings in the relationship of the railway line as a means of sustainable transport

## **7.0 CONSIDERATIONS OF THE OPTIONS FOR GROWTH - Option 6**

### **7.1 Option 6 - Focus growth in the north of the District to link into the service and facilities available in Tiptree, Witham and Maldon/Heybridge**

Set out in the Issues and Options Consultation Document 2022 this option was described as.

*"This option would focus major allocations in the settlements in the north of the District. These settlements have a relationship with the settlements of Tiptree and Witham which lie outside of the District, and Maldon/Heybridge in the District and residents can also access the railway connections at Hatfield Peverel and Witham and the strategic road connection of the A12. Residents of the District look to these settlements for the majority of their higher-order services and facilities. Maldon/Heybridge is not included in this scenario for strategic growth allocations because of the amount of growth it has previously received, the amount of existing commitments it already has but are still to come forward and the lag in infrastructure coming forward in the town. Maldon/Heybridge requires a period of time in order for planned infrastructure to be delivered and existing commitments to be built out without additional pressure from new strategic growth. 10% of the growth would be directed to the remaining large villages and towns."*

<b>SPREADSHEET A - OPTIONS</b>	Can the option deliver the land requirement	Can the option deliver 10% on smaller sites of less than one hectare? This includes smaller sites with existing planning permission (234 at present)	Could this option deliver land for a secondary school	Could the option offer economies of scale to deliver other infrastructure including the funds to build the secondary school	Affordable Housing can it be delivered via this option	Could the option offer/provide/improve sustainable travel options	In terms of locations for growth does this option offer/improve/provide enough sustainable locations to accommodate the required growth	Would the option support the sustainable functioning of essential services such as health and social health, access to emergency services
<i>Option 6 - Focus growth in the north of the District to link into the service and facilities available in Tiptree, Witham and Maldon/Heybridge - Great Totham South, Wickham Bishops, Tollesbury, Tolleshunt D'Arcy. 10% would be directed to the remaining large villages and towns.</i>								

## 7.2 General comments on option 6

- This option would benefit from links to the A12 corridor, Danbury and Hatfield Peverel.
- There is the need to ensure the continuing support for the towns Maldon, Heybridge and Burnham-on-Crouch.
- The option would create similar problems to those that already exist.
- Economies of scale funding would go outside the district.
- Development would be close to Colchester and Chelmsford.
- Good access to the A12,
- No windfall development.
- This option would be discharging responsibility for infrastructure to neighbouring authorities, ignoring sustainable communities such as Maldon and Burnham-on-Crouch.
- Loss of rural character of small villages.
- Would need good cycle routes to the towns.
- Impacts could be mitigated against by pepper-potting.
- Put development where infrastructure already is.
- Have had an over-reliance on Maldon/Heybridge and Burnham-on-Crouch.
- Focus growth in areas which are less dense.
- Danbury is already over-burdened.
- Closer to strategic transport links.
- Tiptree already has services and facilities.
- This option would not resolve the affordable housing problem in the south of the District.

## 7.3 Statutory Consultee Comments

- **Chelmsford City Council** – no comment

- **Colchester City Council** - This option is not supported. There are already a number of capacity issues within Tiptree, notably health care services, public transport and the road network. These issues are being explored through the Tiptree Neighbourhood Plan, which is currently preparing its Regulation 14 draft. In addition, this option could also further add to the strategic capacity concerns associated with the A12 and the connecting network, including traffic increase to and from and through Tiptree and surrounding settlements. This approach could lead to coalescence of settlements within Maldon as well as with neighbouring settlements outside of the District. Focusing development in one broad direction could lead to a disproportionate level of affordable housing provision throughout the district.
- **Braintree Borough Council** –This option appears to be limited by a lack of available sites, meaning that the Plan may not be able to deliver its expected level of growth. This could also have a significant impact on Witham and the surrounding villages. Growth and infrastructure improvements in Witham are planned for within the Braintree Local Plan but any further growth which is seeking to make use of the facilities of Witham would need to provide for further significant infrastructure improvements.
- **Essex County Council** - have stated that all the options have cross boundary issues. There is the need to provide a new secondary school in the District. The Plume Academy will have, once the present expansion has been undertaken, reached capacity. There are concerns about Ormiston Rivers Academy and William De Ferrers Academy`s ability to expand further. There will be a need to consider primary school and early years provision alongside growth.

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. Growth options 1 to 6 and to a lesser degree option 7 need to consider the impact of growth along the A414 through Danbury. 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. Option 6 is considered to have significant strategic cross boundary issues.

- **National Highways** - have made comment on Option 6 they have said that focusing development on the north of the district could lead to detrimental impact upon the operation of the A12, even though there is a programmed scheme to widen the A12 between J19 and 25 (as it does not factor in unplanned growth). This would need investigating and mitigating, with contributions from the

Council into the Strategic Road Network, if this option were to be pursued. This may require even more growth to make the plan viable, alongside other infrastructure provision requirements.

- **Mid and South Essex Health and Care Partnership** – Priorities require healthcare hubs that can host a wider range of health and care services including diagnostics and early intervention services; support a move to improved digital services and provide capacity for drop-in and wellbeing services. These are being established through a combination of refurbishment and/or extension of existing facilities; sharing of facilities; and new build projects. The suitability of existing health provision, including ambulance stations will need to be reviewed to ensure that it meets the needs of the growing population. The HCP's preference is for a pattern of growth that reduces travel time and hence increases the efficiency of district nursing activities and makes the best use of any potential centralised cross functional clinical community services. Closely grouped strategic housing developments rather than pepper potting of housing developments are therefore a preferred option. Pepper potting of housing would not be conducive to an efficient cost-effective district nursing service or support Patient accessibility to healthcare centres where GP, community and out-of-hospital services are offered will be better where sustainable and active modes of transport are available and attractive. This is more likely to be achievable in strategic developments that are well related to larger settlements rather than small scale and isolated developments. In addition, a shift to active travel will have population health benefits.

7.4 **Summary of option 6** – To date, despite a further extension to the call for sites ending on the 15th 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 wooded areas and local wildlife sites are in the north and also 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.

There are also concerns raised from National Highways concerning the impact on the operation of the A12, part of the Strategic Road Network. This is the only option that they have commented on. As with all the other options, highway impact has been raised as an issue and this would be assessed through transport modelling. There could also be an issue on the AQMA in Danbury and this could be fundamental but at the present time this impact or mitigation is not known.

Colchester City Council have objected to this option because of the impact on the infrastructure in and around Tiptree; they have commented that settlements 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's area. 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 the 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. 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; but this is not a reason to discount it without further investigation.

Essex County Council - have stated that all the options have cross boundary issues. There is the need to provide a new secondary school in the District. The Plume Academy will have, once the present expansion has been undertaken, reached capacity. There are concerns about Ormiston Rivers Academy and William De Ferrers Academy's ability to expand further. There will be a need to consider primary school and early years provision alongside growth. There, is not enough land in this option to deliver a secondary school and it would not deliver the economies of scale to deliver other infrastructure.

- 7.5 **Analysis of option 6** – On its own without any other option, this option would only deliver 20% of the housing requirement at 310 per annum and 13% of the affordable housing target. With regard to the impact on Tiptree and Witham, there is a risk in that because both of these settlements are already planned for in terms of housing and infrastructure requirements, by taking this option forward, any additional identified pressures would have to be funded by developer contributions from sites within the northern part of the District and effectively funding or new infrastructure provision would go out of the District into the adjacent areas where the impact is felt; as a Duty to Cooperate matter. This could impact on the District's ability to fund other infrastructure within the area, such as secondary and primary schools. A new secondary school could not be planned for outside the District because as stated above the two locations it could go are already planned for in neighbouring authority Local Plans. This option could also place a disproportionate amount of growth in Tollesbury and Great Totham South because they are the two settlements with the most land put forward in the north. This does raise a question around the sustainability of this option given that Tollesbury does not have rail connection though it does have a bus service connection; a



transport strategy may have to be developed if this option were to go forward, the transport modelling will help to answer these questions by looking at impact and mitigation.

This option could not even be delivered in tandem with another of the options 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. If option 1 was combined with this option in that it would include the towns there would still be insufficient land to deliver the housing requirement (6188) and no headroom if any sites failed. This option then carried 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.

## **8.0 CONSIDERATIONS OF THE OPTIONS FOR GROWTH - OPTION 7**

### **8.1 Option 7 – Focus growth along the rail line to Althorne, North Fambridge and Southminster**

Set out in the Issues and Options Consultation Document 2022 this option was described as.

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

SPREADSHEET A - OPTIONS	Can the option deliver the land requirement	Can the option deliver 10% on smaller sites of less than one hectare? This includes smaller sites with existing planning permission (234 at present)	Could this option deliver land for a secondary school	Could the option offer economies of scale to deliver other infrastructure including the funds to build the secondary school	Affordable Housing can it be delivered via this option	Could the option offer/provide/improve sustainable travel options	In terms of locations for growth does this option offer/improve/provide enough sustainable locations to accommodate the required growth	Would the option support the sustainable functioning of essential services such as health and social health, access to emergency services
<p><i>Option 7 - Focus growth along the rail line to Althorne, North Fambridge and Southminster - include Burnham-on-Crouch- 10% would be directed to Maldon/Heybridge, and the remaining large villages</i></p>								

8.2 **General comments on option 7** - There was a lot of objections to this option, but this was mainly influenced by the fact that there was a large site in Althorne in the HELAA, which features in a lot of the comments. At the present time the Council cannot comment on whether individual settlements can or cannot accommodate future growth or on sites which have not had any technical evidence work done on them. The Council needs to make a choice on where that growth is going to go in a broader strategic sense, and this was one of the reasons for the Issues and Options Consultation 2022. Other comments were.

- that the north has already taken sufficient growth around Maldon/Heybridge,
- the railway has insufficient capacity
- the railway is a sustainable form of transport with capacity,
- impact on the landscape,
- focus growth around the railway stations,
- it is a greener solution.
- There is sufficient growth in the north more development needs to go in the south.
- Villages with a railway should be ranked higher.
- The option does not spread development around locations.
- Could provide a catalyst to offer new services to locations and a modal shift in transport.

### 8.3 Statutory Consultee comments and Summary

- **Chelmsford City Council** have commented that this option could have an impact on the road network through South Woodham Ferrers.
- **Colchester City Council** – no comment
- **Braintree Borough Council** - commented that it seemed to be an interesting possibility especially considering its proximity to the railway line and the high levels of commuting to London, albeit this could exacerbate the out-commuting problem and associated local affordability issue. This option could be beneficial if Bradwell B were to be approved as it would concentrate infrastructure.
- **Essex County Council** - have stated that all the options have cross boundary issues. There is the need to provide a new secondary school in the District, the Plume Academy, once the present expansion has been undertaken, has reached capacity. There are concerns about Ormiston Rivers Academy and William De Ferrers Academy`s ability to expand further. There will be a need to consider primary school and early years provision alongside growth. 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. 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%. The Health Authority advocate growth on strategic developments that are well related to larger settlements and this option would fit in with their model for delivering health services in the future.
- **Mid and South Essex Health and Care Partnership** - Priorities require healthcare hubs that can host a wider range of health and care services including diagnostics and early intervention services; support a move to improved digital services and provide capacity for drop-in and wellbeing services. These are being established through a combination of refurbishment and/or extension of existing facilities; sharing of facilities; and new build projects. The suitability of existing health provision, including ambulance stations will need to be reviewed to ensure that it meets the needs of the growing population.

The HCP's preference is for a pattern of growth that reduces travel time and hence increases the efficiency of district nursing activities and makes the best use of any potential centralised cross functional clinical community services. Closely grouped strategic housing developments rather than pepper potting of housing developments

are therefore a preferred option. Pepper potting of housing would not be conducive to an efficient cost-effective district nursing service or support Patient accessibility to healthcare centres where GP, community and out-of-hospital services are offered will be better where sustainable and active modes of transport are available and attractive. This is more likely to be achievable in strategic developments that are well related to larger settlements rather than small scale and isolated developments. In addition, a shift to active travel will have population health benefits.

- 8.4 **Summary of option 7** - There is not quite enough land for this option on its own to deliver the housing requirement and as with all the other options it cannot deliver the 10% of the housing requirement on smaller sites. It also does not deliver the affordable housing target, potentially delivering only 50% of it. There are some sites large enough to accommodate a secondary school in this option, though it would be unable to fund it. There would also be a question mark over the economies of scale to fund other needed infrastructure. The Health Authority advocate growth on strategic developments that are well related to larger settlements and this option would fit in with 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 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.
- 8.5 **Analysis of option 7** - 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. The consultation has 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, 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 it in, and it should be for the evidence to determine whether it should be removed as first proposed.

As a standalone option with Burnham-on-Crouch in it, option 7 still does not provide the housing requirement, it is short 1667 homes at 310 per

annum and 2147 homes short at 334 per annum; 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 so in effect it would become a combination of options 1 and 7 then the quantum of housing would increase to 8016, 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 and facilities and also along the railway line in keeping with the key tenant of this option which was about exploring growth potential and constraints in line with an available sustainable travel choice.

Option 7 could be combined with options 2 or 3 but this is moving toward Option 4 (pepper potting) and Southminster is the largest village in the District already and it is in the option for consideration.

## **9.0 CONCLUSION**

- 9.1 As set out in Section 8 above, 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 consulted at Issues and Options stage in 2022. Given that Option 4 has received objections from all of the key statutory infrastructure providers and our surrounding local authorities it is recommended that this not be taken any further for testing and 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.
- 9.2 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 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.
- 9.3 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.

- 9.4 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 1. So that it is clear, in this option we 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). The Council would also have to formulate a windfall policy to ensure support for delivery.

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 and the potential to delivery 8016. 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.

- **RECOMMENDATION – PURSUE FURTHER TESTING FOR OPTION 3 – GROWTH IN THE TOWNS AND LARGE VILLAGES.**
- **RECOMMENDATION – PURSUE FURTHER TESTING FOR OPTION 5 IN COMBINATION WITH OPTION 1**
- **RECOMMENDATION – PURSUE FURTHER TESTING FOR OPTION 7 IN COMBINATION WITH OPTION 1**
- **RECOMMENDATION – DO NOT PURSUE OPTION 4 – PEPPER POTTING ANY FURTHER IN THE LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW PROCESS.**
- **RECOMMENDATION – DO NOT PURSUE OPTION 6 – GROWTH ONLY IN THE NORTH OF THE DISTRICT.**

OPTIONS	Towns	Large Villages	Medium Villages	Small villages	10% contribution from land (no permissions - for information only)	Total Contribution	Shortfall Potential on Housing Requirement (red)	Potential affordable housing contribution	Shortfall on affordable Housing Requirement	Total 10% Contribution (Fcol plus , 1.0ha existing commitments)	Total 10% shortfall
Option 1 - Retain the option in the LDP approved in 2017 – focus growth in the settlements of Maldon/Heybridge and Burnham on Crouch - 10% would be on smaller sites - 310 PA	4960				21	4981	-1219	1266	-2174	255	-365
Option 1 - Retain the option in the LDP approved in 2017 – focus growth in the settlements of Maldon/Heybridge and Burnham on Crouch - 10% would be on smaller sites - 334 PA	4960				21	4981	-1699	1266	-2174	255	-413
Option 2 - A strong focus on the towns and larger sustainable villages. Top three/four/five large villages Southminster, Tollesbury, Mayland, Latchingdon and Wickham Bishops and 10% would be directed to the other large villages - THIS IS WITH THE TOP 5 LARGE VILLAGES	4960	4830			43	9833	3633	2962.5	-477.5	277	-343
Option 2 - A strong focus on the towns and larger sustainable villages. Top three/four/five large villages Southminster, Tollesbury, Mayland, Latchingdon and Wickham Bishops and 10% would be directed to the other large villages - THIS IS WITH THE TOP FOUR LARGE VILLAGES	4960	4740			43	9743	3543	2926.5	-513.5	277	-343
Option 2 - A strong focus on the towns and larger sustainable villages. Top three/four/five large villages Southminster, Tollesbury, Mayland, Latchingdon and Wickham Bishops and 10% would be directed to the other large villages - THIS IS THE TOP THREE VILLAGES	4960	4164			43	9167	2487	2696.1	-743.9	277	-343
Option 3 - Growth generally focused on the towns Maldon/Heybridge and Burnham on Crouch and all the large villages of the Settlement Hierarchy - Southminster, Tollesbury, Mayland, Wickham Bishops, Tillingham, Tolleshunt D`Arcy, Great Totham South, Latchingdon. 10% would be directed to the medium villages - Althorne, Cold Norton, Bradwell, Purleigh, St Lawrence, Langford, Heybridge Basin, Woodham Walter, North Fambridge	4960	5234	70		172	10436	4236	3092.9	-347.1	406	-214
Option 4 - Pepper-potting, spreading the growth around the towns, large, medium and small villages	4960	5234	1918	115	172	12399	6199	3754.65	314.65	406	-214
*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 - 10% towns, large, medium & small villages.	4960	1050	1556		172	7738	1538	1632.1	-1807.9	406	-214
Option 6 - Focus growth in the north of the District to link into the service and facilities available in Tiptree, Witham and Maldon/Heybridge - Great Totham South, Wickham Bishops, Tollesbury, Tolleshunt D`Arcy. 10% would be directed to the remaining large villages and towns.		1126	0	0	102	1228	-4972	442.4	-2997.6	336	-284

OPTIONS	Towns	Large Villages	Medium Villages	Small villages	10% contribution from land (no permissions - for information only)	Total Contribution	Shortfall Potential on Housing Requirement (red)	Potential affordable housing contribution	Shortfall on affordable Housing Requirement	Total 10% Contribution (Fcol plus , 1.0ha existing commitments)	Total 10% shortfall
Option 6 - Focus growth in the north of the District to link into the service and facilities available in Tiptree, Witham and Maldon/Heybridge - Great Totham South, Wickham Bishops, Tollesbury, Tolleshunt D`Arcy. 10% would be directed to the remaining large villages and towns. ADDING IN OPTION 1.	4960	1126			102	6188	-12	1708.4	-1731.6	336	-284
Option 7 - Focus growth along the rail line to Althorne, North Fambridge and Southminster - No evidence has come forward to not include Burnham on Crouch- 10% would be directed to Maldon/Heybridge, and the remaining large villages - THIS IS FOR 310 PA	1477	2279	653	0	124	4533	-1667	1695.4	-1744.6	358	-262
Option 7 - Focus growth along the rail line to Althorne, North Fambridge and Southminster - No evidence has come forward to not include Burnham on Crouch- 10% would be directed to Maldon/Heybridge, and the remaining large villages - THIS IS WITH 334 PA	1477	2279	653		124	4533	-2147	1695.4	-1744.6	358	-310
Option 7 - Focus growth along the rail line to Althorne, North Fambridge and Southminster - No evidence has come forward to not include Burnham on Crouch- 10% would be directed to Maldon/Heybridge, and the remaining large villages - ADDING IN MALDON AND HEYBRIDGE	4960	2279	653		124	8016	1816	2589.1	-850.9	358	-262