

QUESTIONS AND STATEMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

TO THE CABINET MEETING ON 2 MARCH 2021

Land North of South Woodham Ferrers Masterplan

1. Alan Brunning – To be put in person at the meeting

1. What changes have been made to the Masterplan by the Sustainable Development committee as directed by the policy board
2. Why is traffic data collected for Essex Highways by Ringway Jacobs 18/19 October 2016 and modelling by Vectos in 2019 not suitable to assess the feasibility of this plan.
3. Why hasn't the growth in commuter traffic from the towns to the east of SWF been considered in this plan
4. On what basis can Essex Highways declare that the extra crossings will improve traffic flow on the B1012 at peak times?
5. How can CCC planning state that the B1012 will become '*more akin to a street*' if traffic flow will be increased?
6. Please can Essex Highways reconcile the incompatibility of Q 4 and 5 above.
7. Why increase capacity at Hamberts' and Old Wickford Road roundabouts when the capacity of the Burnham / Hullbridge road junction between the two cannot be increased?
8. Why does the Plan declare flow can be increased at the Hullbridge road junction (3), what is the truth?
9. How can a traffic pollution baseline be established before the detail transport assessment is presented?
10. Who will check and verify the traffic survey results and detail modelling when available from the developer?
11. Where will the through traffic go when the B1012 becomes 'a street'.
12. Can Planning and Highways confirm there is no plan to re-route through traffic via Ferrers Road?
13. Why do Officers expect SWF and Dengie residents commute and shop by bike to make this plan feasible? This directly contradicts core planning policy DC4.
14. How do Highways expect the SWF and Dengie residents to get to work without using their cars?
15. How can the plan deliver the required 3m wide footways for cycling route Corridor A when there is no scope or land to widen the existing footways or roads.
16. If this masterplan is passed what scope is there for the Planning committee to recommend major changes in the routing of the B1012 when the Feb survey shows it highly congested.
17. What is the long term plan to handle the projected traffic for the construction of Bradwell B?

2. Peter Brewerton – To be put in person

Please see separate document

3. Mike Hall

Chelmsford City Council – D115326 Local Flood Risk Management Strategy;

Future development in South Woodham Ferrers should be steered away from the high and medium flood hazard zones into areas of reduced flood risk.

Fenn Brook each side of Burnham Rd is designated by E.A as **High Risk Zone 3**.

SuDS DRAINAGE SCHEMES FOR MASTERPLAN;

Part D CIRIA SuDS Manual C753 requires all water drainage proposals should be accompanied with **stringent** maintenance plans in order to ensure its efficiency throughout its intended lifespan. This should also include information on who is adopting and maintaining the scheme.

- 1. Will there be a contribution from the SuDS financing to maintain and excavate silt in Fenn Brook between Burnham and Ferrers Rd since this section is fundamental to efficient drainage of the northside of Burnham Rd?***

FENN BROOK FLOODING ISSUES:

Environment Agency maintenance only comprises the cutting weeds once per annum. The major problems that exist are the build-up of silt reducing considerably its capacity, no work on this has been done since I have lived here since 1980. Fenn Farm Bridge represents a pinch point as it obstructs the flow of water in conditions of high pluvial water (June 2016 flood) and the greater risk with the combination of High tide and high pluvial water, this came within a whisker of pluvial flooding on 14/01/21. Photo attached.

There will be an additional risk following completion of the proposed development from the substantial increase in waste water/sewage to the existing Sewage Works, 1200 homes an additional – 396 Cubic Metres. The Outfall is fed into Fenn Brook which at high tide backflows upstream influencing stream height adjacent Old Wickford Rd.

My questions are;

- 2. Has any Modelling for additional waste water in Fenn Brook been carried out, and if so, what are the results?***
- 3. Will Fenn Farm Bridge be enlarged to allow greater flow capacity?***
- 4. What is the Environment Agency response to these increased risks?***

ANGLIAN WATER DRAINAGE ISSUES: Photo attached.

The day of the Masterplan Questions meeting 14/01/21, Old Wickford Road adjacent to the Whalebone Pub was flooded with sewage escaping from a drain cover in the road. This gradually fed into Fenn Creek over six hours. Sewage flooding has occurred three times in one year period, 16/2/2020, 18/06/2020 and 14/01/2021. Anglian Water were informed on every occasion, there is previous history of this as well.

A survey of Ferrers Rd residents up to Cornfields Rd resulted in a feedback of 30% confirming “regular” backing up of WC’s after heavy rain. This demonstrates the inadequacy of the Sewage infrastructure in this area. Residents are fearful of even more Sewage waste to be processed from 1200 extra homes; i.e 396 Cubic metres pumped into Fenn Brook per day. (Using Masterplan figures, 1 person 110 litres per day, 3 x person average per household, x 1200 houses)

Residents consider the existing drainage infrastructure is not fit for purpose. Anglian Water have not attempted to solve the “underlying” problems.

5. *What guarantees can be given that 1200 homes waste water will not exacerbate sewage flooding and W.C back-up and existing problems will be resolved?*

TRAFFIC CONCERNS, BURNHAM AND FERRERS RD’S

The Promoters of the Ringway Jacobs A.M Peak Flow Survey data showed 85% Traffic Free Flow capacity, sampled around 08.45 hrs. This is either an error or a deliberate act to mislead decisions by C.C.C and E.C.C Highways.

The actual A.M Peak Flow time is between 06.00 -07.00 hrs (evidence from Automatic Traffic Count Surveys, TomTom, local residents).

This invalidates the Ringway Jacobs data in compiling statistics for use in presentation such as Traffic Surveys and Modelling.

What has happened to Due Diligence of the Data by C.C.C and Highways, they are knowingly supporting self- interested Developers by supporting incorrect data!

PLEASE RECONSIDER!

6. *Who decided 08.45 was peak time flow for Burnham Rd, was it an error or deliberate?*

It is blaringly obvious that the impediments to efficient traffic flow in Burnham Rd will result in diversion to Ferrers Road. There is no transparent recognition by Highways to this, but they now feel the need to build a filter lane for west borne traffic at Shaw Farm roundabout. This will appeal even more to Rat Run traffic.

The Masterplan is designed to ensure the north development is cohesive with the existing town, but Ferrers Rd will become drivers chosen route thus dividing the south side of town instead, especially at peak times!

Estimates of 50-80% traffic is likely to divert to Ferrers Rd during peak periods!

Chaos, if Bradwell 2 becomes a reality since this appears not to have been taken into account.

7. *What solution is proposed to avoid Ferrers Rd Rat Running?*

- 8. *What are the proposals for extra Pedestrian crossings for Ferrers Rd***
- 9. *Ferrers Rd is subject to sinkage, additional HGV's will exacerbate this, Has this been taken into account?***
- 10. *Are the bridges in a condition to cope with increased numbers of HGV's***

FERRERS RD HEALTH & SAFETY ISSUES:

Shaw Farm roundabout exiting vehicles travelling south/east towards the West Railway Bridge accelerate heavily as the road elevates creating more exhaust fumes and associated noise. A 7 Day Automatic Traffic Survey also recorded 20% excess speeding vehicles of up to 90mph. The elevated road effectively exposes Ferrers Rd residents to air and noise pollution as there is no barrier to help deflect it.

On 15th July 2019, survey of 35 affected Household residents were unanimous in requesting reduction of Noise/Air pollution by appropriate means such as Noise Barrier, Traffic Calming and Noise absorbing road surface measures. This information was submitted to Essex Highways and local L.H.P Councillor however this has been ignored. Documents retained.

Ferrers Rd residents are seriously concerned and frustrated by the apparent lack of acceptance, consideration and concern by Highways and C.C.C on the expected large increase in Traffic that Burnham Rd impediments will effectively divert to Ferrers Rd.

- 11. *Ferrers residents demand appropriate solutions to noise and air pollution, will this be considered?***
- 12. *Automatic 7 Day Traffic Survey has recorded many speeding vehicles in excess of 60-80 mph on the crown of West Railway Bridge. What calming measures are proposed for Ferrers Rd?***

4. South Woodham Ferrers Town Council – To be put by Councillor R Massey

The South Woodham Ferrers Town Council welcomes the opportunity to comment on the Masterplan for site SG10.

Accomplishments

- The Town Council wishes to note for the record that level of engagement it has received from Countryside Properties and its Devcomms teams has been very professional, high quality, welcoming and indeed a very pleasant experience throughout this process and should be considered as a model for future development engagements of this type.
- We support the layout and green focus of the development and the amount of open space that is being provided.
- We support and are pleased with the commitment from the developers to ensure the whole site is constructed to Essex Vernacular design standards, in keeping with the rest of the town.

- We have noted the changes to the public transport commitments, and we are pleased that a (5 year) expansion of the 36 service, including its through journey to Broomfield Hospital, as well as enhanced links to Basildon, are now part of the Masterplan submission.

Clarifications

The Town Council raises the following points that we believe require further due diligence.

- The Town Council believes the pedestrian crossing of the Burnham Road for senior school pupils still remains unsafe and we would like to see more thought and consideration for safer crossings to be examined.
- The Town Council would like to see the new primary school constructed and brought into operational use as soon as possible as this will reduce crosstown car journeys, a problem already identified by the submission from Essex Highways. Trying to juggle existing capacity and catchment areas will increase journey distances for all our primary school pupils and create considerably more car journeys.
- The question of traffic on the Burnham road and through to the Rettendon Turnpike will always be an emotional one, and the Town Council has strived to remove all the emotion from our rationale. The Town Council cannot form a reasoned opinion on any other potential traffic issues of the roadway due to the lack of comprehensive and verifiable surveys and/or accurate modelling.
- The Town Council notes that there are still significant drainage capacity issues to be addressed and we acknowledge that talks are on-going with Anglian Water. The Town Council has considerable concerns that a couple of issues still require addressing, these being the current Burnham Road drainage not having the capacity to carry further run off and ensuring that the lowest point on the Masterplan site can handle the distribution of wastewater which, based on the Masterplan, will be for around 75% of the whole site.

Key Points Summary

The Town Council would welcome more opportunity to be engaged regarding the use of the 'recreational land' as we have many demands from a number of sports that could benefit from more local facilities. We believe this overall use should not just be weighted around the traditional commercial 'pitches for hire' models between rugby, football and cricket.

The Town Council believes that throughout this Masterplan process, the planners have not fully comprehended the uniqueness of the South Woodham Ferrers Site 10 within the whole Local Plan process. South Woodham Ferrers is not an urban or sub-urban location, it is a semi-rural location. As a consequence, the dependency on road travel and the car will always remain higher than for the other development sites located within the urban and sub-urban zones of Chelmsford. The on-going need to expand the successful Chelmsford City Park & Ride effectively demonstrates the need that semi-rural communities will require good car access to Chelmsford and give further weight to this rationale.

South Woodham Ferrers both needs and supports the City of Chelmsford to be a successful, environmentally aware centre of commerce, shopping, culture and trade. We welcome this development and understand the need for new homes for our community to grow and prosper. However, the Town Council still believes the Burnham Road, the pedestrian and cycle crossings and the general road transport infrastructure solution requires more work

before 'locking down' and handing over to the professional teams of the developers and planning lawyers in the pre-planning stage.

The Town Council would strongly support the cabinet in its decision to request more due-diligence and evidence-backed design of proof of a sustainable pedestrian, road and cycle transport policy before giving the final approval to this otherwise very competent Masterplan for South Woodham Ferrers.

5. Andrew Thorpe-Apps – To be put in person

The Master Plan for South Woodham Ferrers sets out the proposals for the site which are to be discussed by Cabinet. It is fully understood that this is not a planning application but public comments have rightly concentrated on highway matters which will no doubt be commented on at Cabinet.

When this site was suggested by the previous Conservative Administration in 2016 and incorporated in the draft Local Plan it was their understanding that Essex Highways would upgrade the A132 to a dual carriageway to overcome existing problems on that road.

The Local Plan adopted by the Liberal Democrat Administration in May 2020 does not show that dualling will be carried out, despite the fact that existing residents of South Woodham Ferrers had reluctantly accepted that the road improvements would be the trade-off for 1000 new homes.

The Master Plan shows 1200 new homes, a 20% increase in numbers, but no commensurate increase in benefits for all those using the A132.

Would the Cabinet Member comment on why the original aims of using this site have not been followed through and what actions are being taken to ensure that the proposed traffic surveys will be based on the latest information, including the traffic from the building of Bradwell Power Station?

6. Purleigh Parish Council

My Council remains greatly concerned about the implications of this plan, should it be approved by Cabinet at its meeting scheduled for 2nd March 2021, which it believes is inadequate to cope with the potential effects of Bradwell B and the 1,000 plus homes proposed to the north of Burnham Road.

Members are of the opinion that in terms of traffic management and related infrastructure, Chelmsford City Council and all relevant decision makers, including Essex County Council, need to treat the proposals for Bradwell B and the large-scale development planned for South Woodham Ferrers as one issue, with ambitious future-proofed proposals to ensure the safe and efficient movement of traffic through the town. Chelmsford City Council's response to the Bradwell B consultation advocated the '*... consideration of highway mitigations around the town such as a South Woodham Ferrers by-pass...*' and yet this potential solution seems to have been ignored in the current version of the Masterplan which replaces a by-pass with

a series of six pedestrian crossings and a new roundabout, the effects of which will combine to create a slow moving traffic jam, and an increase in pollution in very close proximity to a school.

Purleigh Parish Council is greatly concerned about traffic flow from the Dengie Hundred and the even narrower bottleneck South Woodham Ferrers will become should a by-pass not be created. It only takes one or two incidents to bring entry and exit to the town to a standstill during peak times as it is, without the vast amount of extra traffic that will be created by the new homes planned for the north of Burnham Road and those resulting from Bradwell B (an estimated 500–700 two-way HGV movements per day and traffic generated by the movement of a huge travelling workforce during the construction phase.) There is a real opportunity at this juncture to resolve these issues, to benefit both the environment and local economies.

Burnham Road struggles to cope at peak times, exacerbated by traffic generated by new housing developments in Maldon, Southminster, Burnham, Tillingham and other parishes in the Maldon District. Any measures introduced such as crossings and a new roundabout which will further slow traffic will make the situation worse, and emerging from a pandemic it is even more important for decision makers to create a sustainable, accessible and efficient highway network for employers, employees and the movement of goods.

My Council fears that limited resources have resulted in a lack of coordination between decision makers which will adversely impact residents of the parishes in the Dengie Hundred such as Purleigh and Stow Maries many of whom, with inadequate public transport options, are forced to rely on an efficient highway network to get to and from their places of work at peak times.

Regarding Bradwell B, my Council notes that both the strategic routes proposed utilise the B1012 through South Woodham Ferrers to cater for all Bradwell B traffic movements, and is the main evacuation route in the event of an incident. Chelmsford City Council quite rightly in its response to the Bradwell B consultation stated that South Woodham Ferrers needs a new by-pass. My Council would therefore ask that before Chelmsford City Council approves the Masterplan, the planned six pedestrian crossings and new roundabout on the B1012 are replaced with a new northern by-pass.

The gridlock resulting from the recent works to the Hamberts roundabout in South Woodham Ferrers, and the damage to verges in Stow Maries during these works, has also emphasised the need for a by-pass north of South Woodham Ferrers.

My Council supports Stow Maries Parish Council and the Woodham Infrastructure Group in their request that infrastructure issues are addressed and implemented prior to the commencement of building works to the north of Burnham Road and that the proposed Masterplan before you be rejected and subsequently amended to include the creation of a new northern by-pass.

7. Mayland Parish Council

We wish to express our concern and alarm given the lack of appropriate infrastructure to accompany the new developments in all areas that are reliant on the B1012 (Burnham Rd) for

traffic access and egress. The plans as they stand do not make sense and are a recipe for gridlock.

Furthermore the withholding of important data is indefensible.

We have seen the information produced by Mr Alan Brunning, a member of The Woodham infrastructure group (W.I.G) and are fully in agreement with it.

We demand that all relevant data is made public and that these plans are revised before the developers are given the go ahead given that this will limit the options for a satisfactory solution to the highways problem.

8. Cold Norton Parish Council

Cold Norton Parish Council understands that the Cabinet Meeting of Chelmsford City Council will consider approving the Masterplan for South Woodham Ferrers at the meeting scheduled for 2nd March 2021. Of particular concern to the Councillors of Cold Norton Parish Council is the inadequacy of the infrastructure planning to mitigate the inevitable increases in traffic resulting from proposed new housing and industrial developments.

The critical issue to address in the long-term is increased housing capacity in Maldon, Burnham-on-Crouch and South Woodham Ferrers and the effect on the existing road network in and out of the Dengie peninsular. It is essential that the extent of roads which are currently subject to upgrading be reassessed: without the additional upgrading of the road network (between South Woodham Ferrers and the Rettendon Turnpike interchange with the A130) there will be daily gridlock around South Woodham Ferrers which will not only affect local residents but also be extremely detrimental to the smooth flowing of construction traffic and employees attempting to access Bradwell B.

When assessing traffic flows, allowance should also be made for the future major increase in local traffic loads on the B1012 around South Woodham Ferrers now that there is approval for a major new housing and industrial development which is solely to be accessed from the same stretch of B1012. This major pinch-point will seriously impede traffic flow into and from the Dengie.

Cold Norton Parish Council wishes to express its concern and alarm given the lack of appropriate infrastructure to accompany the new developments in all areas that are reliant on the B1012 (Burnham Rd) for traffic access and egress. The plans as they stand do not make sense and are a recipe for gridlock.

It is understood that original planning was based on traffic volumes given to the Planning Inspector which were known to be outdated and inaccurate. Apparently more recent data produced for Countryside Properties, Sainsbury's and KFC is considered proprietary and therefore cannot be shared. Furthermore, The Highway Authority does not undertake the traffic flow modelling and it is up to each individual development to model its own impact mitigation proposal. Clearly there needs to be an overriding study of the combined impacts and mitigation strategies.

My Councillors have seen the information produced by Mr Alan Brunning, a member of The Woodham Infrastructure Group (W.I.G.) and the response from Cllr Mike Mackrory to his email highlighting several issues.

Whilst being supportive of the principles of Sustainable Development it is clear, that whilst city dwellers may have viable, and to some extent, acceptable travel alternatives with short distances and cycle routes, residents of villages in the Dengie countryside have no reasonable option than to use private car transport out of necessity rather than politically correct choice.

The Councillors of Cold Norton Parish Council believe that all relevant data should be made public and that these plans are revised before the developers are given the go ahead as this will limit the options for a satisfactory solution to the highways problem.

9. Stowe Maries Parish Council

Steeple Parish Council wish to express their concern and alarm given the lack of appropriate infrastructure to accompany the new developments in all areas that are reliant on the B1012 (Burnham Rd) for traffic access and egress. The plans as they stand do not make sense and are a recipe for gridlock.

Furthermore the withholding of important data is indefensible.

We have seen the information produced by Mr Alan Brunning, a member of The Woodham infrastructure Group (W.I.G.) and (a sample of which we enclose) and are fully in agreement with it.

We respectfully demand that all relevant data is made public and that these plans are revised before the developers are given the go ahead given that this will limit the options for a satisfactory solution to the highways problem.

10. Woodham Walter Parish Council

Woodham Walter Parish Council wishes to comment about the Plan as regards to the lack of sufficient infrastructure to support the growth in housing and population. Our particular concern relates to traffic movements. Motorists will likely want to find many different routes in and out of the South Woodham Ferrers area given the likely negative impact on the B1012. Woodham Walter has already seen a significant impact by the expansion of Maldon on the A414 and local roads and would not want this to be exacerbated.

Other Questions

Susan Sullivan

At last week's Full Council meeting the Liberal Democrat Administration ignored the Petition put forward by thousands of local residents, myself included, and agreed to charge users of Hylands fees for parking. This will mean those who wish to walk their dogs having to pay £3 each time they park, as will those using the award-winning playground.

New playgrounds have been put in in other areas of Chelmsford by the City Council and these are essential, particularly at this time, so that children can benefit from exercise and fresh air.

It is accepted that, since the first suggestion of proposed charges, a belated consultation on how to charge is underway. Is this an indication of plans to charge for parking at other Parks in the future?

Can the Cabinet member confirm that the Administration is not looking at charging for parking in Chelmsford's parks and open spaces such as Galleywood Common and is instead looking at ways of saving costs rather than trying to increase income from those most in need at this time?



