

## EB023

### Regulation 14 Summary of Responses - 2015

#### Vision

Langford & Ulting will continue to be a friendly and neighbourly place to live and work in. Future development will meet the needs of this rural community whilst retaining the special qualities of our countryside and waterway setting and reflecting the historically dispersed nature of and diversity of styles in the evolution of our Parish.

Note: Names are given only for organisations; responses from individuals are anonymised and referred to be reference number only.

	Comments	Comment	Action
8	Reference to "protecting open space within the village as well as the surrounding countryside including the landscape, views and habitats" is to be encouraged and welcomed	Noted	NAR
9			
10	Are friendliness and neighbourliness objectives upon which a Neighbourhood Plan can be based?	Noted	Both objectives considered important by PC and these attributes are supported through the responses received

Policy 1 Protecting and Enhancing Biodiversity			
	Comments	Comment	Action
1			
2			
3	Surface Water Management: Keen to see new developments managing surface water through SuDS Infrastructure: A foul drainage solution should be approved/implemented before commencement/occupancy of any new development	Covered by criteria (f)	NAR
4	Importance of SuDS in protecting biodiversity has been acknowledged Opportunities should be sought to provide open space/sustainable transport links/wildlife and ecological value/climate change resilience/ improved water quality and flood risk management Incorporation of green and/or brown roofs and walls	Plan seeks to achieve these issues as far as it achievable to do so	NAR
5			
6			
7			
8	Policy broadly compliant with NPPF paragraph 109 Provision of green infrastructure as part of new development proposals can provide opportunity	Agree	NAR
9			
10			
11	Broadly consistent with N2 of LDP	Agree	NAR
12	Preserve rural feel	Agree	NAR
13	The natural environment and biodiversity should be maintained	Agree	NAR
14	I enjoy the local environment and would like to see it preserved for future generations	Agree	NAR
15	Well rounded policy for protecting local environment, flora and fauna	Agree	NAR
16	Retains and enhance nature of village	Agree	NAR
17	It is vital to protect our beautiful countryside and preserve it for future generations	Agree	NAR
18			
19	Living in the Parish the majority of my life (Langford) let's keep it as it is, with minor changes	Agree	NAR

20	The countryside should be respected in all aspects	Agree	NAR
21	It is important to protect every aspect of the countryside	Agree	NAR
22	Improving drainage will reduce incidents of sudden flooding. Preservation/encouragement of wildlife is essential for human well-being and survival	Agree	NAR
23	Protects existing style of village	Agree	NAR
24	But would add: "encourage good practice in hedgerow management and drainage in farmland."	Noted but would be difficult to achieve through planning policy	NAR
25	It's about right	Agree	NAR
26			
27			
28	Correct but not too extreme	Agree	NAR
29			
30	We need to preserve the countryside we have and build accordingly	Agree	NAR
31	We have some beautiful open areas and a general feeling of countryside in Langford which it's important to protect	Agree	NAR
32			
33	Any development should enhance biodiversity	Agree	NAR
34	The rural landscape is home to a wide variety of wildlife - development should respect this	Agree	NAR
35	Because we live in a very rural area, where wildlife is and should be in abundance. It is part of the beauty of this area, and it is hugely important that it is protected. There are areas (especially the lane towards the golf course) where there is a lot of unsightly litter, and the organisation of working parties to clear this would help (I would support and hopefully other members of the community would do likewise): – could be advertised in The Beacon magazine. (A prevalence of litter only encourages others to add to it, rather than taking pride in their village.) And/or maybe some “take your litter home” signs at the end near to the Beeleigh Falls would help - where people have their picnics and dump the residue. Also, many of the rights of way have dogs’ used “poop bags” littered around or even caught on trees. More strategically-placed dog litter bins would help.	Agree	NAR
36	It is important to keep the rural feel of our community and to protect this in any future developments	Agree	NAR

Policy 2 Public Rights of Way and Bridleways

	Comments	Comment	Action
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8	Improved footpaths and bridleways offer opportunities for walking and cycling and can be used to provide sustainable transport options	Policy aims to achieve this	NAR
9			
10			
11	Broadly consistent with T2 of LDP	Noted	NAR
12	Rural footpaths remain an important leisure amenity	Agree	NAR
13	The footpath network is a critical part of the Parish infrastructure and should be maintained and developed where possible. Existing paths should be joined up to provide easy, safe routes such as crossing the B1019	Agreed	Add encourage connections to existing networks
14	I make extensive use of the local paths and bridleways - good outdoors exercise	Noted	NAR
15	Use footpaths and bridleways frequently and would hate to lose access to them and the countryside	Policy aims to protect existing networks	NAR
16	Respect access	Policy aims to protect existing networks	NAR
17	These should also be protected for future generations	Policy aims to protect existing networks	NAR
18			
19			

20	These should be protected for future generations	Policy aims to protect existing networks	NAR
21	These should be protected for future generations	Policy aims to protect existing networks	NAR
22	Reduces likelihood of ramblers walking through crops etc	Noted	NAR
23	Agree as worded	Noted	NAR
24	But would add "permissive paths" - ie S106 agreement with Essex Water Co.	Not appropriate to add in permissive paths	NAR
25	Speeding traffic is a concern	Agree	NAR
26			
27			
28	OK	Agree	NAR
29			
30	The present bridleways are very important for social and exercise reasons for us and new residents to enjoy	Agree	NAR
31	They are a great source of fun to explore and cycle along	Agree	NAR
32	Creation of bridleways should be given more prominence. Suggest following rewording: "Existing public rights of way provide a high level of amenity value and will be maintained and protected (if necessary by authorised diversion) and every opportunity will be taken to create new rights of way and bridleways in particular, and the network enhanced where new development takes place, funded by S106 agreements where possible."	Difficult to add in S106 agreement	Policy 2 reworded to make more robust
33	Don't want to lose any bridleways etc	Agree	NAR
34	Footpaths/bridleways in the Parish are all well used	Agree	NAR
35	For the very reasons stated – i.e. these rights of way make a very important contribution to the quality of life and the health of the community and, as such, are greatly valued.	Agree	NAR
36			

Policy 3 Design and Character

	Comments	Comment	Action
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8			
9			
10	(e) Subjective statement - difficult for development to achieve and therefore unsound by virtue of its ineffectiveness Alternative: "New development should respect the historic environment in relation to designated and non-designated heritage assets through sensitive design and construction techniques"	Noted	Suggested rewording is covered by Policy 4. In addition MDC points out that policy is broadly consistent with LDP and as they have not raised an objection, wording not altered.
11	Broadly consistent with D1 of LDP. Note that decision making is responsibility of MDC and both LDP policies and NP policies will be taken into account	Agree	NAR
12	Keeps buildings in keeping	Agree	NAR
13	The varied style of the buildings in the Parish contributes significantly to its character. Large number of identical or "built to a standard model" houses are not appropriate in this environment	Agree	NAR
14	Important to retain the character of the area but it may be necessary for a high wall or hedge to "hide" a necessary but unsightly building - ie. Allow high boundary where it would be beneficial	Noted	Policy would not preclude high boundary treatment where appropriate
15	We are a small parish so any development will have an impact, it is important that it follows and fits with existing properties	Agree	NAR

16	To "fit-in" and be sympathetic with location	Agree	NAR
17	We need to keep and enhance our local designs	Agree	NAR
18			
19			
20	Design and character are important to retain the character of the village	Agree	NAR
21	Design and character should be compatible with the existing aesthetics of the village	Agree	NAR
22	Plots, including gardens, plus improved drainage (see Policy 1), will help mitigate the effects of flash flooding	Agree	NAR
23	Poor quality design and materials would spoil village	Agree	NAR
24	Ticks all the boxes	Agree	NAR
25	Reasonable	Agree	NAR
26			
27			
28	In keeping with location	Agree	NAR
29			
30	We must preserve the village character by fitting any new design of building to what we have already	Agree	NAR
31	It's important to have new buildings fit in and blend with the existing	Agree	NAR
32			
33	New developments should be well designed and in keeping with existing landscape	Agree	NAR
34	Important to keep dispersed character of housing in the Parish	Agree	NAR
35	The whole character, appearance, and environment within Langford & Ulting are unique in this area and, as such, there is much charm, peace, and tranquillity (marred only by the busy main road). Just one building being noticeably different in character would spoil this setting, and we should all do our best to protect the characteristics of our village and have pride in it	Agree	NAR
36	It is imperative that the feel and cohesiveness of the villages is protected whilst not mitigating against new building.	Agree	NAR

Policy 4 Historic Environment

	Comments	Comment	Action
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8			
9			
10	The policy states that heritage assets "will be conserved and enhanced" making the policy unsound (NPPF paragraph 137) Suggest: "Heritage assets in the Parish and their settings will be preserved or enhanced"	Noted	Change wording "Any designated heritage assets in the Parish and their settings will be conserved or enhanced..."
11	Broadly consistent with D3 of LDP. Note that decision making is responsibility of MDC and both LDP policies and NP policies will be taken into account	Agree	NAR
12	Keep the heritage	Agree	NAR
13	The parish has a number of important buildings and these and their surroundings should be conserved	Agree	NAR
14	Historical nature should be preserved but maintaining this may be at odds with modern low carbon energy solutions - eg solar. Could therefore consider making exceptions to allow low carbon energy generation	Noted	Policy would not preclude such development, no need for an exception as covered by Policy 10
15	It is an important part of maintaining the appearance and atmosphere of the villages	Agree	NAR
16	To "fit in" and be sympathetic with location	Agree	NAR
17	Conservation is essential to maintain our heritage	Agree	NAR
18			
19			



20	The village has been built around historic sites	Agree	NAR
21	All historic sites should be conserved as they are what the village has grown around	Agree	NAR
22	In the interest of future generations	Agree	NAR
23	Care needed	Agree no need for change to policy	NAR
24	Covers everything	Agree	NAR
25	No need for change	Agree no need for change to policy	NAR
26			
27			
28			
29			
30	We must preserve the village character by fitting any new design of buildings to what is here already	Agree	NAR
31	Yes, strongly agree that Langford's history should be preserved as we are all part of it.	Agree	NAR
32			
33	We think the historic heritage of our village should be maintained	Agree	NAR
34	There are a lot of listed buildings in the Parish which are part of its history	Agree	NAR
35	Because all of the designated heritage assets and their settings are part of the intrinsic nature of this village. It is therefore vitally important to protect them. We recognise and understand the concern for the present demise of "The Homestead" and we do hope that the owner/s can be persuaded that there is local government funding available to support them in any efforts to restore the building to its former beauty and to make it habitable. It's possible the occupant believes that to accept such funding would bring about a commitment to "following regulations". Perhaps a letter from the District Council explaining the extent of funding available, and that with or without such funding, listed buildings will always have stricter regulations applied – maybe that would help.	Agree	NAR
36	Obvious in a small rural village.	Agree	NAR

Policy 5 Supporting and Encouraging Small Business

	Comments	Comments	Action
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8			
9			
10	It should be acknowledged that Oval Park forms an existing employment site with and has extant planning permission for additional floorspace and is allocated in both the adopted Local Plan 2005 and the emerging draft Local Plan	Agree	Added "Because it is the case that CML is an allocated employment site"
11	Broadly consistent with S7 and E4 of LDP. Note that decision making is responsibility of MDC and both LDP policies and NP policies will be taken into account	Agree	NAR
12	Happy to encourage small businesses	Agree	NAR
13	Provided that any changes do not adversely harm the amenities of adjoining or nearby residential occupiers	Agree	NAR
14	Small business should not be impeded	Agree	NAR
15	Local work is important to the life and vibrancy of the parish. Helps to keep young people in the area. Needs to be in keeping with existing development	Agree	NAR
16	Encourage entrepreneurs, less commuting	Agree	NAR
17	If there is enough call for it	Agree	NAR
18	Do not require small business in rural area	Noted	However NPPF supports strong, prosperous economy
19			

20	Small businesses should be encouraged if they do not have an adverse effect on the neighbourhood	Agree	NAR
21	It is important to encourage small business in a way that it does not impact on adjoining properties or the rural life	Agree	NAR
22	To a degree	Agree	NAR
23	Especially with modern means of communication	Agree	NAR
24	Presumably this will include barn conversions such as that at Langford Hall	Agree	NAR
25	Within reason	Agree	NAR
26			
27			
28	Obvious to achieve sustainability. Work hubs often impractical due to available space. Live/work units need to be kept in proximity to accommodation	Agree / Noted	NAR
29	Work hub in a housing area would cause car/van movement dangerous for children and noisy. Better in a small business area	Work hubs appear in Policy 6, comment noted and rolled over to Policy 6	Addressed in Policy 6
30	Yes, but not to carbreaking or intrusive businesses. I worked from home myself in a granary.	Agree	NAR
31	New business should be encouraged as long as operating from sympathetically converted premises	Agree	NAR
32			
33	We support the regeneration of the community	Agree	NAR
34	Only support small businesses that do not cause nuisance to neighbours	Agree	NAR
35	I agree that residents should be able to earn a living from home or from a local small business if that's possible. It does of course depend on what type of business – those that encourage tourism, such as b&b's or holiday lets would be good, because they in turn bring more business to the whole locality, without much disruption to others. But businesses can produce noise, smells and extra traffic, and this possibility should be considered, and such businesses should have consent refused.	Agree	NAR
36	We have a surprising number of small, home-based businesses in the two villages and this should be encouraged and provided for.	Agree	NAR

Policy 6 Working from Home

	Comments	Comment	Action
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8			
9			
10			
11	Note that decision making on new residential development and residential extensions in the rural area is the responsibility of MDC and this process will take account of both LDP and NP policies in place at the time. Provision of work hubs is considered to be desirable but is considered to be difficult to deliver in practice given the relatively small scale of new housing development being planned for the village	Noted	NAR
12	Encourage and help those working at home	Agree	NAR
13	Only to the working from home element. Disagree with work hubs part of policy	Noted	More explanation of work hubs given in supporting text to clarify
14	Not sure why this has to be built into planning - isn't a spare room enough? Remove - too prescriptive	Noted	More explanation of work hubs given in supporting text to clarify
15	Agree with need for home working but not sure why all properties should be required to provide for this	Noted	More explanation of work hubs given in supporting text to clarify
16	Support multi-use dwellings, less commuting, encourage entrepreneurs	Agree	NAR
17	No brainer!	Agree	NAR
18			
19			

20	Our local roads are becoming congested and accessible local employment would be an advantage	Agree	NAR
21	With the increasing impact vehicles have on our road systems it is good to encourage employment for local inhabitants	Agree	NAR
22			
23	Especially with modern means of communication	Agree	NAR
24	Presumably this would include a suitable new building in a garden (eg. sheds)	Agree - policy seeks to prioritise integral design	NAR
25			
26			
27			
28	In village of this size very necessary	Agree	NAR
29			
30	Yes, it would help the village to be more of a community to have people working from home and of use to each other	Agree	NAR
31	It makes sense for new homes to include space for home offices if needed	Agree	NAR
32			
33	Where possible the provision of a work hub/office should be considered	Noted	NAR
34	Particularly work hubs if a large estate were to be built in the future	Agree	NAR
35	I don't agree or disagree. To do away with open-plan spaces in all new dwellings would go against a very popular trend amongst young families. It may be a case of supply and demand, in that developers keenly watch what designs are popular and build accordingly. Probably the demand for working at home is quite small, so only a small proportion of homes will be built to accommodate that.	Noted	NAR
36	We have a surprising number of small, home-based businesses in the two villages and this should be encouraged and provided for.	Agree	NAR

Policy 7 Farm and Other Rural Buildings

	Comments	Comment	Action
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8			
9			
10			
11	Broadly consistent with E4 of LDP. Note that decision making on conversion of farm and other rural building in the rural area is responsibility of MDC and both LDP policies and NP policies will be taken into account	Agree	NAR
12	Use farm buildings as long as in keeping	Policy 9 addresses this issue	NAR
13	Criteria set out in the policy statement are critical	Agree	NAR
14	Important to find a good use for buildings which might otherwise become run down	Agree	NAR
15	As long as it is not rampant and is sympathetic to existing community	Agree	NAR
16	Agree as worded; new life vs dilapidation	Agree	NAR
17	Excellent re-use of buildings		
18			
19			
20	It is right to enhance the neighbourhood by utilising farm buildings which would otherwise be left to decay	Agree	NAR
21	Many rural buildings are left to decay so to use them to enhance the local area and amenities is a	Agree	NAR

	positive approach		
22	Help tourists appreciate the area	Agree	NAR
23	Current practice throughout the District	Agree	NAR
24	But should not the same conditions apply to barn conversions for residential use	As currently worded the policy allows conversion of rural buildings in certain circumstances	NAR
25	No dirty industries	Criteria in policy would ensure amenities are protected	NAR
26			
27			
28			
29			
30			
31			
32			
33	We agree with the re-use of farm buildings for business or tourism but would also include there use for dwellings for local people (re gov. initiative)	Policy 9 addresses this issue	NAR
34	But scale of business must comply with Policy 5	Some larger scale businesses may be appropriate in existing buildings, sufficient safeguards within policy	NAR
35	It is much preferable to restore an old farm building to a good use such as this (so long as sympathetically done), than having these old buildings starting to fall down through lack of maintenance when they become un-needed	Agree	NAR
36	Sensible policy and much better than allowing farm/rural buildings falling into disrepair and becoming an eyesore through lack of use.	Agree	NAR

Policy 8 Community Facilities and Services

	Comments	Comment	Action
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8			
9			
10	New services and facilities will be supported subject to access and highways Query first bullet point as considered to be subjective and difficult to apply to development and suggest it is amended to state: "The service or facility does not conflict or cause harm to the amenity of nearby residential uses"	Agree	Criteria (a) changed to suggested wording
11	Broadly consistent with S7 and E3 of LDP. Note that decision making on community facilities is responsibility of MDC and both LDP policies and NP policies will be taken into account	Agree	NAR
12	Keep community facilities	Agree	NAR
13	Criteria set out in the policy statement are critical	Agree	NAR
14	Important to help bind local community	Agree	NAR
15	Particularly agree that traffic levels and available parking should be considered	Agree	NAR
16	Retain village cohesion	Agree	NAR
17	Sensible idea	Agree	NAR
18			
19			
20	A rural location needs appropriate community facilities and services	Agree	NAR
21	Community facilities and services are important in a rural location provided they enhance the area	Agree	NAR



22	Community facilities and services are important in a rural location provided they enhance the area	Agree	NAR
23	Strict control needed	Noted	NAR
24			
25	Increase in traffic should be considered	Traffic covered by criteria b) of policy	NAR
26			
27			
28	This will only work with an increase of population	Overall approach of plan is to support an increase in population including young people	NAR
29	Village needs more youth	Overall approach of plan is to support an increase in population including young people	NAR
30			
31	It is important to have community facilities to unite the village	Agree	NAR
32			
33	Support new well managed facilities	Agree	NAR
34			
35	yes – this all sounds very logical.	Agree	NAR
36			

Policy 9 New Housing in the Parish for Local People

	Comments	Comment	Action
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6	<p>Single plot dwellings would supply the required additional capacity in the village but policing/control of this policy is a concern</p> <p>Will create uncontrolled, unsustainable rural development it should be clearer which plots will be allowed</p> <p>Needs qualification to allow the churn of local property to go to local people, affordable homes and accessible property for older people to downsize into</p> <p>Policy not sound, contrary to government policy. Problem with unsustainable locations / NPPF and LDP policies</p>	<p>Comments taken into account in re-wording policy</p>	<p>Policy 9 reworded</p>
7			
8			
9			
10	<p>Consider policy is unsound. 10 year residency condition is neither justified nor effective or consistent with national policy. No justification from the evidence base to support such a policy. Policy would be difficult to enforce and could give rise to inconsistent consideration of PAs in the District. Policy should be rewritten - no suggested wording.</p>	<p>Comments taken into account in re-wording policy</p>	<p>Policy 9 reworded</p>
11	<p>Inconsistent with H9 of the LDP. Rural exception sites are outside the defined settlement boundary and are subject to the process set out in H5. Policy 9 should be re-written to remain consistent with the approach of MDC</p> <p>Policy also inconsistent with data collected from May 2014 Housing Survey, RCCE Housing Needs Survey</p>	<p>Comments taken into account in re-wording policy</p>	<p>Policy 9 reworded</p>

12	Unnecessary to limit to local residents	Noted	Note support for policy, consideration has been given to deleting the local connection statement, but this is not the intention of the policy
13	Policy requires some additional criteria - In particular about the maximum number of houses created through this method	Noted	Plan cannot set maximum or target number
14	Risk that single plot houses would be too expensive for first time buyers. Allow permission for lower cost option	Noted	Policy would not preclude low cost option. Affordable housing is important for the village
15	It is important that people (especially the young) with a connection to the community should be able to find housing locally	Agree	NAR
16	Prevent family dispersion	Agree	NAR
17	We need housing for locals	Agree	NAR
18	Too many on plan already		
19			
20	Smaller houses to accommodate local needs would be beneficial in maintaining village life	Noted	NAR
21	It is valuable to retain the aspect of village life for local residents by encouraging small developments	Agree	NAR
22	But not to discourage "new blood"	Noted	Note support for policy, consideration has been given to deleting the local connection statement, but this is not the intention of the policy
23	Parish Council and MDC have long recognised need for a few affordable homes for local families or offspring	Noted	NAR
24	But the policy should not exclude the selective development of small sites which don't demonstrate the specified local connection. The latter often relates to affordable housing provided by a Housing Association (ie. Local nomination rights)	Noted	Note support for policy, consideration has been given to deleting the local connection statement, but this is not the

			intention of the policy
25			
26			
27			
28			
29			
30	As long as we stick to the rules	Agree	NAR
31	Not sure if this means new housing is only granted for the needs of people in the parish or who have connections? If so, this is slightly exclusive of newcomers. Fresh blood often breathes fresh air into a village!	Noted	Note support for policy, consideration has been given to deleting the local connection statement, but this is not the intention of the policy
32			
33	Strongly agree with all aspects of this policy as we have family who would like to live here again	Agree	NAR
34		Agree	NAR
35	I do agree that, if there is evidence that people with local connections want to stay in the village and would not otherwise be able to, this would be a good idea. In Purleigh a dedicated old-people's home was built on the initiation of local people. It has worked well, and provided homes not only for people from the village who can't cope at home but also to help people in the village who have elderly relatives who need to live closer to them. Here is the link: <a href="http://www.purleigh.com/popha.htm">http://www.purleigh.com/popha.htm</a>	Agree	NAR
36	This is at the heart of the Plan and permits development in the villages consistent with the historical building pattern that has taken them to their current size but will prevent swamping the villages with unsuitable 'blocks' or rows of housing such as are not present in their current make up and will prevent an urbanisation creep that could all too easily happen. Whilst not, perhaps, in line with housing policy in Maldon that policy is for a much more urban landscape and is not suitable for small, rural situations.	Agree	NAR

Policy 10 Energy Efficiency and Sustainability

	Comments	Comment	Action
1			
2			
3			
4	<p>As well as helping the environment, simple changes resulting in the more efficient use of resources could save UK businesses approx. £23bn a year.</p> <p>Over the next 20 years demand for water is set to increase but there is likely to be less water available due to drier climate and tighter controls on abstraction.</p> <p>New development should be designed to be as water efficient as possible.</p>	Agree	NAR
5			
6			
7			
8			
9			
10	Support proposals to meet Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4	Agree	NAR
11	No objection as this is consistent with D2 of the LDP	Agree	NAR
12	Encourage energy efficiency	Agree	NAR
13	Energy efficiency is critical	Agree	NAR
14	<p>Important for environment - best way to reduce energy consumption.</p> <p>Allow provision for low carbon energy provision on existing houses</p>	Agree	NAR
15	I would like to see it possible to use more methods of generating green energy	Agree	NAR
16	Reduce environmental impact	Agree	NAR
17	Sensible	Agree	NAR
18			
19			

20	It is important that homes are built to a high ecological standard to protect the environment	Agree	NAR
21	It is important that homes are built to a high ecological standard to protect the environment	Agree	NAR
22	I think this is a national requirement anyway	Noted	Policy reworded to accord with National Policy subsequent to drafting Plan
23			
24	Fine	Agree	NAR
25			
26			
27			
28	Yes this is covered by Building Regs already	Noted	Policy reworded to accord with National Policy subsequent to drafting Plan
29			
30			
31			
32			
33	Energy efficiency should be high priority	Agree	NAR
34			
35	Clearly it is good for the environment if we don't have to use so much fuel to keep our homes warm. We live in an old house, which had poor levels of roof insulation. But now that it is well-insulated, the upstairs of our house is warmer in the winter, cooler in the summer, and we spend less on our heating.	Agree	NAR
36	An absolute must for new builds.	Agree	NAR

Policy 11 Local Fibre or Internet Connectivity

	Comments	Comment	Action
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8			
9			
10	Development on a single plot unlikely to provide the critical mass necessary to trigger improvement	Agree	Policy aims to encourage provision
11	Consistent with S7 of the LDP	Agree	NAR
12	Improve broadband offering	Agree	NAR
13	Broadband connectivity is critical for the future	Agree	NAR
14	Vital to allow small/medium business to flourish - consider overhead cables as well as ducted for those away from highway	Comment taken into account	Policy reworded
15	Good to have high speed broadband for both home and local business	Agree	NAR
16	Build in / Future proof	Agree	NAR
17	If only .....	Agree	NAR
18	High speed internet - waste of money and time	Noted	Surveys show this is an important priority for the community as a whole
19			
20	If local businesses are to be encouraged it will be necessary to have efficient internet access	Agree	NAR

21	An efficient internet connectivity is necessary if small businesses are to be encouraged	Agree	NAR
22	Probably - too technical for me	Noted	NAR
23			
24	Fine	Noted	NAR
25	Badly need internet connectivity	Agree	NAR
26			
27			
28	Very poor in Witham Road - private booster needed	Noted	Policy aims to improve situation
29			
30			
31			
32			
33	Strongly support any improvement in service	Agree	NAR
34	No comment		
35	Yes, I agree that broadband speeds need to be increased - not only saves the frustrations of private users but is much better for business.	Agree	NAR
36	Agree but somewhat aspirational at the moment!	Agree	NAR



Policy 12 Development within the Settlement Boundary for Langford

	Comments	Comment	Action
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6	Forward thinking proposal to allow modest growth around core of village to accommodate sustainable development	Agree	NAR
7			
8			
9			
10	Agree that support should be given for sustainable development within the Langford Settlement Boundary But it fails to take into consideration of established properties in Ulting Lane and established business at Oval Park which represent important elements of the settlement	Noted	It was considered that given MDC's proposed settlement boundary, the plan's suggested boundary was large enough and justifiable
11	Alternative boundary identified would allow significant expansion of the village (approx 4 times the physical land area) to the detriment of its existing character. Settlement Boundary needs to be tightened up. Rural settlement boundaries will be further considered as part the Council's forthcoming Rural Allocations DPD	Noted	Parish Council proposed boundary is justifiable
12	Encourage sustainable development	Agree	NAR

13	Settlement boundary proposed is far too extensive. Settlement boundary should not allow houses to be built behind the existing row of houses - thus retaining the linear nature of the village (ie a single row of houses along the main roads)	Noted	It was considered that given MDC's proposed settlement boundary, the plan's suggested boundary was large enough and justifiable. Other policies safeguard character and landscape of parish
14	Maintain character of village	Noted	NAR
15	The proposed boundary seems much more sensible	Agree	NAR
16	Prevent over-development / Can sewerage system cope?	Noted	NAR - dealt with case by case
17	Sensible	Agree	NAR
18	Too many houses in Heybridge already planned	Noted	Plan seeks to deal with development proactively to sustain parish in the future
19			
20	A settlement boundary is important to protect the village from becoming part of an urban sprawl	Noted	NAR
21	A settlement boundary is important to protect the village from merging into one large settlement with adjoining villages	Noted	NAR
22			
23	The extended development boundary proposed makes more sense. The MDC proposal would prevent further houses	Noted	NAR
24	Larger boundary makes sense	Noted	NAR
25			
26			
27			
28	In my opinion not enough suitable space for meaningful development, allocated sites do not make best of future opportunities	Noted	Support noted for larger boundary but boundary put forward is justifiable

29	Several houses are left out and there is little extra land available for any future development	Noted	Support noted for larger boundary but boundary put forward is justifiable
30			
31	Very important to have a boundary defined with the Heybridge North garden suburb coming so close	Noted	NAR
32			
33	"N/A"		
34	But would not want any backland development allowed	Noted	Other policies safeguard character and landscape of parish
35	If by "settlement boundary" you mean the boundary of the area within which development would be allowed, then we both disagree. Although some new dwellings will be needed, and although the ones just recently started outside of the development boundary (next to Langford Lee) promise to be very attractive buildings in sympathy with their surroundings, we feel that to increase the settlement boundary to such an extent, in this ribbon-development fashion, could encourage too much new development, to the extent that the very character of the village would be altered detrimentally. Indeed, under the webpage <a href="http://www.planningni.gov.uk/index/policy/rural_strategy/psrni_regional_policies/psrni_design/psrni_des07.htm">http://www.planningni.gov.uk/index/policy/rural_strategy/psrni_regional_policies/psrni_design/psrni_des07.htm</a> - Ribbon development has consistently been opposed and will continue to be unacceptable, primarily on grounds of visual amenity, reinforced on occasions by road safety objections. This type of development is not attractive. It often uses suburban siting and design solutions which are detrimental both to the character and amenity of the countryside. It creates a built-up appearance when viewed from the road, it sterilises backland, often hampering the planned expansion of settlements and makes access to farmland difficult.	Noted	It was considered that given MDC's proposed settlement boundary, the plan's suggested boundary was justifiable. Other policies safeguard the character and landscape of parish
36	Settlement boundary. The proposed boundary in the Plan is sensible though can be brought into the back building line of housing if necessary. The boundary proposed by Maldon is ridiculously tight, corseting the village and allowing no space for development of any kind. Since the whole ethic of a Neighbourhood Plan is to manage building not to prevent it I don't see how this boundary agrees with that requirement.	Noted	Parish Council proposed boundary is justifiable

Other Comments	Comment
1 Against any further residential building, not just number of extra houses but all the ancillary expansion: too much traffic, over-stretching of services, loss of countryside amenities and general over-crowding	Neighbourhood planning proactively encourages development - see National Planning Policy Framework
2	
3	
4 The Plan would benefit from a policy or discussion around flood risk. Figure D2: Environment Agency Flood Plain Extents in Maldon of the Mid Essex Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (Appendix D – Maldon Supplementary Report) shows large areas surrounding the River Blackwater to be designated as Flood Zone 3b “Functional Floodplain”. This is defined as ‘land where water has to flow or be stored in times of flood’. According to Table 3 of the NPPF Planning Practice Guidance, ‘more vulnerable’ land uses (such as residential development) should not be permitted in this zone. This means that the Plan area is fairly heavily constrained in terms of flood risk and this has not been recognised or considered.	
5 Draft plan looks very good. Suggests toning down the Introduction ie "hostile" planning applications	Wording altered
6	
7 The Parish Council received and noted the Neighbourhood Plan	Noted
8	
9	
10 Support embracing and managing change (Foreword) Intention set out in Draft N Plan appears to restrict rather than embrace development Appears that N Plan was prepared in direct response to proposed residential development at Oval Park S3: Reference to the setting of the Waterworks and CML's existing premises	It should be noted that CML submitted a response to the Business Survey which negates some of the comments and a copy of this has been sent to GL Hearn CML was also sent a Landowner Intentions letter but no response was received Note support, plan has been made positively, plan made so community had a voice Reference to CML, Waterworks and Ernest Doe's to be added to text and

	<p>omitted from text</p> <p>"Larger tracts of new development have resulted in rather monotonous townscape making them stand out as incongruous features" - unclear what this refers to - not helpful or appropriate</p> <p>CML not mentioned in Economy and Business</p> <p>LDP allocates whole of Oval Park for Employment uses - not mentioned in N Plan</p> <p>N Plan should acknowledge extant planning permission for 5815sqm employment space at Oval Park</p> <p>Housing terminology needs substantiating with percentages</p> <p>Housing situation won't improve unless more housing comprising a mix of unit sizes and tenure is built</p>	<p>acknowledge extant planning permission</p> <p>Noted - sentence on monotonous townscape removed</p> <p>Plan sought to avoid repetition of Local Plan information - employment site</p> <p>Housing policies have been reworded to take into account comments received and evidence collected through Housing Survey and community consultation</p>
11	Further discussion with MDC with regard to Policy 9 and Policy 12	Meeting held 20th May 2015 to resolve MDC's concerns
12		
13		
14		
15		
16	Full marks to Parish Council for this initiative	Noted
17		
18		
19	The local Langford & Ulting Parish Council have done a very detailed report on what is best for Langford and Ulting, I congratulate them for that, and their suggestions should not be overlooked by MDC	Noted
20		
21		
22	A useful document that focuses the mind	Noted
23		
24	<p>Actively collaborate with MDC and other parishes with proposals to mitigate the impact and increased traffic through the village</p> <p>Does the settlement boundary mean that those living outside (but still within the</p>	Parish Council remains in partnership working with neighbouring Parish Councils to address issues. See Policy 9

	Parish) can have no expectation of any future development however it might comply with the stated policies? An excellent document! Well done	
25		
26		
27	The safeguarding of our trees in the village and not allow it to become open landscape	See Policy 1
28	Personally, I thought our jointly proposed site had great merit as living environment away from busy traffic!	Document plans positively for development for the future
29		
30	You have worked so hard on this - well done	Noted
31	Thank you for putting so much time into this	Noted
32		
33		
34		
35		
36		