

CHELMSFORD POLICY BOARD – 12 January 2023

PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND STATEMENTS

Item 5 – Strategic Growth Site Policy 7 – Great Leighs Masterplan

1) Mr B – local resident

In relation to my previous comments, already made to the masterplan and the recent planning application concerning 7b & 7c, can I please ask you to give serious thought to mine and our neighbour's dilemma here in BanTERS Lane at Great Leighs.

To give a brief overview, I completed a self-build project in 2012 where the design and access statement clearly stated that due to the site falling outside of the village development boundary it was classed as semi-rural therefore building height was not to exceed 1.5 stories. Glass-link doors were required to break-up building mass and as to aid ramblers to see countryside behind! Move on now 10 years and these build aspects can be changed and removed, surely some consideration of previous planning rules has to be given to existing properties??

A big objection and concern that I hold is that my Neighbour at Corner Cottage is being given circa 20 metres of green edge to buffer from any new build, whereas my property is being given zero. Please see the attached image showing the oak beams & plain glass feature I have at the rear of my property, in the part of 7c where build if allowed at 2.5 stories - this will be overbearing to my property and affect our privacy. We're also set to experience severe light loss if new plots are positioned nearby which will affect the fabric of the property as it is of Eco design and relays on winter sunlight when available to help heat the internals.

I request that the Committee could discuss and amend to allow a green buffer and landscaped hedgerow to follow on from as recommended in the masterplan hedgerow along BanTERS Lane. I also request it to continue around to the rear boundaries of Rosylea and the woodlands.

Finally, within the local masterplan the landscape statement calls for the hedgerow and mature trees that separate the 2 parcels of land of 7b & 7c to be kept unchanged to allow some screening to the main 7b parcel of development. Please also note that all mature trees have been removed in 2022 and relocated around Moulsham hall. I request these to be reinstated & be it recommended in the final masterplan.

I chose to build initially on this piece of land as it was rural, unlit, dark, considerably quieter & surrounded by countryside. Please seriously consider our concerns as we do not wish to be incorporated into this development.

2) Mr P

Good evening Members. In addition to (Savills) statement, I would like to cover a couple of additional points, also relating to Site 7A.

1. Building Heights and Density (para 3.22 - 3.56)

We suggest the inclusion of clarifying text to the legend within the Building Heights Plan in response to comments proposing lowering heights along the northern edge of the two neighbourhood centre parcels and western extent of the northern 7a parcel.

The height plan currently sets “up to max 2 storeys” heights for the northern development parcel, and “up to max 3 storeys” for the neighbourhood centre parcels, which are not set building heights but “up to” parameters only. It is normal practice that building heights and specific building locations are determined through the rigorous process of PPAs and planning application work informed by technical assessments - including heritage assessment and Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, undertaking testing of set viewpoints and provision of building wirelines.

We propose the building heights included in the document remain unchanged but are qualified with the following additional wording to ensure a robust and defensible position for the planning authority.

Building Heights legend and/or document text to include the following:

“Actual building heights and locations in the context of sensitive receptors (listed buildings) to be tested and determined by technical input through planning application preparation to include Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment.”

2. Access to the northern parcel of 7a from Moulsham Hall Lane

The landowner is disappointed that officers cannot at this time support the proposed access, despite significant evidence and benefits put forward. In the absence of a robust highways reasoning for this decision, we accept the removal of the access for the purposes of approving the Framework Master Plan, but the landowner reserves their right to pursue this issue further through a planning application at a later date.

3) Mr D

Good evening members, and thank you to officers for the detailed presentation and comprehensive report. I'm here to speak in support of the Great Leighs masterplan on behalf of the consortium of landowners and developers.

The masterplan is the culmination of a great deal of detailed design and technical work. The final proposals have been developed alongside both council and county level officers. There has also been extensive engagement more widely, involving key local stakeholders and members of the public. Therefore, we are pleased that officers are endorsing the masterplan subject to a small number of further considerations.

The consortium wishes to make the following comments:

1. *Upgrading of Chase Side Bridge to improve accessibility for cyclists (paragraph 3.33)*

In response to this further consideration, the consortium are happy for the final masterplan version to include a requirement to investigate in more detail the feasibility and viability of improvements to the Chase Side Bridge route for cyclists, within the context of the retention of the existing bridge structure.

We trust that this suggestion is helpful and can be agreed, and we request that members support the officer recommendations. I am joined by the masterplan architect, and highways specialist, alongside representatives from the consortium. Together, we would be happy to answer any detailed queries.

4) Mrs C – Local Resident

Hello to all,

I strongly disagree with this proposal NEWEST SITE to be included

The traffic that it will undoubtedly cause on London road would be far greater than is already, having a show peoples site on the proposed London road would be detrimental to the value of our property and of those in the immediate vicinity of this site, I believe I would not feel safe and at risk in my own home. My understanding there has already been an agreed location that complies with the councils required planning on the previous proposal.

I fear that if this goes through the next step would be that the green belt buffer between Great Leighs and Youngs End would disappear. The possibility of further building on the land next to my house XXX which has on record todate been twice refused due to increased traffic which is already unacceptable. The impact to residents' mental health through anxiety, which I unfortunately suffer with would undoubtedly have a negative

impact.

i.e traffic which is already loud and heavy and very regularly exceeds the forty miles an hour limit. Conservation of woodland on both sides of the London road, the wildlife and natural character and history of the local area are all at extreme and unacceptable risk of loss.

We all need to know your destination as our mental health depends on it .

I urge you to think about this not happening and the racecourse can have the show peoples site next to the new houses as already proposed and agreed and not to the detriment of the local resident of Youngs End for the sake of increasing profits for the developers and attractiveness salability of the houses on the new developments at Great Leighs.

Thank you for your time