

**BURNHAM-ON-CROUCH NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN  
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES RECEIVED TO THE REGULATION 16 CONSULTATION.**

<b>Ref No. &amp; Name</b>	<b>Subject/section</b>	<b>Comment</b>
<b>1 Allotment Association</b>	<b>Allotments - Policy CS-5</b>	<p>Policy CS-5-Allotments. Whilst it is noted in that policy that the Allotments are a "valued and well used resource" it may be of help to state the current position regarding their use to reinforce that statement.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There are 267 plots of which five are currently vacant. The allotments are in Devonshire Road, Burnham on Crouch.</li> <li>2..Plot holders 188, (some plot holders have more than one plot)</li> <li>3.The Association bulk buy materials for the benefit of plot holders.</li> </ol>
<b>2 Anglian Water</b>	<p><b>5.8</b></p> <p><b>Policy PI.19</b></p> <p><b>Policy EN.2</b></p>	<p>It is suggested that the heading is amended to the following: <i>Water recycling centres and underground sewerage/surface water infrastructure.</i> This suggested amendment reflects Anglian Water terminology.</p> <p>In regards to funding sources, developers fund some of the improvements; however, it is important to remember that developers cannot be expected to help resolve current issues and existing problems. They can only fund what is needed in relation to the development proposal.</p> <p>It is suggested that the text be amended to reflect Anglian Water concerns.</p> <p><b><i>Ensure that developers demonstrate that there is or will be sufficient infrastructure capacity at Burnham On Crouch Water Recycling works Centre and within the underground sewage/surface water infrastructure in the town to meets all current and projected future necessary requirements.</i></b></p> <p>Reference is made to CIL in regards to funding; this should be removed as provision is made in line with the Water Industry Act.</p> <p>Anglian Water welcomes Policy EN.2 which will ensure that sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) are seen as an integral part of the proposed development within the neighbourhood plan designated area.</p>

Ref No. & Name	Subject/section	Comment
	<p data-bbox="465 451 651 491"><b>Policy HO.6</b></p> <p data-bbox="465 528 712 676"><b>Chapter 10 – Housing Site Allocations and RAG Sheet</b></p> <p data-bbox="465 1034 701 1106"><b>Asset Encroachment</b></p>	<p data-bbox="750 180 2011 408">Anglian Water would wish to see in the policy that all new development should adhere to the surface water management hierarchy outlined in Part H of the Building Regulations with disposal to a surface water sewer seen as a last resort. Under no circumstances will surface water be permitted to discharge to the public foul sewerage network. We would want to see a surface water drainage solution identified and implemented prior to the construction of hard standing areas to protect our existing and future customers.</p> <p data-bbox="750 451 1686 491">It is pleasing to see that this policy refers to reduced water usage.</p> <p data-bbox="750 528 1984 600">Within the document reference is made to allocation sites in the Maldon emerging local plan, our position on these is explained below.</p> <p data-bbox="750 608 2029 986">Anglian Water has made an assessment of the available capacity at the Water Recycling Centre (WRC) (formerly known as sewage treatment works) and the foul sewerage network for each of the proposed sites contained within the consultation document. Please find Anglian Water’s comments below, these comments relate to sites identified in the consultation document and should be read alongside the attached RAG sheet. It is important to note that this assessment does not take account of the cumulative impact of development on the WRCs and the foul network. The sites proposed would be served by Burnham on Crouch WRC. This WRC does have current capacity to serve the proposed growth. However, infrastructure upgrades to the foul network will be required to serve the proposed growth.</p> <p data-bbox="750 1034 2033 1222">The allocation North of Burnham on Crouch (East) is in close proximity to a pumping station. It may be that the layout of the sites can be adjusted so as not to encroach on the protection zone. Development should be located a minimum of 15 metres from Pumping Stations. The landowner/developer is advised to contact us at the earliest opportunity to discuss the viability of the sites.</p> <p data-bbox="750 1265 2024 1415">Where there are sewers or water mains crossing the site, the site layout should be designed to take these into account; this existing infrastructure is protected by easements and should not be built over or located in private gardens where access for maintenance and repair could be restricted. The sewers or mains should be located in highways or</p>

Ref No. & Name	Subject/section	Comment
	<b>General</b>	<p>public open space. If it is not possible to accommodate the existing sewers or mains within the design then diversion may be possible under section 185 of the Water Industry Act 1991 or entering into a build over/near agreement may be considered.</p> <p>We closely monitor housing and economic growth in our region to align investment and the operation of our infrastructure to additional demand for used water. Anglian Water will be preparing a business plan in the next year which will identify the need for further investment to accommodate growth within the Anglian Water region. Local Plan growth targets and the timing of sites will be a key source of information to inform our business plan.</p>
<b>3 Anita Harris</b>	<b>PI.19 Surface Water Infrastructure.</b>	<p>Whilst I feel the NP does reflect the views expressed by residents, I do not feel it has put sufficient emphasis on the surface water problems that follow even moderate rainfall. I would use the problems faced at Hester Place and the Village Hall car park as examples. Neither are currently, or likely to be, subject to further planning applications, but remedial work is required.</p> <p>There needs to be a wider ongoing review where surface water is a problem with a defined responsibility for ensuring a remedy is found and corrective action taken.</p>
<b>4 BROOD &amp; "Say No"</b>	<b>Strategic Policy</b>  <b>Policy CS.3 –</b>  <b>Policies PI.10 and PI.11</b>	<p>3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph section 3 – on the they key infrastructure requirements - It is believed that the MDC LDP Evidence base referred to above is now well out of date – This requires completely updating by MDC early in 2017 and be kept up fully to date to fully support the processes in Policy HO.4 for the entire life of the LDP and NDPs</p> <p>This policy needs fleshing out. In particular it requires specific details covering exactly what needs to be done and a prioritised implementation plan. At the moment it's just an unsupported wish-list.</p> <p>Needs to clarify and be expanded per the Emerging LDP to be sure that there are safe separated Cycle Paths connecting the Strategic Allocation Estates to Ormiston Academy and the shops/surgery etc facilities in the established town over the rail bridge. These need to be designed and constructed such that already narrow Maldon and Southminster Road carriageways are not compromised in any way for cars and truck normal usage. These new paths have to be additional to the existing narrow road network and suitable for Motability</p>

Ref No. & Name	Subject/section	Comment
	<p data-bbox="465 256 660 296"><b>Policy PI.13</b></p> <p data-bbox="465 608 660 647"><b>Policy PI.17</b></p> <p data-bbox="465 799 660 839"><b>Policy HO.4</b></p> <p data-bbox="465 1070 660 1110"><b>Policy HO.7</b></p> <p data-bbox="465 1230 660 1270"><b>Policy HO.9</b></p>	<p data-bbox="750 145 1980 217">Scooter usage in every way – not cannibalise precious main road space creating safety hazards</p> <p data-bbox="750 256 2040 568">1/ Not sure what is meant by Global Business 2/ 2nd bullet needs to clarify that amongst the problems at Wickford are the total lack of safe waiting rooms or security/ station staff after 18:00 most days. This is totally unacceptable and has led to lone females being harassed and in at least one case being attacked. Lack of inspectors/conductors on Crouch Valley trains after 18:00 creates similar issues of anti-social behaviour . If Burnham plans to be a sustainable commuting town, the rule of law and order must be re-established and commuters living in new housing must feel secure</p> <p data-bbox="750 608 2040 759">All Burnham car parks in all ownerships (incl Millfields and Providence!) suffer from deferred maintenance and in many cases poor lighting. If Burnham plans to be an attractive/safe tourist centre, this NDP needs to prioritise corrective action with appropriate Implementation Plans</p> <p data-bbox="750 799 2024 1031">Requires strengthening and detailed with a draft process and SLA that either BTC asks MDC to subscribe to and implement to deliver the NDP’s strategic intent or BTC is given delegated authority to handle (assuming adequate skill/resource base) <i>’ Burnham Town Council would recommend to Maldon District Council’</i> requires strong rewording to clarify that this is a fundamental non-discretionary part of the NDP that MDC as the LPA has to follow</p> <p data-bbox="750 1070 2018 1190">This must emphasise the need for Cycle Paths to be on dedicated incremental real estate. Carving out lanes on Maldon/Southminster Roads would cause safety hazards &amp; choke traffic</p> <p data-bbox="750 1230 2024 1417">Needs to include Cycle Lane provision requirement per modified Policy HO.7 &amp; HO.8 Very careful thought is needed re inclusion of any Amenity Area or Open Space – Suggest full consultation with existing nearby residents, who express concerns re security, safety, need for exclusion against potential vehicle ingress and overnight stays on landscaped areas</p>

Ref No. & Name	Subject/section	Comment
	<p data-bbox="465 376 696 488"><b>Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)</b></p> <p data-bbox="465 799 591 831"><b>General</b></p>	<p data-bbox="750 145 2024 328">Defined hard standing short term car park with well illuminated car parking to service safe drop-off/pick-up for nearby school would be a great community gain. Equally very important that in this sensitive location surrounded by problematic roads, the new development has generous private amenity car parking to avoid overspill onto Marsh Road</p> <p data-bbox="750 376 2024 759">It is acknowledged both in the District LDP and our town's Neighbourhood Plan, that Burnham has limited/aging infrastructure and services that require urgent investment to overcome legacy issues as well as incremental impacts from new developments. CIL is an obvious and appropriate source of funds for mitigation actions, however because MDC have worked hard with Developers and others to bring extra housing for the town forward (to help build the District 5 year land supply); none of the +600 extra houses approved to date have attracted CIL payments. In the spirit of the CIL Legislation, Burnham needs to spell out in its NDP that it requires an equitable share of the overall MDC CIL pot, even though very few of its own extra dwellings will directly contribute to that pot.</p> <p data-bbox="750 799 1935 919">We enthusiastically endorse the strategic thrust of the latest draft and ask that both Councils proactively prioritise the early adoption of the plan with no further delay</p> <p data-bbox="750 935 2024 1046">On the basis we believe that with these small modifications the strategic intent of this excellent plan will be able to be sustainably delivered to the benefit of the whole town and again urge all speed to both the District and Town Council accordingly</p>
<p data-bbox="96 1058 405 1126"><b>5 Charles Church/Persimmon</b></p>	<p data-bbox="465 1058 719 1246"><b>Promotion of identified Strategic Site S2 (j) North of Burnham (east)</b></p>	<p data-bbox="750 1058 1995 1126"><b>Policy S1</b> –the policy should make clear that development should satisfactorily mitigate the impacts arising from that development. Suggests revised wording for S1</p> <p data-bbox="750 1174 1973 1243"><b>Policy HO.3</b> – Object to the requirement for developments to achieve Built for Life 12 'greens.' Suggests replacement wording.</p> <p data-bbox="750 1291 1962 1359"><b>Policy HO.4</b> – It is not clear what is meant by cumulative impacts being 'containable' Suggest revised wording.</p>

Ref No. & Name	Subject/section	Comment
		<p><b>Policy HO.6</b> – Objects to the policy adopting National Technical Standards.</p> <p><b>Policy HO.8</b> – The site has a resolution to grant subject to a s106. The approved plans secures vehicular access from Southminster Road. Figure 12 should be amended to detail the access from Southminster Road</p>
<p><b>6 Chelmsford City Council</b></p>	<p><b>4.4</b></p> <p><b>5.4 and Policy PI.13</b></p>	<p>There is no mention of secondary school capacity. There appears to be no reference to this in the list of Evidence Base documents. Anecdotal evidence shows a cyclical shift of secondary school age pupils from Burnham-on-Crouch attending school in South Woodham Ferrers, and also the reverse. This may affect capacity at William de Ferrers School at South Woodham Ferrers, which may have implications for school capacity needs generated by development in the Chelmsford City area which will be outlined in its Local Plan Preferred Options in February 2017. If there is no impact anticipated from future housing development in Burnham-on-Crouch, this should be stated.</p> <p>The Plan should also commit to working with Chelmsford City Council and the South Woodham Ferrers Neighbourhood Plan Group, on the cross boundary issue of improving the quality of train services (including late evening services, changing services at Wickford, and reliability issues as outlined in the Policy PI.13) on the Crouch Valley Line, which passes through the Chelmsford City area.</p>
<p><b>7 Direct Rail Services</b></p>	<p><b>General</b></p>	<p>Can you confirm there will be no requirements for the railway line to be closed during any of the planned works? I understand the station will be getting refurb/update and more services are being requested.</p> <p>If you can confirm about any line closures as this will have an impact on us.</p> <p>The only other concern we may have is if new houses are being built by the railway line to put some noise barriers in place, especially if the frequency of services are planned to increase. From experience noise can be a key factor and the new houses should have something to deter the noise level they are exposed to.</p>

Ref No. & Name	Subject/section	Comment
<b>8 Environment Agency</b>	<u><b>Ecology and the Water Environment</b></u>	<p>The plan includes sections on the river and the environment and we welcome the recommendation for the general avoidance of any major development next to the Crouch Estuary.</p>
	<b>Water Framework Directive</b>	<p>The plan currently makes no reference to the Water Framework Directive (WFD) or the River Basin Management Plan. A minimum requirement under the directive is to prevent deterioration in the ecological status of WFD water bodies including, in this instance, the Crouch Estuary, Goldsands Bridges Ditch and Raywick Redward Ditch. We would welcome the addition of text in the plan to consider how, where relevant, protective measures or enhancements can be sought. For example the incorporation of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDs) in new developments should be encouraged to provide wildlife habitat and prevent deterioration in the water quality through contaminated run off.</p>
	<u><b>Seawall Surfacing Materials</b></u>	<p>Policy RI.1 suggests improvements to seawall access, and this would require a Flood Risk Activity Permit under the Environmental Permitting Regulations 2010. While this proposed development is to be welcomed as part of the England Coast Path, we would welcome early discussions to ensure consideration is made to minimise environmental impact. Attention should be given to the more remote section of sea wall towards Holliwell Point and also the sea walls to the West of Burnham to avoid impacts on the unique flora of the SSSI. Text should be included to reflect this.</p>
	<u><b>Tidal Defences</b></u>	<p>Studies are ongoing into the lifespan of existing tidal defences in Burnham on Crouch. Any future public realm works within 16m of the tidal defence must not hinder its maintenance and would require a Flood Risk Activity Permit. The outcome of an engineering investigation to be carried out this financial year will be shared with Burnham Town Council and Maldon District Council.</p>
	<u><b>Floodgates</b></u>	<p>If the Town Council wishes to use floodgates, arrangements called 'flood dam notices' will be required which places legal duties on the owner of the gates regarding their operation. The present Environment Agency policy for Burnham on Crouch is to seek removal of floodgates which are no longer in use wherever possible. Text should be included to highlight this.</p>

Ref No. & Name	Subject/section	Comment
9 ECC –	<b>Relationship with the LDP</b>	ECC welcomes the acknowledgement that this Plan should be read in conjunction with the emerging Maldon District Council Local Development Plan (2014 – 2029). Policies S1 and S2 are consistent with the strategic sites in the LDP.
	<b>Community &amp; Social Infrastructure</b>	<p>In progressing the evidence base to support the submitted LDP the County Council, as education authority, identified a deficiency in early years and childcare provision arising from the impact of the planned growth. The submitted LDP identified that there is sufficient capacity at the existing primary schools in Burnham on Crouch to accommodate the pupil product from the LDP allocation of 450 dwellings.</p> <p><i>Primary Education</i></p> <p>The primary education capacity at Burnham on Crouch was extensively discussed at the LDP examination in 2015, and has been subject to additional work by ECC, and developers, to identify capacity at the existing primary schools. The links to this additional work are listed below, Burnham-on-Crouch and Southminster Primary School capacity statement: And the ECC response regarding the reduction in capacity of 417 to 390 places:</p> <p>ECC has been consulted upon planning applications on two sites allocated in the Local Plan and this draft NP, namely Burnham West (Site S2 (i)) and Burnham North West (Site S2 (j)). The number of homes proposed at each site is not by itself sufficient to justify or fund a new primary school. However, ECC sought a s106 contribution from both applications to mitigate their impact on education. Both applications are within the priority admissions area for Ormiston Rivers Academy, which has a surplus of places, and no contribution was sought.</p>
	<b>Policy CS7</b>	Policy CS. 7 regarding the provision of early years and childcare is welcomed. Any new facility will need to be provided in the most appropriate location to meet the demand. ECC has responded to the planning applications on two sites allocated in the Local Plan, Burnham West (Site S2 (i)) and Burnham North West (Site S2 (j)). ECC has sought a s106 contribution from both applications to mitigate their impact on early years. The application regarding Site S2 (i) includes a nursery site within the outline part of the application, and is welcomed.
	<b>Section 5 –</b>	The draft neighbourhood plan identifies some potential highway projects to improve



Ref No. & Name	Subject/section	Comment
	<p data-bbox="465 140 703 212"><b>Physical Infrastructure</b></p> <p data-bbox="465 879 555 911"><b>PI 13</b></p> <p data-bbox="465 1075 555 1107"><b>PI 15</b></p>	<p data-bbox="748 140 2047 834">vehicular access into and through Burnham on Crouch (Policies PI.1 – PI.12). The minor highway improvements suggested in these policies should be considered through the Maldon Local Highways Panel (LHP). Consequently, it should be stressed that the highway schemes identified are subject to the MLHP process, and are not presently `committed` schemes with regards to a solution or funding. As previously indicated projects PI1 and PI5 have been subject to the process above, and identified by local Councillors for consideration. Policy PI. 1 (LHP Reference LMAL 152027) is currently a proposed scheme included on the Maldon District LHP Potential Schemes List at a cost of £45,000. However, the LHP is fully committed with schemes for the period 2015/16, but will be considered for funding in 2016/17. Policy PI. 5 (LHP Reference LMAL 142019) - the LHP has investigated a potential 20mph speed limit on Marsh Road/Church Road/Southminster Road, Church Road/Southminster Road. These roads are designated as Priority Routes in terms of the Functional Route Hierarchy, to enable safe and efficient movement of traffic. It is unlikely that a 20mph speed limit would be adhered to or enforced by the Police. ECC recommends all schemes identified in these policies should be progressed through the Local Highways Panel.</p> <p data-bbox="748 879 2047 1031">Policy PI. 13 – regarding rail improvements The issues identified in this policy are not the responsibility of the County Council, and will need to be addressed to Abellio East Anglia Limited. Reference to any funding by ECC should be deleted, and replaced with the Rail Franchise Operator.</p> <p data-bbox="748 1075 2047 1417">Policy PI. 15 – regarding Local Bus Services In Essex around 85 per cent of the bus network is provided commercially. Around 15 per cent of the bus network is supported by ECC. Some of these services have to be provided by law, such as home to school transport for qualifying children; concessionary fares; looked after children; and adult social care. Other services are discretionary, such as those where a commercial service isn't currently viable and Community Transport schemes. In 2015, ECC began a review of its financial support for those local bus services that it pays for across the County. An additional consultation, Local Bus Network Review Consultation (November 2016), is being undertaken between 4 November 2016 and 3rd</p>

Ref No. & Name	Subject/section	Comment
	<p data-bbox="465 256 555 288"><b>PI 18</b></p> <p data-bbox="465 608 674 679"><b>Environment Policies</b></p> <p data-bbox="465 759 533 791"><b>EN2</b></p> <p data-bbox="465 1270 685 1302"><b>RI 1 and RI 5</b></p>	<p data-bbox="750 137 2054 217">January 2017 regarding 8 services in the Maldon Area where the current contracts end in 2017.</p> <p data-bbox="750 256 2054 568">Policy PI. 18 – regarding Broadband The Policy to support improved broadband provision is welcomed. This supports a priority within the MDC Economic Prosperity Strategy to improve connectivity within the District by ensuring the widest possible coverage of Superfast Broadband which is important for supporting rural businesses and creating new business opportunities. The majority of the properties covered by the Neighbourhood Plan area have already been connected to the Fibre upgrade by Superfast Essex. Other than small pockets the remaining properties will be connected between June 2017 – July 2018 by Superfast Essex (Cabinet Areas 4 and 6).</p> <p data-bbox="750 608 2054 719">ECC welcomes policies encouraging the mitigation of flood risk (EN1; EN2), the use of wind power and possible other renewable sources (EN4; EN5), and new homes considering the risks relating to climate change.</p> <p data-bbox="750 759 2054 1222">Policy suggestion EN2 – regarding Surface Water Management ECC welcomes the inclusion of the wording in relation to ‘surface water flooding’ into the Policy. All development proposals must give priority to sustainable drainage principles in the provision of surface water drainage to ensure that flood risk will not be increased either on or off site. Where development does occur it must be made safe and flood resilient for its lifetime. Runoff from new developments should pass through appropriate treatment stages to ensure that Water Framework Directives regarding water quality objectives are being met and that development is in line with paragraph 109 of the NPPF. ECC as the Lead Local Flood Authority welcome the opportunity to provide advice should any sites in the neighbourhood plan area come forward where there may be opportunities to alleviate existing flooding.</p> <p data-bbox="750 1270 2054 1417">Policy RI.1 and RI.5 ECC supports reference to the England Coast Path (ECP) in Policy RI.1, with the Maldon to Burnham stretch planned to be developed in 2015/16 and the Burnham to Wallasea Island stretch in 2016/7. The final anticipated date for full implementation throughout Essex is</p>

Ref No. & Name	Subject/section	Comment
	<p data-bbox="465 411 674 483"><b>Heritage and Character</b></p> <p data-bbox="465 799 600 834"><b>Housing</b></p>	<p data-bbox="750 140 831 172">2020.</p> <p data-bbox="750 180 2042 368">The Coastal Path will bring walkers, visitors and tourists into Burnham on Crouch providing substantial economic growth opportunities for overnight accommodation and catering. Burnham is well positioned to benefit as a start and finish point having the train station link to London. The town offers the attraction as "Gateway to Wallasea Island's RSPB reserve", as referred to in Policy RI.5.</p> <p data-bbox="750 411 2042 754">ECC welcomes the identification, and acknowledgement of importance, of the wide range of heritage assets throughout the Plan. In addition to referring to heritage assets recording by MDC, reference should also be made to the Historic Environment Record (EHER) for Essex as the most comprehensive inventory of the county's historic environment, including Burnham-on-Crouch. This is maintained by the County Council, and MDC's own website directs people to the HER and provides contact details. Potential housing developments all have the potential to contain archaeological deposits, and any application for these areas will be expected to be supported by an appropriate archaeological desk-based assessment, field evaluation and mitigation strategy.</p> <p data-bbox="750 799 2042 911">The draft Neighbourhood Plan includes policies regarding strategic allocations S2 (i); S2 (j) and S2 (k) in the emerging Local Plan, and these are referenced in Policies HO.7, HO.8 and HO.9.</p> <p data-bbox="750 919 2042 1142">Policies HO. 7 – HO. 9 indicate the preferred access points and layout of development according to the Town Council, and these suggestions should be made by the Town Council when they respond to the relevant planning application. ECC is responsible for protecting the safety and efficiency of the highway network, as required by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) paragraph 32, and seeks to ensure that such proposals for development:</p> <ul data-bbox="750 1150 1709 1302" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• are accessible by means of transport other than the private car</li> <li>• are designed to the correct standards</li> <li>• safe and suitable access to any site can be achieved for all people</li> <li>• have their impact on the highway network mitigated appropriately</li> </ul> <p data-bbox="750 1310 1977 1417">ECC formal response to applications regarding Local Plan sites S2 (i) and (j) have been submitted to MDC, as part of our statutory responsibility, and considered in the determination of planning applications.</p>

Ref No. & Name	Subject/section	Comment
	<p><b>HO 7</b></p> <p><b>HO 8</b></p> <p><b>HO 9</b></p>	<p>Site HO. 7 – Maldon Road/Chandlers/Creeksea Lane (Local Plan S2 (i)) In response to application FUL/MAL/14/00356, ECC, as the highway authority, considered the site to be in line with current National and Local policy and safety criteria and was acceptable in terms of safety and capacity impact upon the local and wider highway network. The applicant will provide a highway contribution, as per the LDP, for the Highway Authority to do a feasibility assessment with the aim of providing improvements to the B1010/B1021 Maldon Road/Church Road junction. A wider range of highway mitigation works have also been recommend by ECC in terms of access and connectivity. The Highway Authority concluded that the proposal would not be detrimental to highway safety, capacity or efficiency, and is consistent with Policy T2 of the Local Plan and ECC Development Management Policies (February 2011). The application has been approved subject to completion of the S106 agreement.</p> <p>Site HO. 8 – North of Burnham on Crouch West (Site S2 (j)) This revised scheme (FUL/MAL/16/00093) follows the refusal of planning permission in July 2015 and addressed the Council’s reason for refusal. ECC made no objection to the site in relation to highways and access. Overall the highways authority concluded that ‘the proposal will not be detrimental to highway safety, capacity or efficiency at this location or on the wider highway network’. Full Permission has been granted subject to S106. A contribution has been requested towards highway improvements in Burnham-on-Crouch related to the B1010/B1021 junction.</p> <p>Site HO. 9 – North of Burnham on Crouch East (Site S2 (k)) An application is expected to be submitted during 2017</p>
<b>10 Essex &amp; Suffolk Water</b>	<b>General</b>	<p>We have no comments to make. The Company can supply an adequate level of water supply for the proposed development.</p>
<b>11 Gladman Developments</b>		<p>Reserve sites should be included in the Plan. References to the emerging LDP should be replaced with ‘the Development Plan’ to ensure conformity with the basic conditions. Reference to new development having to resolve existing infrastructure capacity issues do not meet the tests for planning obligations.</p>

Ref No. & Name	Subject/section	Comment
	<p><b>S1 –</b></p> <p><b>PI 20</b></p> <p><b>HO 2</b></p> <p><b>HO 10</b></p> <p><b>SA/SEA</b></p>	<p>S1 – The identified housing target should be considered as a minimum. The NP should allocate housing reserve sites, to be brought forward of housing requirements are not being met across the District. Site submission for land off Southminster Road for 80 dwellings, either as an allocation or as a reserve site..</p> <p>PI20 The issue of resolving waste water capacity should not form part of the Plan</p> <p>HO2 – Concerns with the wording of this policy, as it suggests that residential development would only be permitted where it meets local needs at the Burnham-on-Crouch level only. This does not accord with meeting the overall housing needs of the District.</p> <p>HO 10 – Design policies should avoid unnecessary prescription or detail and should not be used inflexibly . Principles NHD 28 and NHD33 seek to impose restrictions on residential development based on highways safety and landscape and visual concerns. There are no evidence base documents to the NP that point to any issues with regard to these matters. These constraints should be considered on a site-by-site bases taking into account supporting evidence.</p> <p>SA/SEA – Questions adequacy of the draft screening opinion. Also questions adequacy of the SA/SEA for the LDP, which the NP relies upon.</p>
<p><b>12 Glyn &amp; John Hitcham</b></p>	<p><b>General</b></p> <p><b>Strategic Policy</b></p>	<p>We are totally supportive of the aims and intent of the plan, however we respectfully make the following points:</p> <p>Page 19 of the NDP under 'Strategic Policy' (in line with the Emerging LDP) correctly identifies the need to ensure that Infrastructure Deficiencies are speedily dealt with as '<i>set out in Policy S2, S6 and E1 of the Maldon District Council Emerging Local Development Plan</i>'. <u>However</u> it is our belief that the Infrastructure Deficiencies for Burnham are not fully captured in the LDP lists and therefore they are flawed and require systematic updating on a regular basis by MDC if they are to be relied upon. For example the ongoing and chronic Flooding Issues frequently referred to at Burnham Town Council meetings relating to Station Road, Hester Place and at the Carnival Hall (aka Village Hall) need remedial prioritisation and urgent funding.</p> <p>We further recommend that District CIL and District/Town New Homes Bonus funds be</p>

Ref No. & Name	Subject/section	Comment
	<p data-bbox="465 491 651 528"><b>Policy HO 4</b></p> <p data-bbox="465 683 696 794"><b>Need for expeditious determination</b></p>	<p data-bbox="750 140 1995 252">allocated to remedy these longstanding issues that otherwise would stop sustainable planned growth in our town and ask that the policy details of the final NDP be amended accordingly.</p> <p data-bbox="750 300 2040 448">Although we are aware that MDC has a land supply well in excess of 5 years we feel that in taking planning decisions on developments not covered in the Emerging NDP and LDPs, the District Council is often too cautious and doesn't use the full power of the Neighbourhood Plan as potential grounds for refusal.</p> <p data-bbox="750 491 1995 639">We recommend that BTC strengthen the processes between themselves and MDC to ensure that Policy HO.4 is strengthened such that the NDP clarifies that non-inclusion in the NDP or no compliance with design standards are a full and complete rationale for refusal of a Planning Application, even if it would have otherwise been 'sustainable'.</p> <p data-bbox="750 683 2007 831">Time is of the essence to put this NDP fully in place. BTC and MDC must set robust targeted processes in place to run the Referendum Approval well before the current unambitious target of May 2017. Necessary work can with good will on all sides be easily telescoped to achieve a March Approval.</p>
<p data-bbox="96 842 376 874"><b>13 Gordon Clarke</b></p>	<p data-bbox="465 842 595 874"><b>General</b></p> <p data-bbox="465 922 640 954"><b>Comments</b></p> <p data-bbox="465 1114 607 1145"><b>Wording</b></p> <p data-bbox="465 1310 719 1374"><b>Strategic Policy S1</b></p>	<p data-bbox="750 842 1899 874">I acknowledge the effort that has been put in by members of the Steering Group.</p> <p data-bbox="750 922 2040 1070">The terms Burnham Town Council <b>supports/is supportive/encourages</b> etc. are used in the numbered Policies throughout the Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP). In most cases the nature of that support is not detailed. For the Policies to be meaningful, the method of the support should be defined.</p> <p data-bbox="750 1114 2018 1262">Some wording in the document is open to interpretation. This could lead to conflict depending on who is seeking to use a particular policy. One specific correction is required in the Section <b>River</b> paragraph <b>8.1</b>. The Ordnance Survey uses the local spelling of <b>Holliwell</b> for the farm and point as does the racing mark in the river.</p> <p data-bbox="750 1310 2018 1418">a) We are about to enter year three of the Maldon District Local Development Plan (LDP) although it has still not been approved. This means that the NDP effectively supports the construction of 390 units in the Town in the next three years. I think that the NDP should</p>

Ref No. & Name	Subject/section	Comment
		<p>recognise the slippage that has occurred and schedule the 390 units proposed for years 3 - 7 of the plan. Realistically developers are unlikely to achieve the planned programme.</p> <p>b) <b>Policy S1</b> - The NDP highlights a number of issues that need to be resolved before development beyond the 450 target can be considered. The plan identifies the need for improvement of local highway capacity but wording of the policy S1 fails to mention highway as an issue. It is clear that development of sites S2 (i) and (j) will limit the available options for an alternative route into the Town. I believe the NDP should address this issue. I would also ask that consideration be given to insertion of a Policy that the Town Council would not support development beyond the current boundaries of S2 (i) that could lead to Burnham extending to Creeksea Lane and Ferry Road.</p> <p><b>PI 3</b> a) <b>Policy PI.3</b> - The wording of this policy is unclear. It suggests that the road between Alexandra Road and Devonshire Road junctions is Church Road whereas it is Station Road. As drafted it suggested that Church Road should have double yellow lines for its entire length from the railway bridge to the Marsh Road junction. Is this the intention?</p> <p><b>PI4</b> b) <b>Policy PI.4</b> - The NDP would benefit from stronger wording such as "Request the Highway Authority to implement" the one-way system detailed for Devonshire Road as a specific policy. The general comment of support for highway improvement could remain as a separate policy.</p> <p><b>PI6</b> c) <b>Policy PI.6</b> - The narrative in paragraph 5.2 highlights the problem of the "tight spot" outside Woodford's Garage in Maldon Road but the policy does not address the issue. I believe that investigation of an alternative route into Burnham, either north or south of Ostend, should be considered and planned for as part of the current NDP before possible options are lost with development of sites S2 (i) and (j).</p> <p><b>PI7</b> d) <b>Policy PI.7</b> - Is it being suggested that a second bridge be built on Marsh Road or that existing bridge would provide an alternative route into the Town if traffic control is installed to allow for one-way operation? The wording does not make it clear. In either case I do not think that Marsh Road is suitable for such use bearing mind the effect that additional traffic would have on St. Mary's School and the limited width of the road between Glendale Road and Church Road. What route would the necessary link road take from the bridge into the Town?</p> <p><b>PI 11 &amp; PI 12</b> e) <b>Policy PI.11</b> and <b>PI.12</b> - Please see my comments in relation to policy <b>HO.9</b>.</p> <p><b>PI 19 &amp; PI20</b> f) <b>Policy PI.19</b> and <b>PI.20</b> - I agree with the intention of these policies but suspect that</p>

Ref No. & Name	Subject/section	Comment
	<p data-bbox="465 336 539 368"><b>HO9</b></p> <p data-bbox="465 531 584 563"><b>Review</b></p>	<p data-bbox="750 145 2049 292">they have not been put to Anglian Water for their comment or take account of the provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991. I believe the NDP should, as a matter of policy, press Anglian Water to instigate the required improvements to the sewerage system and sewage treatment works.</p> <p data-bbox="750 336 2049 483">a) <b>HO.9</b> - I do not think that it is appropriate to develop site <b>S2 (k)</b> permitting vehicular access from Marsh Road. <b>Figure 13</b> in the NDP does not show how access is to be gained to this site. Detailed suggestions are offered regarding vehicular and pedestrian access, public open space and types of development.</p> <p data-bbox="750 531 2049 603">The NDP considers the period 2014 to 2029. Should some reference be made to how the NDP is to be reviewed over the remainder of its 15 year life?</p>
<b>14 Historic England</b>	<p data-bbox="465 647 595 679"><b>General</b></p> <p data-bbox="465 879 555 911"><b>PI 03</b></p> <p data-bbox="465 1190 562 1222"><b>HC 01</b></p>	<p data-bbox="750 647 2049 834">Historic England is primarily concerned with the impact of proposals on the historic environment. We continue to welcome the acknowledgement of the historic environment contained in the Plan to the extent that Heritage and Character is identified as one of the seven themes, and that protection and enhancement of the town's built heritage is a key principle set out in Section 2.</p> <p data-bbox="750 879 2049 1145"><i>PI03 Make Burnham a more pedestrian and cycle friendly place to live.</i> Policy suggestion PI11 is concerned with the provision of new cycle parking areas or shelters in the town. Such facilities are likely to be located within the conservation area and therefore we recommend that the policy be strengthened by the addition of a requirement for new cycle provision to be appropriate and sensitively located to ensure there is no harm to the character or appearance of the conservation area, or the setting of the listed buildings located within the conservation area.</p> <p data-bbox="750 1190 2049 1377"><i>HCO1 Improve Awareness of the conservation area in the town centre.</i> Whilst the Neighbourhood plan seeks to have the Burnham Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan update, this is not included within any policy. Historic England would suggest that there is policy requirement for the update of the town centre's conservation area appraisal which includes an up-to-date management plan</p>



Ref No. & Name	Subject/section	Comment
		<b>Strategic Environmental Assessment/ Sustainability Appraisal/ Integrated Impact Assessment</b> Historic England has no comments to make on this document.
<b>15 John James</b>	<b>General</b>   <b>Policies EC6 &amp; EC6.1:</b>   <b>Policy RI.1</b>   <b>Policy RI.5</b>	<p>I entirely support and endorse the plan in general and congratulate all of those personally and professionally involved in its preparation and production. Having been living and practicing in the town of Burnham-on-Crouch for over 35 years I wish for the following comments to be considered in respect of the specific matters and policies referred to below:</p> <p>I strongly support and encourage the creation of a new purpose built "Visitor Centre" for Burnham-on-Crouch to be located on The Quay that is undoubtedly the only suitable location. Such important new facility will provide essential services and advice to visitors, tourists and the general public and would provide information on hotel and bed-and-breakfast accommodation, local features and facilities, Crouch ferry links, walking and wildlife and future RSPB advice on the Wallasea reserve etc.</p> <p>I strongly support the retention of the "Town Steps" and the intended improvements and widening of the public floating pontoon. This provides an important core feature for the residents and visitors to the Town – by foot and by boat and should be retained and improved in the public interest.</p> <p>As a long time member [and past Chairman] of the Crouch Harbour Authority and having been on the Crouch Coastal Community Working Group for the Lower Crouch Ferry Crossing project I fully support the proposed policy to enable Burnham-on-Crouch to become a "gateway" to the RSPB reserve development on Wallasea and this will be best implemented by the formation of a new all-weather and all-year ferry crossing from Burnham to the RSPB site and to the existing ferry terminal at Essex Marina. Such ferry service to provide all appropriate facilities for disabled person and wheelchair access and for cyclists with their cycle. This "aspirational" project has now been formally adopted by the CCCT that is fully and formally represented on by members of the Burnham Town Council, Maldon and Rochford District Councils. I believe the Neighbourhood Plan must now make specific reference to this "adopted" project that will undoubtedly encourage and inspire the required regeneration of the Town of Burnham-on-Crouch and its economy,</p>

Ref No. & Name	Subject/section	Comment
		tourism and river activities.
<b>16 Ken Harris</b>	<p data-bbox="465 185 719 217"><b>General</b></p> <p data-bbox="465 456 719 528"><b>Windfall Sites – Pages 61/62</b></p>	<p data-bbox="748 185 2040 411">My assessment is that the Burnham Neighbourhood Plan does generally reflect the residents' feed in/wishes. The process followed has led to a better understanding of the areas of administrative responsibility and accountability. I share the concern that the LDP approval is still awaited and that allows an uncertainty and wider licence currently than would be the case if both plans were in place.</p> <p data-bbox="748 456 2040 608">My specific concerns [current and longer term] relate to 'Windfall' house building – well set out in pages 61/62. In the light of ongoing experience I remain sceptical that H04/H05 will provide the necessary safeguards, particularly around road and drainage capacity. Will the evidence required be available and provided and who will assemble/verify/validate it?</p> <p data-bbox="748 647 2040 719">Looking forward I see it as essential that the plan is accepted, and used, as a working document – under which decisions are made – not simply put on the shelf!</p>
<b>17 National Grid</b>	<b>Specific Comments</b>	<p data-bbox="748 730 2040 911">An assessment has been carried out with respect to National Grid's electricity and gas transmission apparatus which includes high voltage electricity assets and high pressure gas pipelines and also National Grid Gas Distribution's Intermediate / High Pressure apparatus. National Grid has identified the following intermediate gas distribution pipeline as falling within the Neighbourhood area boundary:</p> <ul data-bbox="801 919 1413 951" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="801 919 1413 951">• 1414Z Rettendon 02 7 BAR – IP Pipeline</li> </ul> <p data-bbox="748 999 2040 1070">From the consultation information provided, the above gas distribution pipeline does not interact with any of the proposed development sites.</p> <p data-bbox="748 1118 1346 1150"><i>Gas Distribution – Low / Medium Pressure</i></p> <p data-bbox="748 1158 2040 1262">Whilst there are no implications for National Grid Gas Distribution's Intermediate / High Pressure apparatus, there may however be Low Pressure (LP) / Medium Pressure (MP) Gas Distribution pipes present within proposed development sites.</p>
<b>18 Natural England</b>		<p data-bbox="748 1276 2040 1308">Natural England does not have any specific comments on this draft neighbourhood plan.</p> <p data-bbox="748 1348 2040 1420"><b>Screening request</b> – Natural England agrees with the conclusion that the policies will not have a significant effect on any of the designated sites under consideration. Natral</p>

Ref No. & Name	Subject/section	Comment
		England agrees with the conclusion of the SEA screening that there are unlikely to be significant environmental effects from the proposed plan.
<b>19 Nick Gilmour</b>	<p><b>General</b></p> <p><b>Key principles</b></p> <p><b>S1</b></p> <p><b>Table 1, pg 20</b></p> <p><b>CS1</b></p> <p><b>4.2</b></p> <p><b>CS.2 –</b></p> <p><b>CS.3</b></p> <p><b>CS.4</b></p>	<p>Grammar &amp; punctuation errors identified, and comments on photographs/graphics.</p> <p>Key principle E: Suggest insert "principally" to allow some leeway for those shops and facilities which can sustainably be located without the town centre</p> <p>Should insert a reference as to the baseline date for this figure (i.e. 2014) so that subsequent windfall can be taken into account for the purposes of seeking infrastructure contributions from developers</p> <p>Should be updated to take into account windfall developments already built, in progress or yet to commence following granting of planning permission</p> <p>Specifically add "the library" to this list Funding for what exactly? None of these currently qualifies for direct support from 'council taxes'?</p> <p>Insert "where a <u>sustainable</u> need..."</p> <p>Insert "sustainable" and caveat the sentence with "which accords with other policies in this plan, e.g. transportation links," change to "will" to increase certainty of the policy intent. Implementation: Contributions from developers should be sought to provide for required additional community facilities in place of funding from 'council taxes'</p> <p>Append "...with a particular focus on the expansion and renewal of assets in Riverside Park, including better skate park, BMX track, sports pitches, gym trail, and walking and cycling routes linked to the rest of the town, particularly the north." Implementation - As with the space near the church, there should be a specific policy statement and implementation plan to support these aspirations.</p> <p>Append "... and be easily accessible from the north, west and south to serve both existing and new developments."</p>

Ref No. & Name	Subject/section	Comment
	<b>CS.5 –</b>	Note - this land could also potentially support the future expansion of Burnham on Crouch Primary School or for a swimming pool - please avoid using 'perpetuity' to preclude such uses
	<b>4.4</b>	Ensure there is a Supply of Primary and Early Years Education to Meet the Identified Need in the Town - Has ECC confirmed this as at the date of the draft report?
	<b>P26 First Para</b>	Suggest strengthening this to be clear that, since 2014, the existing build, in progress or permitted windfall, plus strategic development sites has already caused a need for more primary places above existing capacity and all further development cannot possibly sustainable or permitted without implausible creation of additional primary school capacity.
	<b>Policy CS.6 –</b>	This has already happened? (expansion). Suggest amending policy to "When existing primary school capacity in the town is exhausted, development will not be permitted or regarded as sustainable without sufficient developer contributions to increase it."
	<b>policy CS.7 –</b>	Append "while maximising accessibility by the wider community."
	<b>Policy CS.8 –</b>	There is no evidence to support this idealism (BTC securing operational control)
	<b>Policy CS.8.1</b>	Need to append an objective here
	<b>Policy CS.8.2</b>	Is this in addition to the 450 homes? Amend policy: "Secondary Area <u>A</u> "
	<b>P29 Policy PI.2</b>	Believed by whom? ECC want to put a roundabout here!
	<b>Policy PI.3</b>	It would be safer and more sustainable for the retail units at this location to reduce the width of the pavement and create recessed parking bays. This will maintain line of sight. As it is, the existing parking arrangements serve to slow traffic slightly - this may be a better outcome in the long term than removing them.
	<b>P 30 Policy PI.5</b>	Insert "roads adjacent to"

Ref No. & Name	Subject/section	Comment
	<b>5.2</b>	Why is this in parentheses? (B1010)
	<b>Policy PI.6</b>	Remove "need to" and "on a scheme"
	<b>Policy PI 10</b>	Insert "and to the railway station"
	<b>Policy PI.11</b>	Append: "and seek similar provision at the Maple Way / Foundry Lane crossing." (Eastern Road bridge) + amend to "across the town centre at prominent locations, e.g. the railway station, health facilities, schools, retail, etc...."
	<b>Policy PI.13</b>	"Global Business"?
	<b>Policy PI.14</b>	Should maximise interconnectivity with Crossrail at Shenfield and Southend Airport
	<b>5.5</b>	Insert 'dedicated'. Replace Coop with Fiveways. Where is the masterplan available?
	<b>Policy PI.16</b>	Suggest "BTC will support planning applications for improvements to the railway station/Fiveways junction area which align to the aspirations of this Neighbourhood Plan" Implementation - is this really Network Rail's remit?
	<b>5.6</b>	What about the parking at the Marina?
	<b>Policy PI.17</b>	Re Millfields - note, this would be at the expense of recreational green space. this should be replaced elsewhere if it is to be built on.
	<b>Policy PI.18</b>	Suggest the Policy is modified to reflect that network providers ensure that <b>all</b> existing sites and new developments across the town receive at least 2 bars of GSM reception including 3g/4g provision.
	<b>Policy EC.2</b>	Provide examples of how this will be encouraged
	<b>Policy EC.3</b>	Insert "on both sides of the highway"

Ref No. & Name	Subject/section	Comment
	<p><b>7.1</b></p> <p><b>Policy EN.4</b></p> <p><b>Policy EN.6</b></p> <p><b>Policy RI.1</b></p> <p><b>10.2</b></p> <p><b>Policy HO.7</b></p> <p><b>P70 - NHD.13</b></p>	<p>Incorrect. "Some parts..." better</p> <p>Nebulous. Define or remove this policy</p> <p>"Protect and expand the range of materials accepted at the recycling amenity centre...."</p> <p>Ist bullet - "and cycling"  2<sup>nd</sup> bullet - this could include the small public beach, much used in the summer  Potential 4<sup>th</sup> bullet - Add a bullet point to consider the creation of a natural amphitheatre near the beacon and/or an inspirational and tourist-attracting art installation</p> <p>Windfall - "have already been incremental approved applications and are..."</p> <p>End 2<sup>nd</sup> Para - insert "railway station"</p> <p>2<sup>nd</sup> sentence - be clear that these are attributes which should be avoided</p>
<p><b>20 Pigeon Land</b></p>	<p><b>Promotion of identified Strategic Site S2 (i) South of Maldon Road</b></p> <p><b>S1</b></p> <p><b>S2</b></p>	<p>1.4 Pigeon has submitted a planning application that seeks to deliver housing, employment and community facilities in Burnham-on-Crouch. The site area of the planning application includes the LDP allocations S2 (i), for 180 homes, and E1 (q) for 3.4 hectares of employment. The planning application also includes the land between the two allocations</p> <p>2.3 In a number of paragraphs of the Neighbourhood Plan the remoteness of Burnham-on-Crouch is highlighted. This does not reflect the current situation.</p> <p>3.1 S1 does not accord with the draft LDP Policy S2, or paragraph 2.81 of the draft LDP. LDP. Policy S1 should not refer to Burnham as having a "target" of 450 homes as this does not comply with the District's strategic planning policy which sets minimum housing requirements.</p> <p>3.2 Policy S2 should reflect the findings of the Maldon District Council Employment Evidence and Policy Update July 2015 which identified a need for an additional 11.1 hectares of B uses employment land in the District including the 8.4 hectare allocated in</p>

Ref No. & Name	Subject/section	Comment
		<p>the LDP.</p> <p>3.4 Extension to the Burnham Business Park should include B8 uses.</p> <p><b>CS2</b> 3.5 This policy conflicts with LDP policy S6. The development of Burnham West (S2(i)) proposes providing community facilities where required. Revise policy to include strategic location as suitable locations for community facilities.</p> <p><b>CS6</b> 3.7 Policy CS6 does not reflect the current position with regard to primary school places. Suggest revised policy wording.</p> <p><b>CS7</b> 3.11 CS7 should be amended to recognise the opportunity of providing early years education alongside employment premises.</p> <p><b>PI20</b> 3.12 This policy states that all small applications and development proposals (i.e. under 10 homes) will need to commit to fund front loaded mitigation works to the sewerage/surface water infrastructure. This goes beyond what is required of such planning applications and is in excess of District and national planning requirements.</p> <p><b>EC1</b> 3.13 EC1 is unclear when it states that a range of office sizes and types should be provided. The policy should reflect the range of uses proposed in LDP policy E1.</p> <p><b>EC6</b> 3.14 EC6 should contain more flexibility, revised wording is suggested.</p> <p><b>HC3</b> 3.15 Do not support the restriction on cul-de-sacs. The wording re: cul-de-sacs should be removed</p> <p><b>HO1</b> 3.19 HO1 is not necessary as it requires compliance with the other policies in the Plan and the LDP. 3.20 The requirement for Design &amp; Access Statements for all developments is contrary to the NPPG.</p> <p>3.22 HO3 is not clear on its aim of having housing for the elderly 'close' to shops and services and how this sits with LDP policy S6. A range of housing for older people should</p>

Ref No. & Name	Subject/section	Comment
	<p><b>HO3</b></p> <p><b>HO5</b></p> <p><b>HO7</b></p>	<p>be provided on the strategic sites. Delete reference to 'close to shops and services.'</p> <p>3.23 Policy HO.3 requires that housing developments of 5 or more dwellings should achieve 12 "greens" against the requirements of "Build for Life" and be eligible for "Build for Life Outstanding Status." Such requirements should be dealt with by building regulations.</p> <p>3.24 HO5 - The reference to affordable housing is unclear. It would be better to state that affordable housing will be required as set out in the LDP.</p> <p>The representation to HO7 relates to the LDP allocation S2(i) and planning application for Burnham West.</p> <p>3.26 Fig 11 indicates low rise development should be located along Maldon Road and Creeksea Lane frontages. It is not clear what low rise development is. If bungalows, then this is out of character with the area. Bungalows should be located along the eastern edge of the development.</p> <p>Open space – the location of this should not be restricted</p> <p>3.29 The guidance on Burnham West should reflect these proposals (listed in para 3.28).</p> <p>3.30 Additional wording to the policy is suggested to provide flexibility.</p> <p>4.1 We appreciate the need for good design in any area and are pleased that the quality design of the Burnham West planning application has been recognised by the officers and members of the District Council. Essex has a comprehensive and well respected design guide that is known as the Essex Design Guide. The design principles in Appendix 1 need a number amendments where they go beyond the requirements of local and national planning policy and beyond the Essex Design Guide. Detailed comments are provided.</p> <p>4.2 The status of Appendix 1 is unclear (policy or guidance?).</p>
<b>21 RHS / Sadler / Tolhurst</b>	<b>Promotion of identified Strategic Sites S2 (j) and</b>	<p>The representation to HO8 and HO9 relate to the LDP allocations S2(j) and (k) and the planning application on S2(j)</p> <p><b>HO8</b> – Welcome that Fig 12 is entitled as providing indicative design guidance. A number</p>



Ref No. & Name	Subject/section	Comment
	<b>S2(k)</b>	<p>of the principles outlined are supported. The suggested access along the western edge of the Academy school field is considered to be unrealistic. The eastern part of the site has potential for a sensitive low density development, delivering safe vehicular access from Southminster Road.</p> <p><b>HO9</b> - Welcome that Fig 12 is entitled as providing indicative design guidance. A number of the principles outlined are supported. The references in the policy and supporting text to 'simple urban blocks' should not prevent alternative forms of development coming forward. The setting of St Mary's Church could be achieved through a smaller area of land, in conjunction with appropriate landscaping. There may be other ways of achieving sufficient open space to meet local needs. Flexibility should be retained and proposals judged on their merits.</p> <p>The explicit reference to requiring contribution towards improvement of Marsh Road is of some slight concern, and needs to be viewed in the context of application of the tests in the CIL regulations, although it is welcomed that Para. 10.8 does make reference to the importance of compliance with the NPPF and in particular the role of viability as a key consideration.</p> <p>Former Reserve Site (RE3) – Planning permission has been granted on the southern part of the site. It is considered that the remainder of the site would still make a valuable contribution towards meeting future housing needs.</p>