

Response to Planning Applications to be determined by Maldon District Council.

Response from: Mayland Parish Council

Planning Application Reference: **22/00314/OUTM PP-11430366**

Outline planning application for a phased development for up to 750 houses, education provision, allotments, roads
Land South of Fambridge Road, Burnham Road and East West of Station Road, Althorne

Our views on the above application are:

1. We recommend the granting of planning permission, for the reasons listed below:

*

or

2. We recommend the refusal of planning permission, for the reasons listed below:

1. There are limited/no school places or provision to cater for current housing in the Dengie
2. The one-track rail line is frequently closed for maintenance/failure, and has seen significantly reduced service in recent years
3. Bus services are near to non-existent
4. The services for Gas, Electricity and Water are sufficient currently, but what extra capacity can they take? Sewage is a particular issue. There is limited capacity at all nearby plants for extra housing.
5. There are insufficient Doctors surgeries in the area for the current population
6. There are limited / no NHS dental places available in the Dengie
7. The nearest hospital with an A&E is Chelmsford. Ambulance waiting times are at an all-time high. More houses, on an ambulance trip of 30 minutes.
8. Provision for retail in Althorne is non-existent, meaning road traffic increase to and from Burnham/South Woodham/Maldon
9. Other points raised include the effect on the landscape, the environment, the local wildlife, the carbon footprint of this development, the increased risk of flooding and excess surface water and lastly, where are the jobs for these 1500 (assuming 2 people per house) going to be?

This application site lies within a rural location outside of the defined settlement boundary of Althorne, which is defined within the LDP as a smaller village providing few services and facilities and limited employment opportunities. If developed, the site, by reason of its location, will not provide the quality and have limited access to sustainable and public transportation, resulting in an increased need of private vehicle ownership and limited access to services, facilities and employment opportunities. Furthermore, the village and its limited services and facilities would be unable to sustain the quantum of development proposed. The development would therefore result in significant and demonstrable harm that cannot be outweighed by the benefits arising from this residential scheme. The development would therefore be unacceptable and contrary to policies S1, S2, S8, D1, T1, T2, H4 of the LDP and the guidance contained within the NPPF.

The proposal, by reason of its quantum of development proposed, layout, density, grain, scale, design and relationship with the wider area, would harm the character and appearance of the area. The identified harm to the countryside and wider area would be significantly and demonstrably greater than the benefits arising from the proposed development. As such, the development would be unacceptable and contrary to Policies S1, S8, D1 and H4 of the LDP.

The current LDP states that a proportion of new development will be directed to the rural villages to support rural housing needs, local services and facilities and the rural economy. Strategic growth in the rural villages will be related to the settlement hierarchy, reflect the size, function and physical capacity of the wider area. Significant infrastructure constraints exist which will strictly limit the capacity for growth in Maldon, Heybridge and Burnham-on-Crouch in excess of that set out in Policy S2. Any proposal for development in excess of the allocations set out in Policy S2 will need to demonstrate to the Council's satisfaction that:

- It will not prejudice or delay the delivery of the Garden Suburbs, Strategic Allocations, or planned infrastructure improvements; and
- There will be sufficient infrastructure capacity to support the development. Proposals which may prejudice the delivery of the LDP, either individually or cumulatively will be resisted by the Council.

Having considered the application with regard to the aforementioned guidance. The Parish Council is of the opinion that the impact upon Secondary School places within the District is not sufficient to either support additional growth and meet the requirement of NPPF Paragraph 95 and hence will be detrimental to Policy S2 and should be refused. 4. NPPF Paragraph 49 . However, in the context of the Framework – and in particular the presumption in favour of sustainable development – arguments that an application is premature are unlikely to justify a refusal of planning permission other than in the limited circumstances where both: a) the development proposed is so substantial, or its cumulative effect would be so significant, that to grant permission would undermine the plan-making process by predetermining decisions about the b) the emerging plan is at an advanced stage but is not yet formally part of the development plan for the area scale, location or phasing of new development that are central to an emerging plan NPPF Paragraph 50. Refusal of planning permission on grounds of prematurity will seldom be justified where a draft plan has yet to be submitted for examination; or – in the case of a neighbourhood plan –before the end of the local planning authority publicity period on the draft plan. Where planning permission is refused on grounds of prematurity, the local planning authority will need to indicate clearly how granting permission for the development concerned would prejudice the outcome of the plan-making process.

Given that the application came forward as part of the Call for Sites together with the comments made by ECC Education with regard to a reliance on the New LDP to facilitate infrastructure and that it is in line with a potential strategy outlined by the District Council. The scale and location of the development if approved is likely to reduce the options available to members and hence should be refused for 'Prematurity'

Local Development Plan i.e. Policy D1 – Design Quality and built Environment, Policy S8 Settlement Boundaries and the Countryside)

Signed : *L. A Whitefield*

Date: 14th November 2023

Clerk to Mayland Parish Council

Version May 2016