

View Response

Response Details

From	Cold Norton Parish Council
Date	Started: 07 Mar 2022 11:25. Last modified: 10 Mar 2022 15:45
Status	Complete
Response ID	#1084429

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

N/A

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

4.5: Accessibility

Issues concerned with accessibility from Cold Norton and the other Dengie villages to the main commuting and transport links are further exacerbated by increased planned housing development in the Maldon and adjoining South Woodham Ferrers / Chelmsford districts.

The entire Dengie Peninsular is constrained by the A12 accessed via the A414 through Danbury or the B1019 through Hatfield Peverel and A130 / A13 / A127 routes via the

B1012 / A132 bypassing South Woodham Ferrers to Rettenden.

Cold Norton Pariah Council opposes Chelmsford City Council approach to Outline Planning Application 21/01961/OUT and has already submitted responses to earlier consultation highlighting our concern that the urbanisation of the B1012 Burnham Road will create severe traffic congestion.

CNPC supports both the Woodham and Dengie Infrastructure Group and the United Dengie councils in the belief that it is critical that a new Northern By-Pass is built to redirect east-west traffic away from Burnham Road.

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

N/A

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

6.8: Infrastructure

CNPC agrees in principle with the key issue which have been identified.

However, in the knowledge that the current LDP adopted in 2017 actually covers the 15 years from 2014, we believe that there has been a cumulative shortfall in the provision of needed infrastructure, particularly in terms of transport, health and education .

CNPC wants the revised LDP to ensure that this shortfall is adequately recognised and planned for in addition to new requirements identified to satisfy demand created by planned development included in the LDP planning horizon.

Question 5.

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

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No

Please enter any additional comments

7.3: Proposed Amended Vision

CNPC supports Para 5 of the proposed vision but emphasises that on current evidence (eg transport mobility in and out of the Dengie) this vision has been severely compromised and trusts that its fulfilment will carry sufficient weight in the future.

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

N/A

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

N/A

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

10.3: Standard method for assessing housing need.

Periodic review of projections and trends should be made to verify continued applicability.

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

10.4: Contingency uplift to housing target

Percentage uplift to be based on historical performance.

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

It is considered that adding a further 5 years to the existing 15 year horizon provides very limited advantage relative to the cost and time commitment required except in cases of infrastructure of such scale and lead-time that the principle planning and approval authority would be at a higher administrative level.

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](#)

N/A

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

No

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

N/A

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**

Option 6 : Focus growth in the north of the District to links into the service and facilities available in Tiptree, Witham and Maldon/Heybridge.

* Focuses growth in areas which are currently less densely developed but benefit from good access to commerce and employment opportunities via the A12 / A120 strategic road network and Railway connections at Witham and Hatfield Peverel

* Reduce dependency on the transportation and commuting bottleneck represented by the only alternative road connections from the south of the District via B1012 / A132 through South Woodham Ferrers and A414 through Danbury, both already overburdened.

* Relieve the main towns of Maldon / Heybridge and Burnham-on-Crouch of further development over and above recent expansion to permit time for infrastructure shortages (health, education, employment opportunities) to catch up.

* Permit economies of scale to facilitate improvement in public transport, localised

employment reducing commuting and enhanced retail offer.

* Limit growth causing loss of rural amenity in the Dengie area of the Maldon District which includes unique ecological features, an increasing importance in Tourism and burgeoning growth and recognition of the Crouch Vale wine producing area.

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

Option 4 / Option 6 : Pepper Pot growth throughout the Settlement Hierarchy spreading the growth across all the sustainable settlements in the District but with a northern weighting in growth distribution.

* Housing allocation across the settlements throughout the District will spread the extent of the perceived growth

* Northern weighting would take stronger account of the advantages recognised in Option 6 particularly with regard to managing transportation routes.

* Increased allocation to the north would mitigate pressure on Maldon / Heybridge and

Burnham-on-Crouch in terms of overall growth and infrastructure lag.

* Limited growth allocation to the south would protect the unique characteristics of the Dengie Peninsular from irreparable harm.

*Mitigate possible decline of affordable housing if smaller sites are proposed.

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

Whilst CNPC has contributed to Bradwell B consultations with a recommendation to refuse approval based on major environmental and transportation infrastructure concerns we believe that policy should be determined as part of the LDP process.

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

In instances where such development results in improvement to the physical and visual environment of the settlement. Consideration must be made of available infrastructure for health and education.

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

Not appropriate to the rural aspect of Maldon District

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

Not appropriate to the rural aspect of Maldon District

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

Not appropriate to the rural aspect of Maldon District

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

Not appropriate to the rural aspect of Maldon District

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

With due concern for a realistic assessment of the likelihood of revitalising a source of employment.

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

«No response»

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](#)

Very important. This should already be normal practice.

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](#)

Considered to be still appropriate

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

To encourage a wider scope to design alternatives.

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](#)

On sites of particular interest or history with regard to their location it would be valuable to provide design guidance to encourage conformity with a local vernacular.

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](#)

«No response»

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](#)

«No response»

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

«No response»

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

Policy should encourage local independent business start-ups and support such entrepreneurial initiatives with tax and fiscal encouragement.

Both High Streets would benefit both local residents and tourists by having a wider spectrum of retail outlets.

Consider increasing/improving business/financial planning advice and support to prospective start-ups to encourage those businesses with a reasonable chance of survival and growth beyond their first year of operation.

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

«No response»

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](#)

«No response»

Question 51.

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

«No response»

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](#)

«No response»

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»