

# View Response

## Response Details

From	Karen Neath
Date	Started: 04 Feb 2022 14:54. Last modified: 03 Mar 2022 14:09
Status	Complete
Response ID	#1078273

## PLEASE READ FIRST

### Making Your Comments

There are 60 questions associated with the Issues and Options Document. You do not have to complete them all for your response to be valid, so please feel free to skip those you are not interested in.

You also do not have to complete the questions in one sitting - we appreciate you may want time to reflect on what your response should be. If you wish to complete the questions gradually you can do, but remember to save your inputted responses by clicking the **Finish** button at the bottom of the list of questions, which saves them. You may see that this means skipping past un-answered questions to reach the bottom of the page, but you can always come back to these another time if you want to. By clicking **Finish**, you will save your answers and you can return and complete it another time.

### Saving Your Responses

Please note also that if you leave the page without clicking **Finish**, for example by navigating away from the page using the back or forward buttons, or your internet connection suddenly drops out, the system will not keep your responses as they will not have been saved/stored. We therefore also recommend that you click **Finish** periodically to gradually save your submission so that you do not lose everything that you have written.

## Question 1.

Do you agree with this spatial picture of the District? Please click here to view the **[Spatial](#)**

## Portrait

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

Please enter any additional comments

«No response»

## Question 2.

Are these issues still relevant? Please click here to view the [Key Issues](#)

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

Please enter any additional comments

We do not agree that Maldon has direct links to the A12 as drivers need to pass through Danbury (A414) or Hatfield Peverel to access it (B1019). Maldon also suffers from the lack of a railway station. These issues around connectivity need to be well considered in future planning.

### Question 3.

Do you consider these to be the extent of strategic and cross boundary issues applicable for the Maldon District? Please click here to view the [Strategic Issues](#)

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

Please enter any additional comments

«No response»

### Question 4.

Are these key issues the right ones or are there any key issues that you think have been missed? Please click here to view the [Issues](#)

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

Please enter any additional comments

We agree the key issues. In particular:-

- We believe that there should be a focus on smaller affordable housing rather than the larger 4/5 bed homes. The planning policies should be stronger in defining the types of

properties needed rather the marker being developer led.

- We support a focus on sustainability and carbon reduction.

## Question 5.

Do you agree with the amended Vision? Please click here to view the [Spatial Vision](#)

Yes

No

Please enter any additional comments

«No response»

## Question 6.

Do you agree with the objectives for the review of the LDP? Please click here to view the [Objectives](#)

Yes

No

Don't know

Please enter any additional comments

We support the objectives but would add the following comments:-

- The character of a rural village is often formed and enhanced by its remoteness. the rurality is what people who live there are seeking and attracts them to live there. So any proposals around increased connectivity, accessibility or enhanced infrastructure need to be carefully considered in this context.

- When sites are designated in the Local Plan these does not appear to be any consideration about overall capacity. Each planning application for the site is determined discretely without consideration of what is already in place. We would like to see a inclusion of a policy around overall capacity / sustainability of a site to that local residents are aware of the potential overall build or development of a site.

## Question 7.

Are there other objectives that the LDP needs to aim to achieve? Please click here to view the [Objectives](#)

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

Please enter any additional comments

«No response»

## Question 8.

Do you agree with the Council using the standard methodology in the calculation of its housing target for the period 2023 – 2043? Please click here to view [Housing Needs](#) and the [LDP Local Housing Needs Assessment 2021](#)

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

Please enter any additional comments - please note that not setting a housing target is not an option for the Council and would result in a LDP being found unsound at examination

«No response»

## Question 9.

Should the Council have a contingency or buffer figure in its housing target to ensure that it always has a continuous supply of housing over the plan period and if so what should that buffer be? Please click here to view [Housing Needs](#) and [LDP Local Housing Needs Assessment 2021](#)

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

Please enter any additional comments

«No response»

## Question 10.

Should the plan period be longer than 15 years, should the period be 20 years, so that infrastructure can be planned in over a longer period? Please click here to view the [Housing Needs](#) and [LDP Housing Evidence](#)

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

Please enter any additional comments

«No response»

## Question 11.

Do you agree with the updated Settlement Pattern and how the settlements in the District have been grouped together? Please click here to view the [Settlement Pattern](#) and [LDP Settlement Evidence](#)

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

## Question 12.

If you do not agree, how should they be grouped on what basis? Please click here to view the [Settlement Pattern](#)

«No response»

## Question 13.

Referring to the table on the Council's website which sets out all the services and facilities for each settlement – are there any comments about this or matters which need to be altered or changed? See [Updated Rural Facilities Study 2021 spreadsheet](#)

Our village of Tolleshunt Major it receives a score of 8 for having employment land. We accept that this may be seen as a positive in terms of the economy for the district as a whole but the employment site (Beckingham Business Park) not only provides no facilities or services to the village but is detrimental to the village in term of traffic and noise. So we would question from what perspective the scoring has been done and what it is trying to show.

## Question 14.

Do you agree with the approach set out above for major infrastructure projects? Please [click here to view in Options for Growth](#)

Yes

No

Please enter any additional comments

«No response»



## Question 15.

Which growth option do you consider to be the most appropriate for the District of Maldon? Please set out your reason for this view (please clearly set out which option (s) 1 to 7 you are discussing). Please click here to view the [Options for Growth](#)

«No response»

## 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. Please click here to view the [Options for Growth](#)

Yes

No

Please enter any additional comments

We support option 7 because we believe that, in order to marry with the objectives around carbon reduction and sustainability, future housing growth should be focussed along the railway line. Any substantial future growth around Maldon will only result in increased car journeys. However, we would also support option 4 and a policy around pepper-potting across the district for some, but not all, the required future growth.

We would also ask the Council to look at including a policy about bringing empty homes and unused business or retail units back into use as housing.

## Question 17.

Do you think it is appropriate to include in the LDP Review a policy dealing with major infrastructure projects such as the Bradwell B Nuclear Power Station, to be activated if this type of project comes forward? Please click [here](#) to view the **Options for Growth**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

Please enter any additional comments

«No response»

## Question 18.

Would you consider the delivery of housing appropriate on areas of land where there are disused agricultural buildings, or derelict land in or adjacent to large, medium and small villages? Please click [here](#) to check the relevant villages and [here](#) to view the **Effective Use of Land**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

Please enter any additional comments

We would support this but it would need to be carefully considered with capping on the size of development and protection of landscape views.

## Question 19.

Housing can be delivered in larger quantities, but using less greenfield land, by building at higher densities. Would you consider this appropriate if sites with higher densities were designed to ensure they achieved a high quality of design? Please click here to view the [Effective Use of Land](#)

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

Please enter any additional comments

«No response»

## Question 20.

Do you agree with building at higher densities in all settlements. What would you think was appropriate in terms of housing and higher densities? Please click here to view the [Effective Use of Land](#)

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

Please enter any additional comments

The density of housing must be appropriate to the location.

## Question 21.

Would you support minimum density standards to uplift the delivery of housing and ensure land in Maldon District was used as efficiently as possible, or do you think design, or other factors should dictate density on housing sites? Please click [here](#) to view **Effective Use of Land**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

Please enter any additional comments

We agree there should be a policy of aiming for the highest density possible but each site vary in terms of its urban or rural setting and environment so we do not agree that there should be an overarching minimum standard.

## Question 22.

Would you consider higher density housing appropriate in large, medium and small villages, if the design was to a higher standard and the character of the settlement was still respected? Please click [here](#) to check the relevant settlements and [here](#) to view **Effective Use of Land**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

Please enter any additional comments

«No response»

## Question 23.

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

Please click here to view [Effective Use of Land](#)

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

Please enter any additional comments

«No response»

## Question 24.

It is difficult for Maldon District to have a policy that states that brownfield land should be developed first for housing because of the lack of brownfield land sites in the District. This could also inadvertently lead to the redevelopment of active employment land to residential the consequences of this could lead to job losses and a decline in employment sites.

Therefore, instead of 'brownfield land first', should the Council instead place a *greater emphasis* on encouraging the development of brownfield land for housing? This may mean less affordable housing and other benefits comes forward, but it could redevelop sites which are an eyesore and blight on settlements and residents. Please click here to view [Effective Use of Land](#)

- Yes

- No
- Don't know

Please enter any additional comments

«No response»

## Question 25.

Should the medium and small settlements retain some form of a settlement boundary, albeit more flexibly drawn? Please click [here](#) to check the relevant settlements and here to view [Large, Medium & Small Villages](#)

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

Please enter any additional comments

«No response»

## Question 26.

Should the Council develop a windfall policy for all or specific settlements, potentially capping the number of units for each site coming forward and ensuring the protection for key views, green infrastructure gaps and the historic environment in each village. Please click [here](#) to check the relevant settlements and here to view [Large, Medium & Small Villages](#)

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

Please enter any additional comments

«No response»

## Question 27.

In the event of an increase of need, should the Council look to establish both private and public sites for Gypsies and Travellers in the future, recognising that not all needs can be catered by one tenure of provision? Please click here to view [Gypsies & Travellers](#)

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

Please enter any additional comments

«No response»

## Question 28.

In the event of an increase of need, should the Council seek to intensify or expand existing Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople sites as much as possible, where it is suitable to do so? Please click here to view [Gypsies & Travellers](#)

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

Please enter any additional comments

«No response»

## Question 29.

In the event of an increase of need, should the Council consider how it could use its Settlement Pattern, Rural Exception Sites and/or Windfall Policy (if implemented) to support the increased provision of new sites in sustainable locations that can serve the community's needs better? Please click here to view [Gypsies & Travellers](#)

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

Please enter any additional comments

«No response»

## Question 30.

Is there anything else the Council should be considering for homes for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople? Please click here to view [Gypsies & Travellers](#)



«No response»

## Question 31.

Should the Council seek a proportion of self-build/custom build plots on larger housing sites. Please click here to view [Self Build/Custom Build](#)

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

Please enter any additional comments

«No response»

## Question 32.

In addition to the above, should the Plan also allocate specific sites in the LDP Review exclusively for self-build/custom build, either put forward by people who want to self-build or caveated by policy that they can only be brought forward by self-builders. Please click here to view [Self Build/Custom Build](#)

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

Please enter any additional comments

«No response»

## Question 33.

**Should the Council in the development of a self-build/custom build policy consider ensuring that smaller low cost housing units are encouraged to come forward? Please click here to view [Self Build/Custom Build](#)**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

Please enter any additional comments

We would support self build / custom build if it was delivering smaller affordable units that genuinely supported housing need. We would not want to see a policy that opened the door to large, grandiose properties that were more about an individual's aspirations than community housing need.

## Question 34.

**Designing beautiful spaces and buildings, how important do you think it is that we should actively plan to create beautiful spaces and buildings? Please click here to view [Design](#)**

We certainly do not want to see ugly development in the district. However, we believe that there are many more important considerations for development such as density, property type, size of development and sustainability and we would not want to see any of these compromised by the desire to achieve beautiful design.

## Question 35.

What do you think about the design policy in the [LDP 2017 \(Policy D1\)](#) and the [Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2018](#)? Do they need amending? If so, how and why? Please click here view [Design](#)

«No response»

## Question 36.

Should the Council seek to endorse the [Essex Design Guide](#) with a Maldon District supplementary section? Would this be a more flexible approach to design? Please click here to view [Design](#)

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

Please enter any additional comments

«No response»

## Question 37.

Should the Council in its design policy encourage support for modern innovative design and design to counter the effects of climate change? Please click here to view [Design](#)

- Yes
- No

Don't know

Please enter any additional comments

«No response»

## Question 38.

Please provide comments below on design matters you consider to be particularly important. We would be especially interested in your views on whether we should include general design guidance on relevant site allocations? Please click here to view [Design](#)

«No response»

## Question 39.

Should the LDP Review make climate change one of its key priorities? Please click here to view [Climate Change](#)

Yes

No

Don't know

## Question 40.

What do you consider to be important in terms of development and climate change? Are on-site renewables such as photovoltaics, ground source heat pumps, etc as important/ more important as off-site renewable energy projects such as on-land wind farms, solar farms, district heating networks, etc? Please click here to view [Climate Change](#)

We believe that it is more important that each proposed development sets out how it has considered climate change and how it will help to achieve the Council's net zero goal. This could be location in terms of reducing car use, the building materials used, energy supply, flood alleviation etc.

## Question 41.

**Should we plan for net-zero carbon from plan adoption in 2023? This would require all new development to be net-zero carbon upon adoption of the plan. If yes, would the Council need to bring forward any additional guidance to support this? Please click here to view [Climate Change](#)**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

Please enter any additional comments

«No response»

## Question 42.

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

We believe that the ambition to be net zero carbon should be part of the Council's plan

from now. But we appreciate that it will take time for new developments to be able to deliver this so a future target would seem sensible. . This should not however be taken as a reason for developers to disregard this and they should still be required to show how there have incorporated carbon reduction into their build even if they are not able to achieve net zero at the moment.

### Question 43.

Should the local plan policies strongly support the economy in terms of a transition to a low carbon economy, ensuring development and growth opportunities are supported through this process? Please click here to view [Growing the Economy](#)

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

Please enter any additional comments

«No response»

### Question 44.

Should the local plan allocate employment land so that it extends existing employment premises / areas in the District by working with existing businesses to ascertain their future need? Please click here to view [Growing the Economy](#)

- Yes
- No

Don't know

## Question 45.

Should the Council contain a policy preventing the redevelopment of employment premises to residential units? If so, should the scope of such a policy be limited in any way? Please explain the rationale for your answer. Please click here to view [Growing the Economy](#)

Yes

No

Don't know

Please enter any additional comments

«No response»

## Question 46.

How important is the rural economy? How do you believe the rural economy can be supported through policy? Please click here to view the [Growing the Economy](#)

Very Important

Important

Don't know

Not Important

Please enter any additional comments

We believe that the policy needs to be clear on what is considered to be rural economy. Is this activity that can only be carried out in a rural location e.g. farming or is it just any employment that is in a rural location.

## Question 47.

Should the Council support the development of live/work housing units? Please click here to view the [Growing the Economy](#)

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

Please enter any additional comments

«No response»

## Question 48.

Should the nature, size and type of policy support for Maldon and Burnham-on-Crouch's High Streets' change? How would you like the high street to change? Please click here to view the [Growing the Economy](#)

- Yes
- No
- Don't know



Please enter any additional comments

Maldon and Burnham are not large enough to be retail destinations in themselves. We believe that these High Streets need to adapt to be more focussed towards the tourism industry e.g. holiday accommodation, cafes, boutiques.

## Question 49.

Do you believe this policy (E5 in [LDP 2017](#)) requires modification? If so how would you like to see it changed? Please click here to view the [Visitor Economy](#)

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

Please enter any additional comments

The Policy as it stands offers broad support for development that grows the tourism economy. We believe the policy could be more ambitious and proactive in defining the target tourist market and the types of facilities it aims to provide e.g. holiday flats/ accommodation, entertainment and events, art installation, walking/cycling paths etc.

## Question 50.

Do you believe this policy (E5 [LDP 2017](#)) encourages tourism or is it too restrictive? Please click here to view the [Visitor Economy](#)

Yes, as set out in question 49 we believe the policy could be definitive about what the

Council wants it tourism offer to look like and this may also help to focus development of the High Streets.

## Question 51.

How could planning policy encourage more visitors to the District other than day visitors? Please click here to view the [Visitor Economy](#)

We believe that the District needs to offer more holiday accommodation and a wider variety of activity.

## Question 52.

Should the Council consider having protected landscape views in the District, even though this may place development pressure elsewhere? Please click here to view the [Environment](#)

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

Please enter any additional comments

«No response»

## Question 53.

In terms of access and sustainable transport in the District, what is most important to

you? Please click here to view [Access and Sustainable Transport](#)

One of the key issues for us in Tolleshunt Major is the sustainability of transport. We have a large amount of traffic coming and going to Beckingham Business Park which, given our location, must travel by road. Much of this traffic is not suitable for the local roads and many of the roads, verges and road signs are damaged. It prohibits local people from activities such as horse, riding, cycling , walking and running as there are few footpaths.

## Question 54.

Should the Council focus future growth on those areas with higher levels of commuter access either by bus or train? Please click here to view [Access and Sustainable Transport](#)

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

Please enter any additional comments

«No response»

## Question 55.

Should all new development be linked to its settlement by a footpath wide enough to accommodate a wheelchair or double buggy/pram? Please click here to view [Access and Sustainable Transport](#)

- Yes
- No

Don't know

Please enter any additional comments

«No response»

## Question 56.

Should development have to demonstrate that it can provide safe footpath/cycle links/connections, which incorporate green infrastructure and support active travel choices? Please click here to view [Access and Sustainable Transport](#)

Yes

No

Don't know

Please enter any additional comments

«No response»

## Question 57.

Should the council continue to explore and support complementary projects delivered outside the planning system that can support travel choice and a shift away from the use of the car in the District? Please click here to view [Access and Sustainable Transport](#)

Yes

No

Don't know

Please enter any additional comments

«No response»

## Question 58.

Should the Council take into account the advantages of locations which stand to offer the better chance of securing new infrastructure due to critical massing of development? Please click here to view [Infrastructure](#)

Yes

No

Don't know

Please enter any additional comments

«No response»

## Question 59.

Affordable housing is often the biggest influence on viability, so should the Council continue to prioritise this policy requirement over other infrastructure contributions or design quality across the District? Please click here to view [Infrastructure](#)

Yes

No

Don't know

Please enter any additional comments

«No response»

## Question 60.

Should we consider spare capacity within our existing infrastructure when we determine where new development should go? Please click here to view [Infrastructure](#)

Yes

No

Don't know

Please enter any additional comments

«No response»