

OBJECTING TO WELBECK LAND'S PLANNING APPLICATION AT ROMANS FARM

Welbeck has now submitted their Planning Application to Maldon District Council for 200 new houses on land at Romans Farm off Mill Road.

Planning ref 25/00840/OUTM, Land adjacent Romans Farm Chase and Mill Road Burnham-on-Crouch Essex.

If you are also opposed to this, NOW is the time to formally object!

Closing date for any comments is 29 October 2025.

Top Value Objections

These are the points we believe will carry the most weight with planners. We recommend everyone uses some of these in their objection letter(s). You might not be able to add much to these points as they are simple statements of fact.

Land supply and housing need

Objection	Reference
Maldon's Local Development Plan (LDP), adopted by the Secretary of State, does not allocate any housing to Burnham-on-Crouch beyond the three strategic growth areas. This site is not in a strategic growth area.	Maldon District Local Development Plan LDP
Maldon's LDP anticipates only 450 houses in Burnham-on-Crouch with development restricted to the three strategic growth areas because infrastructure in the town is not sufficiently developed to support further growth.	Maldon District Local Development Plan – Policy S6, p40
The MLDP states that " <i>outside of defined settlement boundaries, planning permission will only be granted where the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside is not adversely impacted</i> ". This site is outside the settlement boundaries for both Burnham-on-Crouch and Stoneyhills (Policies Map for SE Maldon District) so the proposal does not comply.	MLDP Policies Map SE Area and Maldon District Local Development Plan – Policy S8, 2.101, p45

Further Objections

- We recommend everyone also includes some of these
- There is some content in our sample letter, but you don't have to use all of them! Just delete any you don't want to use. Reword them if you prefer
- You can add your own words to say why you think the proposal doesn't comply with it, and why you think this point is important
- Remember this might be read by a **PLANNING INSPECTOR WHO HAS NEVER SEEN BURNHAM-ON-CROUCH OR STONEYHILLS.**

If this goes to appeal then our objections will go to the Government's Planning Inspectorate, which is based in Bristol.

They won't know Burnham-on-Crouch - so sell it to them! Tell them about the beauty, the remoteness, the sense of open space. Let them know about the character and historical side of Burnham-on-Crouch and Stoneyhills.

Sustainability

Objection	Reference
The MLDP requires that developments <i>"seek to reduce the need to travel, particularly by private vehicle"</i> .	MLDP Policy D2, p51
The MLDP states that the Council's strategic approach to improve accessibility is to <i>"reduce the District's over dependence on the car, reduce carbon emissions, and benefit the health and wellbeing of residents"</i> .	MLDP Policy T2, 7.12, p110.
The NPPF states that <i>"...it should be ensured that... sustainable transport modes are prioritised taking account of the vision for the site, the type of development and its location"</i> .	NPPF 115, p33.
The Environmental Sustainability Appraisal objectives in the LDP are <i>"to reduce emissions of greenhouse gases and to maintain and enhance the quality of the countryside ... and local landscape character."</i>	MLDP Appendix 3, p140.
If you use the points above, you'll probably want to say that Burnham-on-Crouch doesn't have jobs for 200 households; that the bus service is not well developed and the nearest bus stop is beyond a reasonable walking distance from houses on this site, and that the nearest shop is over twice as far from the site than people are motivated to walk so people are extremely likely to drive to work and for shopping.	LDP Policy T2, 7.11, p110.
The LDP states that <i>"the Council will seek to ensure all new developments are well connected to existing public transport routes"</i> and that <i>"all development will ... have regard to ... proximity of local transport"</i> .	MLDP Policy H4, p88.

Natural Environment

Objection	Reference
The NPPF states <i>"Planning... decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by protecting and enhancing valued landscapes...; recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside"</i> and that <i>"development should, wherever possible, help to improve local environmental conditions"</i> . Development on this site will cause significant harm to the character and appearance of this rural landscape.	NPPF, 187, p54.
The MLDP states that <i>"the Council's priority is to protect the countryside for its intrinsic value"</i> , and that <i>"development will be largely restricted in the countryside to protect its character and attractiveness"</i> .	MLDP Policy S8 2.103 p46
The NPPF states that authorities should <i>"limit the impact of light pollution on local amenity, intrinsically dark landscapes and nature conservation"</i> .	LDP Policy D2, 3.10, p51 NPPF, 198, p57

Character, history, distinctiveness, amenity

Objection	Reference
The NPPF states that developments should <i>"add to the overall quality of the area"</i> and <i>"[be] sympathetic to local character and history, including the... landscape setting..."</i> .	NPPF 135 p39
This is a good place to write all about the character of Burnham-on-Crouch and Stoneyhills – remember the Bristol Planning Inspectorate people don't know what it's like here!	

The LDP states that all development will have regard to " <i>the impacts upon the amenities of neighbouring properties</i> ".	MLDP Policy H4, p88.
Here's a good place to talk about how good it is to enjoy the beauty and open space of a rural agricultural field as you walk along the footpath beside it.	
The LDP states " <i>It is important that any growth would [reflect] the size and function of the settlement.</i> "	LDP 2.29, p20.
You'll want to know that this development would increase the number of houses in Mill Road and Stoney Hills by 200, which would be a 142% increase in the number of dwellings.	NPPF 70 p18
The MLDP states that " <i>growth will be concentrated in the most sustainable, accessible and appropriate locations, taking into account constraints and the need to protect valued local countryside.</i> "	MLDP 2.4, p12
There are not the jobs here for 200 households so people would drive to work. People would drive to shop. The proposal is to build on rural agricultural land – which is "valued local countryside".	
The MLDP states that " <i>All development must ... protect the amenity of surrounding areas taking into account... outlook... [and] visual impact</i> ".	MLDP Policy D1, page 48
Another good point to use when describing the enjoyment and the beauty and open space of this rural agricultural field, is the visual impact from Public Footpath no 14. If you live in Mill Road – write about the <i>visual impact</i> on the <i>outlook</i> of building here (just don't talk about "the view").	

Education

Objection	Reference
The NPPF states that " <i>it is important that a sufficient choice of school places is available</i> ". Another 200 homes will mean more children have to travel away from Burnham-on-Crouch to school. Also, the nearest primary school is a CofE school, so would not be an option for some families. The development would therefore reduce choice.	NPPF 100 p29

Engagement

Objection	Reference
The NPPF states that " <i>Early engagement has significant potential to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the planning application system for all parties</i> ".	NPPF 40, p13
The results of Welbeck Land's public engagement through a website only based consultation clearly show that over 99% of residents are against the development. The consultation leaflet to residents was poorly drafted and contained which were misleading. Nonetheless the views of the community have been ignored.	

Infrastructure

Objection	Reference
The LDP states that all development will have regard to " <i>the capacity of local infrastructure</i> ".	LDP Policy H4, p88.
If you use this point you may want to be aware that the applicants own submission clearly states that Anglian Water will object because the infrastructure in Burnham-on-Crouch will not cope with more homes at this site. Residents in Mill Road have experienced sewage overflows. GP and dentist surgeries are already over capacity and there is no NHS dentist in the town.	

Road safety

Objection	Reference
The NPPF allows Development to be refused " <i>if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety</i> ".	NPPF, 116, p33.
If you use this point please be aware that <u>traffic jams and poorly parked cars are NOT valid planning points</u> only road <u>SAFETY</u> can be considered. Mill Road is too narrow for vehicles to pass safely down the road and there are frequent instances of vehicles going on to the pavement to pass each other. This creates risks to highway safety because of the conflicts between vehicles, pedestrians and bicycles. There is one footpath along the north side of Mill Road and it is below the minimum standard width for wheelchair and pram users thus also increasing the level of risk to highway safety from conflict between road users.	