

Appendix 3 Summary of Officer Comments, Consortium Responses & Final Position

Original DFD Page No.	New DFD Page No.	Section	Consultee/Officer Comments	Consortium Action/Response	Topic	Consortium response	Final Position
6	6	Introduction	<p>Essex Police have recommended that the opportunity to apply 'Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design' (CPTED) practices should be maximised; their consultation response contains a list of measures to be considered within the architectural design of the scheme – these centre on access and movement, structure, surveillance, ownership, physical protection and management and maintenance.</p> <p>Essex Police recommend consideration be given to the following:                      -Bus Access Gates – Discussion re: the design and specification of the bus gates and consideration to emergency service access through this network.                      -T2 Hangar and Romney Hut – An understanding of the intended purpose for this heritage asset to ensure that the proposed development would not be detrimental to it.                      -Location of the Travelling Showpeople Site – Further consultation regarding the location, proximity, and accessibility of the proposed site and to ensure an integrated co-existence between the site and the local community.                      -Roads Policing Consultation – Liaison to take place with the Roads Policing Team regarding any potential impact on the road network.                      -Construction Considerations – Given the phased construction of the development, a robust security regime will be fundamental to ensure the development does not encourage crime. Security plans and policies will be required not only for the various land parcels, but offices, mechanical plant, machinery, building supplies, tools and other vehicles.</p>	<p>Comments noted and will be addressed at RMA Stage. <b>No action</b></p> <p>Comments noted and will be addressed at OPA Stage. <b>No action</b>                      Zone 2 OPA Team are in the process of arranging a meeting with the Guild of Travelling Showpeople. <b>No action, pending responses from Travelling Showpeople. Amendments able to be made at OPA if needed.</b></p>	<p>Crime Prevention</p> <p>Travelling Showpersons Allocation</p>	<p>To be addressed at RMA stage.</p> <p>Feedback from responses would be useful. Require confidence on the accessibility of the site and connections to schools &amp; community facilities.</p>	<p>Matters will be addressed at reserved matters stage</p> <p>The Consortium have discussed the proposal with the Guild of Travelling Showpeople. A new Character Area page has been included in the DFD (Page 141) which confirms that the site will be designed in consultation with the Guild and their guidelines.</p>
10	10	Local Plan Policy	The ECC Minerals and Waste Local Plan should be referenced.	DFD will be updated. <b>Reference Added.</b>	Referencing within DFD	Unsure on placement of where these changes have been added; suggest more appropriately incorporated in, or just before, para beginning "Material Planning Considerations relevant to CGC include..."	The document confirms that reference will be made to the Essex Minerals Local Plan (2014) and the Essex and Southend-on-Sea Waste Local Plan (2017).
12-13	12-13	The Role of the DFD	<p>Comprehensive Development – Currently a commitment to the principle of comprehensive development is lacking from the DFD. The purpose of the DFD, site wide frameworks, outline masterplan and PFA is to ensure that the allocated site is developed in a comprehensive manner, with place making and garden town principles at the heart of the guiding principles; it would be helpful for the DFD to acknowledge the role that the PFA has to play in securing the commitment of landowners and development partners to work collaboratively in delivering a comprehensively planned new garden community which 'landownership blind', ensuring infrastructure is in the right place at the right time and to maintain standards and consistency of approach in terms of design quality, sustainability and future proofing.</p> <p>The DFD is currently not specific on PFA principles; it would be helpful to have a section within the DFD which specifically identifies the key outputs of the PFA in terms of infrastructure delivery, HIF recovery, expectations in terms of, for example affordable housing requirements, strategic infrastructure (and obligations on landowners to make land available as and when required so as not to undermine delivery), sustainability, biodiversity net gain, transport modal shift, waste management, provision of green infrastructure and template planning conditions to apply to each outline planning permission, monitoring and review and site wide strategies.</p> <p>The third paragraph states that the Stage 2 Masterplan will establish triggers for the delivery of infrastructure items; it would be helpful to confirm that the PFA will establish allocation principle for site-wide triggers with the detail in the IDP for the provision of shared infrastructure which the individual applications will then have to take account of, with site specific infrastructure being secured within the site specific s106 Agreements. No reference is also made to the IDP, which currently sets some high-level triggers for infrastructure.</p> <p>Can there be a new sub-section called – Status of DFD - where it is stated that as the masterplan is requirement of Local Plan policy, and has been subject to wide ranging public consultation, it is a significant material consideration when determining planning applications both for the developer consortium itself and any other developer that might build elements of CGC in the future. The PFA will ensure that there is a legal requirement for CGC to be built in a comprehensive and 'landownership blind' manner without ransom strips so as not to frustrate delivery.</p>	<p>Comments noted and DFD text will be updated as appropriate. <b>Subsection added to P13 on comprehensive development.</b></p> <p>Comments noted and DFD text will be updated as appropriate. <b>Reference to PFA added in commitment stage, but not considered appropriate to go in to any more detail. If people require further detail the PFA can be reviewed.</b></p> <p>Comments noted and DFD text will be updated as appropriate. <b>Reference added to right side column, paragraph 3.</b></p> <p>Comments noted and DFD text will be updated as appropriate. Full details of the consultation process included in the Statement of Community Involvement Evidence Base Document. <b>Section added.</b></p>	<p>Referencing within DFD</p> <p>Reference to and role of PFA</p> <p>Reference to and role of PFA</p>	<p>Addressed in amended DFD.</p> <p>To be addressed. Clarity is still required on what principles are covered in the PFA, the DFD could just list those aspects featured in CCC's original feedback comments so as to save the greater detail for the PFA itself.</p> <p>Addressed in amended DFD.</p> <p>Addressed in amended DFD.</p>	<p>A commitment to comprehensive development is now included at page 13 of the DFD</p> <p>The DFD has been updated on page 13 with wording to indicate what matters the PFA secures.</p> <p>A reference to the PFA and its role is included on page 13 of the DFD.</p> <p>The DFD includes a section on policy status at page 3; it confirms that the DFD is a significant material consideration when determining planning applications both for the developer Consortium and any other developer that may build elements of the CGC.</p>
16	16	Context	The ECC Archaeological Team have identified features that should be referenced within the DFD see consultation summary.	<p>The site context is a very high-level site description and given the size of the site it would not be appropriate to mention everything on this page. There are more detailed descriptions of the site included within the full suite of evidence base documents including the Cultural Heritage DBA. The Cultural Heritage Guiding Framework Strategy (GFS) confirms that each OPA will be accompanied by a detailed DBA, Archaeological Surveys and WSI.</p> <p>Please also refer to the submitted Site Context and Constraints Evidence Base Document that provides a more detailed description of the Site  <b>No action</b></p>	Site Context - Archaeology	The issue would be easily resolved with a short paragraph much like that on pg 18 that provides clear acknowledgement for the existence of archaeological features that may be on site. Current approach can be interpreted to suggest archaeology is a lesser consideration than heritage/transport/minerals/drainage. The specifics areas mentioned should be added to the map on pg 19.	The DFD has been updated to include a new section named Heritage and Archaeology - page 18; this notes that there are various areas of the wider CGC site which are considered to have archaeological potential. The plan on page 19 of the DFD directs the reader to the evidence base of the Cultural Heritage Desk Based Assessment.

19	19	<b>Constraints Drainage DFD - Sustainable Surface Water Drainage</b>	The DFD should state that an executive summary or a technical note will be provided with every application explaining how the whole drainage system is linked over the different phases; there should be a site wide approach to drainage.	Comment noted and this will be confirmed in the Sustainable Surface Water Drainage GFS (Page 82/83). The Evidence Base Document, Civil Engineering Infrastructure Statement includes details of how the site wide drainage strategy will be delivered including plans. <b>No action</b>	<b>Drainage Strategy</b>	The reference in the revised DFD is not apparent (neither on pg19 nor the section on Surface Water Drainage). Reference can easily be incorporated into para on pg 83 which begins "Each OPA will submit a surface water drainage strategy..."	The DFD has been updated at Pages 86 and 87 with various references to Sustainable Water Drainage Systems (SWDS) and a section showing core principles of the strategy.
			The DFD should reference adoption and maintenance considerations; specifically, arrangements should be made for the Stewardship Body to adopt SuDs. Discussions should take place with Anglian Water. <b>Detailed comments have been made with regards to existing water features, rainwater harvesting, and peak rainfall allowance; these are set out in the LLFA consultation response.</b>	Adoption and maintenance to be addressed at the OPA stage <b>No action</b>	<b>Drainage Strategy</b>	Appreciate detail will come at OPA stage, but reference to adoption and maintenance considerations and the anticipated role of the stewardship body should be added to the DFD.	The wording on page 87 has been updated, under the maintenance and adoption section, to clarify the responsibilities of the relevant stakeholders.
	<b>Drawing Site Constraints</b>	The area of Bulls Lodge Quarry known as Brick Farm, should be referenced on the drawing.	Reference will be added. <b>Actioned</b>	<b>Site Constraints Drawing</b>	Addressed in amended DFD.	Brick Farm reference added to plan on page 19.	
		The view between Park Farm and Mount Maskall should be reflected. The DFD should identify the views back towards Little Waltham from Powers Farm. The alignment of views between Powers and Pevereis should be corrected, and the historic parish boundaries and lanes and tracks should be shown.	Views are shown by yellow arrows on the plan on Page 19. Please also refer to the submitted Site Context and Constraints Evidence Base Document that provides a more detailed description of the Site and includes a section on Heritage and the plan on Page 10 includes the historic lanes. Due to the large size of the DFD it is not appropriate to provide all information in the document itself and this is why it is supported by a series of Evidence Base Documents that allow those who wish to review more detail to explain the background to the DFD to refer to the Evidence Base Documents. <b>No action</b>	<b>Site Constraints Drawing</b>	The view between Park Farm and Mount Maskall is included but other views are missing; Parish boundaries, lanes and tracks are still to be added. Discrepancies in alignment of views to be corrected.	The DFD has been updated with an arrow on the plan and updated key to show the view between Park Farm and Mount Maskall.	
20	20	<b>Extraction process, phasing and timescales</b>	Further clarification is required on land restoration with the areas around Park Farm and the deer park pale as these are sensitive. <b>In general terms it would be helpful to have a Gantt chart and plan to show the sequence of mineral extraction alongside the delivery of infrastructure including green/blue infrastructure.</b>	Page 20 provides details of the land restoration strategy including levels diagram and plan. Exact level restoration levels are not yet known and are being developed by the Zone 2 OPA team in consultation with ECC and CCC and full details will be provided at the OPA Stage The plan on page 20 shows the sequencing of mineral extraction across the site including how many years it will take based on the most recent Hanson s73 approvals. Section 9 of the DFD provides full details and plans showing the phasing and delivery of all infrastructure including green and blue infrastructure together with a Table on page 156 to 159 confirming what each OPA will deliver and when. <b>No action</b>	<b>Minerals Extraction Process</b>	Gantt chart would still be useful for visual understanding of the progression of development alongside the extraction process. Reference to phasing is accommodated in the later section on infrastructure, but there is currently nothing to show the anticipated relationship between development and extraction; this is fundamental as there will be several years where these will occur in tandem.	The DFD has been updated at page 19 to show the mineral extraction process and how this relates to the proposed phasing of the Chelmsford Garden Community.
21	21	<b>Park Farm Land and Restoration Levels</b>	The DFD states that there is to be no infilling, but it is unclear how the slopes can be reprofiled without importing additional fill material.	The DFD does not state there will be no infilling and confirms on page 21 that "Once the extraction process is completed in the Park Farm area, the residual holes will be infilled with the removed overburden and topsoil" <b>No action</b>	<b>Restoration Process</b>	True. The issue concerned how levels might be achieved without importing additional material (original feedback came from ECC).	The restoration strategy plan is set out on Page 20 of the DFD; this indicates how the Park Farm and Dukes Wood land parcels will be restored after extraction and what the land levels will look like.
		<b>Dukes Wood Natural Park &amp; Lake</b>	The DFD should clearly state the time required to fill in the lake, rather than "a number of years".	During the consultation process CCC requested that it was preferable not to be too specific about the size of the lake or the time it will take to fill. There are numerous variables and the exact size and time to fill it are unknown at this stage and therefore we cannot state this in the DFD as it may be misleading. <b>No action</b>	<b>Restoration Process</b>	The length of time does need to be better quantified; 'a number of years' is very open ended, a range should be included to anticipate how the lake may be able to serve/be utilised by the future community.	The DFD notes on page 20, that following extraction, the Dukes Wood Nature Park will be left with a large extraction area of lower ground; this will fill with water and become the park's lake over a period of approximately 20 years.
30	30	<b>Vision - Key Targets and Metrics</b>	15 min journey time – the DFD should clarify that this is by sustainable and active travel modes, and not by car.	DFD text will be updated to clarify <b>Updated</b>	<b>Vision Metrics</b>	Addressed in amended DFD.	The vision metric for 15 minute villages at page 30 has been updated and now states that day to day needs are accessible by an active journey of less than 15 minutes.
		<b>Key Metrics</b>	An additional metric should be included relating to the suggested aim for the CGC to achieve net zero operational energy balance on-site, and to strive to be energy positive, not just Zero-Carbon Ready. A further metric should highlight that this is to be a gas free development.	Meeting set up on 3rd October with ECC, CCC, Consortium and Turley <b>No action as net zero still to be agreed and not a critical requirement to add to this page.</b> This is confirmed in the Energy GFS and as gas boilers are banned in all newbuild homes from 2025 all new developments across the Country will be gas free. It is therefore not considered to be a key target or metric specific to CGC that warrants mention on this page.	<b>Vision Metrics</b>	No amendment made, but given justification, no further revisions are necessary.	Net zero carbon is covered in detail at pages 98-102 of the DFD.
37	37	<b>Vision</b>	Further to Government guidance, shared (unsegregated) footpath/ cycle tracks should not be the default arrangement. <b>A discussion is required between CCC and ECC regarding the interpretation of LTN1/20.</b>	DFD will be updated to include a plan showing primary and secondary active travel routes across CGC. <b>Page 66</b> Text will also be added to Chapter 10 (Design Code Framework) to include common overarching design principles for signage, street furniture, primary and secondary active travel route surface treatment as well as Essex Garden Community Street Typologies. <b>Page 168</b>	<b>Vision</b>	Clarity is lacking as to the timeframe within which the Site Wide Design Principles Document will be produced. Updated DFD and DR received - to be reviewed by ECC/CCC.	The approach to design coding and the process of agreeing a Site Wide Design Principles Document is still the subject of discussion between the Developer Consortium and CCC officers. The matter is intended to be addressed before the Cabinet meeting on 24th January.
39	39	<b>Vision</b>	Sketches have been provided for the off-plot parking before and after removal. However, there needs to be a clear strategy from the outset that sets out how these areas can be repurposed to reduce costs, how this is controlled and how this would be funded. This may easily be a stewardship issue.	Comments noted, the principle of removing off plot parking over time is set out in the DFD and the legal mechanism for how it is achieved will be included in the PFA. Further details will be provided at OPA Stage. <b>No action.</b>	<b>Vision</b>	Approach to removing off plot parking should be consistent across the garden community; as such, a site wide strategy is required to address how this will be implemented. The Parking Standards coverage within the Design Rationale (pg23) also does not provide this information.	The parking standards are set out on page 74; these are shown as baseline standards. The standards limit provision on plot whilst allowing additional off-plot parking in parking clusters, within walking distance of, but not adjacent to residential properties. The intention is that parking clusters can be genuinely repurposed for

		<b>Mobility Hubs</b>	The change from 3 to 2 variants of Mobility Hub is noted; however, at recent workshops there was discussion on the retention of tertiary Mobility Hubs, which could be a 'bus stop plus'; in practice, there are a range of facilities that will need to be considered in each location. References elsewhere in the draft DFD to 'bus stop plus' should be clarified. <b>A discussion is required between CCC and ECC regarding this issue.</b>	Advice from Mayer Brown and TPA is that two levels of Mobility Hubs are appropriate. Full details of what will be provided in each is set out in Appendix A4 (Parking Strategy) of the Movement and Transport Report Evidence Base Document <b>No action</b>	<b>Mobility Hubs</b>	Definition of 'bus stop plus' would still be useful for clarity. Review needed by ECC/CCC as to whether removal of a mobility tier is acceptable.	The text on page 73 has been updated and now indicates that the mobility hubs will accommodate bus stops. The hubs allow for the interchange between active travel modes and bus services.
40-43	40-43	<b>Inclusive Villages</b>	A broad commitment should be included within the DFD, which will lead to a requirement that all new homes will be constructed to Part M4(2) standards (or better) and a significant proportion (at least 5%) built to Part M4(3) wheelchair user standards, especially the affordable housing.  Urban design within the development has been approached from the perspective of future residents, particularly those who are vulnerable and/or those with mobility issues.	Housing design standards will meet Local Plan policy at the time each RMA is approved. <b>No action</b>	<b>Accessible Housing</b>	DFD wording states homes will be "capable of catering for all needs and adaptable over time" and "accommodate all residents needs and that can be adapted to suit changing circumstances"; for this to be true, it is fair to consider that all dwellings on site would meet M4(2)-accessible and adaptable dwellings as a minimum, since M4(1) dwellings are merely visitable, not adaptable. The level of provision would go beyond current Local Plan policy and would be supported by CCC. Support would also be given for the provision of M4(3) to increase above policy requirement. The initial feedback therefore is still valid; clarity is required as to the commitment to achieving the higher Building Regulations accessibility standards (or subsequent future accessibility standards).	Homes within the CGC will be built to cater to a range of needs as set out on page 40 of the DFD.
			The 'Inclusive Villages' section does not contain any references to the provision of specialist accommodation for older people, or those living with physical or mental disabilities.	Page 43 refers to the provision of homes for life to support residents through all life stages. It also refers to flexible and accessible facilities for those who are disadvantaged and people with disabilities. Reference is also made to inclusive and adaptable design for homes to all residents needs and that can be adapted to suit changing circumstances. <b>No action</b>	<b>Specialist Housing</b>	Given justification, no further action is required.	Page 43 of the DFD indicates that the homes will be capable of accommodating residents throughout their life.
42	42	<b>Inclusive Villages</b>	What would be the strategy to ensure that the villages have evening activity? The initial approach should be outlined within the DFD including the function of the public realm.	Reference to evening activity will be added to 'The Power of 10+' on Page 41 <b>No action. Page 42's examples, combined with wording on p41, are considered sufficient for the DFD and can be expanded in OPA's.</b>	<b>Resident Night Life</b>	Scope for expansion on wording to cover how some of these nightlife features are actually achievable – i.e. through methods such as	A section indicating that an evening economy will be included in the CGC is set out on page 41 of the DFD.
46	46	<b>15 Minute Neighbourhood</b>	Further details of the complete list of amenities within the CGC and which neighborhoods these will be attributed to, should be clarified in the DFD; this includes amenities within easy walking distance of the OPAs, for example in Beaulieu and Channels, without the destinations, it is not possible to have a 15 Minute Neighbourhood.	A development specification will be added to Chapter 8 (Character Areas) to include uses within each Village Centre and hierarchy. Chapter 8 will be updated to reflect this in the detailed description of each Village Centre and Employment Hub on Pages 122-137. <b>Added as Appendix 4 and referenced on page 52</b>	<b>15 Minute Neighbourhood</b>	The breakdown of distribution of 10+ principles across village centres is also provided in the Design Rationale pgs 6-7 which is helpful, however, some key noticeable changes are noted: Park Farm: no longer reference to Town Hall (though inclusion of Village Hall remains) Willow Hill: no reference anymore to community facilities, nor an employment hub, nor cafes, nor public square Hawthorn: no longer a provision of gym/outdoor gym, nor commercial units, nor sports facilities Great Belsteads: no longer reference to healthcare, nor commercial uses, nor sports provision, nor coworking space CCC to review	The character areas for each village (pages 130-139) have been updated to indicate which services each centre will provide.
47	47	<b>15 Minute Neighbourhood</b>	A 'Last mile' logistics hub has been added to strategy; clarification is required as to how goods will really travel the last mile and how will this be related to Garden City Principles.	Clarification is provided on the last mile logistics hub on pages 47, 52 and 111. The strategic location will enable the transition of goods to a more sustainable last mile delivery vehicles in CGC and the wider City which in accordance with the Garden City Principles outlined on Page 28 by providing a wide range of local jobs, using energy-positive technology to ensure climate resilience, and integrated and accessible transport systems. <b>No action.</b>	<b>Last Mile' Logistics Hub</b>	Clarity is still required as to what is meant by 'sustainable last mile delivery vehicles'; it is not explained/mentioned in the DFD that as part of this 'last mile' energy positive technology is utilised, nor that climate resilience is ensured, nor how it contributes to form an integrated and accessible transport system.	The text on point 3 of page 47 has been amended to remove the wording 'Last Mile'. The text now references logistics hub only; this has been amended throughout the DFD.
48	48	<b>Bullet 3</b>	The bullet point should refer to green and blue infrastructure.	DFD text will be updated <b>Actioned.</b>	<b>Participatory Governance</b>	Addressed in amended DFD.	A reference to green and blue infrastructure has been added to the table on page 48 of the DFD.
49	49	<b>Infrastructure</b>	Reference to the Stewardship Steering group should be included in the final version.	Number 3 on Page 49 refers to the 'Stewardship Steering Group' and states it could include "members of the local community, Parish Council, City and County Councils, the developer Consortium, and other local resident groups and stakeholders". The creation of a "Stewardship Steering Group" is also one of the Guiding Principles in the Stewardship GFS on Page 112 with further details on Page 113. The Table on Page 113 also confirms that the delivery of the Stewardship Steering Group will be secured via S106 at OPA Stage <b>No action.</b>	<b>Stewardship</b>	Reference in original DFD, no further action is required.	Reference to the stewardship steering group is now included at point 3 on page 49.
52-55	52-55	<b>Illustrative Masterplan - General</b>	The Illustrative Masterplan should sequentially be located after the content which sets out the context and strategies to be followed.	Comments noted and Consortium will consider sequence for final DFD version. <b>No action. Preferential to show site after the Vision and then explain more detail after. Matter not considered critical to DFD determination.</b>	<b>DFD Layout</b>	CCC to review.	The position of the illustrative masterplan within the document has not been amended; this is considered acceptable as it does not affect the legibility of the DFD.
53	53	<b>Map of CGC</b>	The location of the travelling show people site is quite remote and access for larger vehicles seems difficult as currently shown.	The Travelling Showpeople site is located off the CNEB roundabout specifically to enable large vehicles access the site easily and remove the need for these large vehicles to travel through CGC. ECC have confirmed they will not accept a pedestrian/cycle route across the CNEB at the junction with the Northern RDR and therefore the DFD proposes a new pedestrian/cycle bridge across the CNEB to link the site to Willow Hill Village Centre meaning it will be a 6-minute walk and 2-minute cycle distance from the Village Centre and Primary School. It will also be a 15-minute walk and 3-minute cycle distance from Hawthorn Village Centre and Primary School to ensure it is not remote from the local facilities. The Travelling Showpeople Site is also adjacent to the Dukes Wood Sports Hub. <b>No action.</b>	<b>Travelling Showpersons Allocation</b>	The site must be well connected to schools and community facilities and accessible to large vehicles that will need to enter/exit the site. Further evidence is required that ascertain that the site will be able to provide this accessibility and connectivity.	A new character area page relating to the travelling showpeople site has been added at page 141 of the DFD. The page includes a map, which indicates how residents would access the nearest villages. The supporting text indicates that Willow Hill Village would be a 10 minute walk and Hawthorns Village would be a 15 minute walk from the site.

			<p>The scale of the site will need to be clarified to check that it is sufficient for commercial vehicles and the necessary plot requirements.</p>	<p>The Travelling Showpeople site will accommodate 9 plots in accordance with Local Plan Policy SGS6. The Site is 2.02ha which is above the minimum 1.8ha required to allow 0.2 hectares per plot as set out in paragraph 7.202 of the Local Plan. The area of the Travelling Showpeople Site will be secured by the Zone 2 OPA Land Use Parameter Plan. <b>No action.</b></p> <p>Furthermore, the Zone 2 OPA Team are in the process of arranging a meeting with the Guild of Travelling Showpeople to discuss the Site and their requirements and the results of these discussions will be discussed with the Council and set out in the Zone 2 OPA Statement of Community Involvement <b>No action.</b></p>	<p><b>Travelling Showpersons Allocation</b></p>	<p>The size of the site is acceptable; more crucial elements relate to access and connectivity. Feedback from the Travelling Showpersons Guild and the response to this from Consortium should be provided.</p>	<p>The final paragraph of page 141 of the DFD confirms that the site will be designed in consultation with the Guild of Travelling Show People and their guidelines.</p>
54	54	Illustrative Masterplan	<p>Clarity is required as to what is meant by appropriate accessible and adaptable housing; there are many references to accessibility but no direct reference to the need for wheelchair accessible housing.</p>	<p>The purpose of the DFD is not to repeat Local Plan Policy or set housing standards. Housing Standards will meet the relevant Local Plan Policy requirements at the RMA Stage. This will allow standards to change over the 20-year delivery of the development to reflect changing needs. <b>No action.</b></p>	<p><b>Accessible Housing</b></p>	<p>Numerous references are made to accessibility / accessible housing features throughout the document, however it would be useful for the DFD to provide clarity that the means of achieving this is through the implementation of Building Regulations M4(2) and M4(3), as applicable, as these are the nationally recognized standards. Further, this would firm up the commitment to provide of adaptable and accessible dwellings; as set out above, any aspiration to exceed the minimum requirements set out in Local Plan policy is supported.</p>	<p>The wording of the DFD has been amended on page 53, to indicate that the delivery of housing will include accessible and adaptable housing, which meets Building Regulation requirements.</p>
			<p>A strong objection is raised to the reference to the provision of specialist housing for elderly people as being the sole means of meeting the specialist residential accommodation requirement; there is no evidence base to support this type of accommodation and it discriminates against the other groups requiring specialist housing that are in most housing need as identified in the Housing Strategy 2022-2027.</p>	<p>The DFD wording will be updated to say "This will include a range of affordable and appropriately accessible housing as well as specialist housing, including accommodation for the elderly. Each Zone OPA will provide a mix or housing and specialist housing in accordance with the most up to date Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA)". <b>Action required. This will be updated and was missed from the latest update.</b></p>	<p><b>Specialist Housing</b></p>	<p>Still in strong objection. Chelmsford's Local Plan Policy DM1 C (i) states with regard to Specialist Residential Accommodation that this has to take account of local housing needs. Our Planning Obligations SPD states that at the time a formal application is submitted the Council, we will consider the SRA needs identified in the Council's Housing Strategy as well as the latest assessments of need, including the SHMA etc. (paragraph 4.47); it is therefore not appropriate to reference accommodation for the elderly, as it is discriminative to those groups who have an identified local need, and this reference must be removed. Reference to the current/most up-to-date Housing Strategy is required.</p>	<p>Specialist housing is referenced as being part of the delivery of housing on page 53 of the DFD. The document confirms that, where required, financial contributions towards specialist housing may be made to support delivery in more appropriate locations.</p>
			<p>The housing mixes are referred to as 'indicative' but it is unclear what this means / what weight this carries. The fact that the table does not even reference 5 bed units, is of concern. Should flexibility be required, then the text needs to acknowledge, more overtly, the need to respond to changing needs over the 20 year timescale identified. A Strategic Housing Needs Assessment will be commissioned in the summer by the Council for the review of the adopted Local Plan and the mix may change significantly for affordable housing and market housing.</p>	<p>The housing mix is by definition 'indicative' as it would not be appropriate to set out a definitive housing mix at the DFD stage as this would restrict the flexibility to change over time and respond to changing need and demand over the 20-year delivery period. The Table does allow for 5 bed houses as the Table confirms that based on the indicative mix there could be 954 houses with 4+ bedrooms which will include 5 bed houses and could also include 6 bed houses if there was market demand. <b>No action. Mix made more indicative with less detail to avoid confusion in OPA's.</b></p>	<p><b>Housing Mix</b></p>	<p>Feedback has not been actioned. Still stands to be a concern that 5Bs are not mentioned and there is no overt acknowledgement to changing housing needs over the 20 year timescale identified. Suggest instead of mix by bedrooms, a commitment to meeting the dwelling size/types mixes as required by Local Plan policy at the time of application</p>	<p>The DFD indicates on page 53, that the housing mix will be provided in accordance with the most up to date planning policy.</p>
			<p>The DFD makes no direct reference to private rented housing; CCC does not identify an express need, but thought should be given to the role this might play in delivering a mixed and inclusive community.</p>	<p>The DFD does not refer specifically to private rented housing as this is included within the total figure for Market Housing. Private rented housing is not a separate Use Class and there is no specific planning policy requirement for such provision. It would therefore not be appropriate to set specific targets in the DFD for such housing. The provision of private rented housing will be provided where there is market demand. <b>No action.</b></p>	<p><b>Housing Mix</b></p>	<p>The issue remains that there is a lack of consideration conveyed as to how the housing element will create a mixed and inclusive community; thought should be given to how the potential for community led housing and the required self-build element play into this too as there is no mention of these either within the DFD.</p>	<p>A section has been added to the DFD to refer to self build and custom housing; it indicates that this will be provided in line with planning policy.</p>
			<p>The breakdown in affordable housing provision does not calculate correctly in both tables; the figure is a couple out in various places and should be changed.</p>	<p>The figures in the Indicative Housing Mix Table will be reviewed. <b>Mix made more indicative with less detail to avoid confusion in OPA's.</b></p>	<p><b>Housing Mix</b></p>	<p>The table shows that for the affordable element, the number of 1Bs has increased compared with the previous version, whilst provision of other sizes has decreased; there is a policy requirement on bedroom mix provision for the affordable rent/social rent element and it is not clear from this table that this is achieved.</p>	<p>The housing mix table has been removed from the DFD; it now indicates that the housing mix will be provided in line with up to date planning policy.</p>
			<p>The percentages do not completely match with the requirements for affordable housing in respect of affordable rent albeit it is only the one decimal point which is out.</p>	<p>The figures in the Indicative Housing Mix Table will be reviewed <b>Mix made more indicative with less detail to avoid confusion in OPA's.</b></p>	<p><b>Housing Mix</b></p>	<p>Addressed in amended DFD.</p>	<p>The housing mix table has been removed from DFD; it now indicates the housing mix will be provided in line with up to date planning policy.</p>
			<p>Reference is made to affordable rent, although CCC may wish to explore the need for social rent in the new Strategic Housing Needs Assessment; rented affordable homes is the preferred reference.</p>	<p>Comments are noted <b>Mix made more indicative with less detail to avoid confusion in OPA's.</b></p>	<p><b>Housing Mix</b></p>	<p>Removal of AHU tenure split if fine. Bedroom size splits should also be removed as it is not clear that the affordable rented/social rented element required by policy will be achieved.</p>	<p>The housing mix table has been removed from DFD; it now indicates the housing mix will be provided in line with up to date planning policy.</p>
			<p>The document seeks to link First Homes and Shared Ownership to Policy DM1; this is incorrect.</p>	<p>The Indicative Housing Mix Table will be reviewed <b>Mix made more indicative with less detail to avoid confusion in OPA's.</b></p>	<p><b>Housing Mix</b></p>	<p>Removal of reference to First Homes and SO against policy DM1 is accepted.</p>	<p>The references to First Homes and shared ownership being linked to Policy DM1 have been removed from the DFD; this is accepted.</p>
			<p>CCC do not prescribe a housing mix for first homes and shared ownership, but the mix is not supported for First Homes given the price cap and is somewhat unrealistic for the shared ownership units in terms of the provision of larger homes.</p>	<p>The Indicative Housing Mix Table will be reviewed <b>Mix made more indicative with less detail to avoid confusion in OPA's.</b></p>	<p><b>Housing Mix</b></p>	<p>See comments above; it is unclear what the split across affordable tenures would be; so we cannot be sure this matter is resolved.</p>	<p>The housing mix table has been removed from DFD; it now indicates the housing mix will be provided in line with up to date planning policy.</p>
			<p>The DFD needs to make clear that each outline planning application must be compliant with DM1 &amp; DM2.</p>	<p>Page 10 of the DFD confirms that "Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and Section 70 (2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 requires applications for planning permission to be determined in accordance with the development plan". It also states that "All Garden Community applications for planning permission will be assessed against CCC's adopted Local Plan" and it goes on to state that "when approved this DFD will also be a significant material consideration in the determination of all CGC applications for planning permission". Each GFS in Chapter 6 of the DFD also lists the relevant local policies to each topic. It is not considered necessary to repeat each Local Plan policy in the DFD as all OPA's will need to be compliant with all adopted local policies. <b>No action.</b></p>	<p><b>Housing Policy Reference</b></p>	<p>Reference to the DM policies has been made in relation to other aspects within the DFD, it is therefore reasonable to add reference to DM1 and DM2 to this section.</p>	<p>Reference to compliance with Policies DM1 and DM2 and the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) is indicated on page 53 of the DFD.</p>

			A need for key worker/healthcare worker accommodation exists to help address recruitment and retention difficulties that limit healthcare capacity in the area. Provision for this type of accommodation with the Chelmsford Garden Community could contribute to addressing this issue and should be included. This should be considered.	Comments are noted <b>No action. Details of specialist housing to be agreed at OPA stage. First Homes could be established by CCC for this use.</b>	<b>Housing Mix</b>	Comments set out above are reiterated in relation to the scope for consideration to be given to how housing will achieve a mixed and inclusive community. CCC do not have the means of allocating to First Homes.	The DFD indicates that the CGC will present opportunities for the delivery of community led housing through high levels of community engagement.
55	55	<b>Illustrative Masterplan - Highways &amp; Transport</b>	A plan has been provided in the Walking and Cycling Strategy that shows 800m radius circles centred on the mobility hub; they are not accurate walking isochrones but an approximation. A more accurate accessibility mapping exercise could be undertaken. A similar exercise focused upon the main pedestrian entrances to the schools would be appropriate too.	The DFD will be updated to include An Active Travel Route Plan that demonstrates all areas within CGC are within a 15-minute walk of a Village Centre. <b>Added to page 67.</b>	<b>Active Travel - Village Centre and Mobility Hub Locations</b>	Updated DFD and DRD received; this needs to be reviewed by CCC and ECC.	A further study has been provided within Section 8 'Character Areas' of the DFD showing walking distances to local facilities and Village Centres from development parcels. This illustrates that 95% of dwellings will be within 10 minutes walk of local facilities.
			The plan below also shows approximate 300m radius circles (black or dashed green) and 600m circles (red), which would relate more accurately to 400m and 800m walking distances respectively from the hubs.	It is not considered appropriate to use a 300m and 600m radius circle to determine travel distances and The Active Travel Route Plan referred to above will provide an accurate walking and cycling time for all areas of CGC. <b>No action.</b>	<b>Active Travel - Village Centre and Mobility Hub Locations</b>	Updated DFD and DRD received; this needs to be reviewed by CCC and ECC.	A further study has been provided within Section 8 'Character Areas' of the DFD showing walking distances to local facilities and Village Centres from development parcels. This illustrates that 95% of dwellings will be within 10 minutes walk of local facilities.
			The analysis suggests that hundreds of residences would be beyond the maximum walking distance targets from Great Belsteads Village Centre and Mobility Hub. Given that such large parts of their circles cover areas where no residents will live and that the Park Farm Village Centre (centre circles) cannot move west, due to the all-through school, it would strongly suggest Great Belsteads Village Centre should be located further east.	The use of 300m and 600m radius circles is not considered an accurate or appropriate way to determine walking and cycling distances. No action.	<b>Active Travel - Village Centre and Mobility Hub Locations</b>	Updated DFD and DRD received; this needs to be reviewed by CCC and ECC.	A further study has been provided within Section 8 'Character Areas' of the DFD showing walking distances to local facilities and Village Centres from development parcels. This illustrates that 95% of dwellings will be within 10 minutes walk of local facilities.
			The above plan also shows that, although they would have reasonable access to a secondary mobility hub (at the centre of black circle), the residents of the south of Park Farm village would not have a Village Centre within a convenient walking distance. An even greater proportion of the Park Farm Village Centre inner circle covers non-residential areas and, again, the area on the east side of the CNEB should be treated with caution due to the impact routing over the bridges will have (i.e.. it would not be as overlapped with Hawthorn village isochrones as it would appear).	All areas within Park Farm Village are within a 15 minute walk of the Village Centre. Furthermore the Park Farm Community Hub, Channels Complex as well as the Beaulieu Local Facility are all within 15 minute walk from the southern area of Park Farm Village. No action.	<b>Active Travel - Village Centre and Mobility Hub Locations</b>	Updated DFD and DRD received; this needs to be reviewed by CCC and ECC.	A further study has been provided within Section 8 'Character Areas' of the DFD showing walking distances to local facilities and Village Centres from development parcels. This illustrates that 95% of dwellings will be within 10 minutes walk of local facilities.
			A concern with independent Mobility Hubs, is that they may not have the high levels of activity and natural surveillance for personal security reasons that one within a Village Centre should have	Comment is noted. <b>No action matter for OPA's and RMA detail.</b>	<b>Active Travel - Village Centre and Mobility Hub Locations</b>	The comment highlights an issue with the reliance on independent mobility hubs; this forms part of the wider discussion. Updated DFD and DRD received; this needs to be reviewed by CCC and ECC.	The final precise location is a matter for RMA's. This would dictate activity and surveillance.
			The above plan demonstrates that the Willow Hill Village Centre essentially covers the CNEB junction, warehouse and countryside, and the Park Farm Village Centre largely duplicates coverage of the residential areas, which would weaken demand to visit Willow Hill Village Centre on foot too.	Comment is noted. <b>No action, see DRD for location rationale.</b>	<b>Active Travel - Village Centre and Mobility Hub Locations</b>	Updated DFD and DRD received; this needs to be reviewed by CCC and ECC.	The Village Centre Accessibility Study within Section 8 illustrates the catchment of residential parcels within a 10 and 15 minute walk. Further clarity has also been provided regarding the hierarchy of Village Centres and services these would provide.
			The conclusion is that the above issues will not help deliver four successful, inclusive, walkable neighbourhoods; as it is, the rationale for their locations, apparently driven by ease of access from the major roads, is not supported.	The use of 300m and 600m radius circles is not considered an accurate or appropriate way to determine walking and cycling distances. No action, see DRD for location rationale.	<b>Active Travel - Village Centre and Mobility Hub Locations</b>	Updated DFD and DRD received; this needs to be reviewed by CCC and ECC.	A further study has been provided within Section 8 'Character Areas' of the DFD showing walking distances to local facilities and Village Centres from development parcels. This illustrates that 95% of dwellings will be within 10 minutes walk of local facilities. Amendments have been made to the active travel network with a view to improve connectivity and directness of key routes. Final amendments to the proposed active travel network are in the process of being agreed between CCC officers, ECC and the Consortium.
			The CGC masterplan should be improved to deliver the Vision by locating the Village Centres in a different configuration, such as shown below. The Village Centres could still be located near to the school sites. A measure of the benefit of the changes would be minimising the standard deviation of the walking distances to them for their catchments.	The proposed location of the Village Centres is a result of over 18 months of consultation and design work by the Consortium in collaboration with ECC and CCC and need to take into account many factors both physically on site as well as phasing deliverability and commercial realities. No action, see DRD for location rationale.	<b>Active Travel - Village Centre and Mobility Hub Locations</b>	Updated DFD and DRD received; this needs to be reviewed by CCC and ECC.	
			The arrangement show means the need for the Park Farm south secondary mobility hub would be removed and with direct routing, the Chelmer Valley Park and Ride terminal (a mobility hub) should cover the southern area of Channels Extension.	Comment is noted No action. <b>Further mobility hub details can be agreed at OPA and RMA stages.</b>	<b>Active Travel - Village Centre and Mobility Hub Locations</b>	The comment highlights an issue with the reliance on independent mobility hubs; this forms part of the wider discussion. Updated DFD and DRD received; this needs to be reviewed by CCC and ECC.	Southern Terminal within P&R is a matter for ECC. The applicant cannot commit to this.
			The location of the centres on the vehicular routes out of the site will result in a significantly higher share of trips being 'pass- by' vehicle trips, which do not help increase physical activity, these generate demand for parking space and associated costs (not just capital), which need to be accounted for fully.	The Village Centres need to be located on key bus routes in order to be accessible by the greatest number of people. The proposed bus gates will ensure that 'pass-by' traffic is minimised. <b>No action, see DRD for location rationale.</b>	<b>Active Travel - Village Centre and Mobility Hub Locations</b>	Updated DFD and DRD received; this needs to be reviewed by CCC and ECC.	A further study has been provided within Section 8 'Character Areas' of the DFD showing walking distances to local facilities and Village Centres from development parcels. This illustrates that 95% of dwellings will be within 10 minutes walk of local facilities. Amendments have been made to the active travel network with a view to improve connectivity and directness of key routes. This includes the relocation of pedestrian/cycle bridges over the bypass between Hawthorn Village and Park Farm. Final amendments to the proposed active travel network are in the process of being agreed between CCC officers, ECC and the Consortium.
			Park Farm Village Centre appears to be located near to the primary vehicular route out of Hawthorn Village and on the one out of Park Farm to the north, rather than in an optimised position for access by pedestrians. The centre only has one side adjoining a residential parcel, so the average and standard deviation for walking distance to it must be much higher than it would be if located more centrally in the village to the south. The 'local facilities' (2) to the north of Beaulieu have not been shown to be of similar importance in terms of providing the range of amenities required for a Walkable Neighbourhood/ Garden Community, moreover, there are limited crossing facilities along the RDR, so they will not be as attractive to access on foot/cycle as a Village Centre should be.	As shown on the Plan on Page 61, Park Farm Village Centre is located at the junction of two key bus routes in order to maximise accessibility. The route from Hawthorn Village is also a bus route to ensure connectivity. Bus Gates are proposed to restrict through traffic. The DFD will also be updated to include an Active Travel Route Plan which demonstrates that all Village Centres are connected by a network of high-quality Primary and Secondary Active Travel Routes. Additional crossing points of the RDR 1 (Beaulieu Parkway) will be promoted by the Consortium however their deliverability will be subject to ECC approval. <b>No action, see DRD for location rationale.</b>	<b>Active Travel - Village Centre and Mobility Hub Locations</b>	Updated DFD and DRD received; this needs to be reviewed by CCC and ECC.	
			An additional secondary hub is missing on the Illustrative Masterplan to the south of Park Farm, when compared with the Movement Strategy, although as shown above, this need could be avoided.	The plan will be updated. <b>Actioned.</b>	<b>Mobility Hub - Document Error.</b>	Addressed in amended DFD.	The secondary mobility hub is now shown on the illustrative masterplan on page 54.

The plan shows the long-term access arrangement for roundabout 7, presuming the CNEB is dualled; it should also clearly note that an interim alternative access arrangement shall be provided by the developer until the CNEB phase 2 junction access connection is completed.	This is the intention and will be detailed at the OPA Stage. This plan is an 'illustrative Masterplan' and it would not be appropriate to show alternative access arrangements on this plan. The Phasing Plans on Pages 152 – 155 show the delivery of access etc. and the text on page 153 confirms that the Travelling Showpeople Site will be fully serviced, and a new access formed from the CNEB junction with the Northern RDR in Phase 2 of the Development (2030-2034). No action.	<b>Interim access arrangements - clarification.</b>	No amendment to DFD but cited reference to interim arrangements on pages 152-155.	n/a
Indicative details for the amendments to Wheelers Hill and the roundabout should be shown; it is potentially misleading as shown.	Comment is noted. <b>No action.</b>	<b>Wheelers Hill Roundabout - layout</b>	No action taken with no explanation. The matter does not appear to be addressed elsewhere in the DFD or supplementary documents.	The indicative amendments to Wheelers Hill are represented within the Land Use and Access Framework Parameter Plan.
To reduce risk, community severance, and delay to through traffic through additional junctions, the housing north of RDR2 should be removed; this should make monitoring transport targets easier and potentially reduce the need for some infrastructure, such as cycling facilities along the north side.	Comment is noted. <b>No action. Subject to ongoing OPA 3 discussions.</b>	<b>Residential Development - North of RDR2</b>	Information provided by Halley Developments. Meeting arranged 03.11. CCC and ECC to issue response.	A new character area page relating to the area north of the Northern RDR has been added at page 142 of the DFD this lists a range of uses, which by their very nature are less co-dependent upon access to services and facilities; any development of this land must be net zero / Passiv Haus.
Bulls Lodge Quarry bridge is to be constructed in a manner which is easily adapted.	This bridge has been approved by ECC under the CNEB Bypass application as the conveyor bridge and will be constructed by ECC. <b>No action.</b>	<b>Quarry Bridge Design</b>	Bridge already approved by ECC.	No further action required.
The northern pedestrian/cycle bridge needs to be attractive for people to use from the north of Willow Hill/ RDR2 to reach the Sports Hubs and Travelling Show People site (and vice-versa), to avoid them traversing the CNEB junction at unacceptable risk. The location suggested may be too far south and indirect to do this well and could fail to mitigate the risk acceptably.	The proposed pedestrian/cycle bridge has been moved further north and the DFD will be revised accordingly. <b>Actioned.</b>	<b>Active Travel - Village Centre and Mobility Hub Locations (pedestrian/cycle bridge locations)</b>	Updated DFD and DRD received; this needs to be reviewed by CCC and ECC.	The location of the pedestrian/cycle bridge has been amended to provide a more direct connection between the Willow Hill Village Centre and the Sports Hub and TSP site.
In principle, the eastern access onto the RDR is expected to be left in, left out only; this presents a problem for the bus strategy potentially, in the longer-term.	Comment is noted. <b>No action. For OPA to finalise arrangement.</b>	<b>RDR1 Access and Bus Route</b>	DFD confirms access location. Detailed design to be tested in OPA discussions. Opportunity for bus right turn only. CCC to discuss with ECC regarding possible right turn for buses.	The design of the junction and bus access arrangements will need to be tested and agreed within OPA negotiations.
Clarification on the short, medium and long-term access arrangements through Channels is required; is the new primary street from the RDR roundabout 3 needed for this.	The Phasing Plans in the DFD Chapter 9 demonstrate the short, medium and long-term access arrangements. Further detail regarding access is included in the submitted Movement and Transport Evidence Base Report and Appendices. <b>See DRD page 21.</b>	<b>Active Travel - Phasing and Access/Routes</b>	Question not directly answered. Need to review movement framework and phasing within DRD and DFD.	The Phasing and Delivery Plans within the DFD now clearly show the access arrangements over the short, medium and long term.
The RDR2 needs to be attractive to through traffic, to avoid it routing via Essex Regiment Way and the RDR or White Hart Lane. The significant number of accesses off the RDR2 and any controlled crossings over it will significantly reduce the efficiency of the road for this purpose. In addition, prioritising active modes across side arms off the RDR2 will cause relatively greater impacts or, if not prioritised, each one will make the RDR2 a less attractive route for active modes too. A consolidation of the number of side accesses and crossings is, therefore, considered necessary.	Comment is noted and discussions are ongoing with ECC on the Northern RDR Design. <b>No action.</b>	<b>Residential Development - North of RDR2 (RDR2 Design approach)</b>	Information provided by Halley Developments. Meeting arranged for 03.11. CCC and ECC to issue response.	A new character area page relating to the area north of the Northern RDR has been added at page 142 of the DFD this lists a range of uses, which by their very nature are less co-dependent upon access to services and facilities; any development of this land must be net zero / Passiv Haus.
Willow Hill is estimated to be approximately 600m wide (E-W), therefore, subject to safety considerations at the junction with the RDR2, it could be served by one bus route on a primary street; this would not only reduce the length of the primary street but would also reduce the number of junctions onto the RDR2. Notwithstanding the recommendation above that the Village Centre should be more central to Willow Hill, a single primary street could be orientated generally NE-SW to the south of the primary school (provided it would not have a detrimental impact on the setting/ environment of the school as per the Developers' Guide) and join with the E-W spine primary street to the north of the All-through school. The arrangement would not be delayed by the mineral workings and could support the Village Centre being central to Willow Hill village and closer to Great Belsteads too.	Comment is noted No action. <b>Matter for detailed OPA discussions.</b>	<b>Residential Development - North of RDR2 (RDR2 Design approach)</b>	The approach to RDR2 and junctions is not a matter for OPA discussions. CCC and ECC to issue response to Hally regarding RDR2.	A new character area page relating to the area north of the Northern RDR has been added at page 142 of the DFD this lists a range of uses, which by their very nature are less co-dependent upon access to services and facilities; any development of this land must be net zero / Passiv Haus.
Domsey Lane will be severed by the RDR2; significant concerns regarding road safety risks and active mode route severance will need to be addressed in due course. The proximity of the primary street to the east appears to be too close especially for general traffic.	Comment is noted and discussions are ongoing with ECC. <b>No action. Matter for detailed OPA discussions.</b>	<b>Active Travel and RDR2 - (Domsey Lane)</b>	The DFD needs to acknowledge the character of Domsey lane and include an indicative diagram showing how the bus gate could be accommodated and how access to the lane will likely be managed.	Domsey Lane is referenced as a specific character area at pages XX and XX of the DFD. The document details how the Design Framework intends to minimise the impact of development on the existing community and character of Domsey Lane.
Notwithstanding the bus gates, the primary streets are shown to be generally very direct and efficient at facilitating vehicular access between the strategic roads and the interior of the site; there is no designed- in advantage apparent for active travel or buses along these streets unless the trip happens to pass through a bus gate. Moreover, they will be potentially significant barriers to pedestrians and cyclists crossing them. The main W-E primary street from the new access off Essex Regiment Way could divert from village centre around the south of the housing (via the street along the north edge of the park) and rejoin to the east, thus leaving a car free route beside the primary school to the village centre for a better Walkable Neighbourhood environment. (See also 71 – Primary Streets below).	The Primary Streets are also Bus Routes and therefore need to be direct to encourage bus use. Separate streets for buses and private cars are not considered an efficient use of land. The proposed bus gates will limit through traffic and the Movement Strategy GFS reiterates that the network ensures that all non-car uses have a clear journey time advantage over users of the private car. <b>No action. Matter for detailed OPA discussions.</b>	<b>Active Travel - Bus Gates</b>	Updated DFD and DRD received; this needs to be reviewed by CCC and ECC.	The approach is considered sensible and appropriate. The location of bus gates are shown on the bus service provision plans contained at page XX of the DFD.

Channels Village Centre would appear to be proposed to consist of Belsteads Farmhouse and Channels Farmhouse; it is not, therefore, understood as being intended to perform any functions of the other Village Centres. The consequence is that the Channels Extension will be reliant upon active travel routes to either Great Belsteads or Park Farm Village Centres, further justifying why they should be relocated to the east and south respectively.	Reference to Channels Village Extension will be reviewed by the Consortium. The Character and function of Channels Extension is described in more detail in pages 130-130. <b>No update, within 15-minute walk of centers.</b>	<b>Active Travel - Village Centre and Mobility Hub Locations</b>	Updated DFD and DRD received; this needs to be reviewed by CCC and ECC.	A further study has been provided within Section 8 'Character Areas' of the DFD showing walking distances to local facilities and Village Centres from development parcels. This illustrates that 95% of dwellings will be within 10 minutes walk of local facilities. Amendments have been made to the active travel network with a view to improve connectivity and directness of key routes. Final amendments to the proposed active travel network are in the process of being agreed between CCC officers, ECC and the Consortium.
The 'all through' school is a substantial area, by inspection, it is two times the normal parcel size. The feasibility of allowing active travel across part of it should be investigated.	This will be determined by ECC who will deliver the All Through School however ECC's Education Site Suitability Checklist specifically states that School Sites should not be "crossed by any public rights of way or access wayleaves. <b>No action.</b>	<b>Active Travel - Movement Framework</b>	Updated DFD and DRD received; this needs to be reviewed by CCC and ECC.	This has been explored with ECC and Consortium and an Active Travel route through the school area is not considered deliverable. However, amendments have been made to the active travel network with a view to improve connectivity and directness of key routes. Final amendments to the proposed active travel network are in the process of being agreed between CCC officers, ECC and the Consortium.
The three independently located primary schools are adjacent to village centres with traffic free squares providing immediate access to them, whereas the all-through school(s) has a substantial belt of greenspace around it, so the suggested preferred access arrangements are not clear. The schools will need to be accessible with vehicles for essential purposes only; such access routes must not conflict with access routes for children. Any parking for staff members' vehicles must be minimised further to travel planning; it should be expected that only car sharers are permitted parking space and remote parking should be considered first.	Separate meetings are taking place with ECC to determine the school site specification and as confirmed in the Education GFS on Pages 106to 108 each OPA will be accompanied by a Land Compliance Study. ECC will design the school sites and therefore parking and building locations will be determined by ECC. <b>No action.</b> Matter for detailed OPA discussions.	<b>Schools and Village Centre relationship</b>	Detailed discussions already commenced within OPA pre-apps.	The position of the school has been agreed following discussion with ECC.
The central CNEB is also a barrier feature that has an impact on east west connectivity. The connections are concentrated to the central parts of the road; to avoid the settlement becoming divided and separated, there needs to be a strong connection between the two. The bridges should be as wide as possible, ideally assisting ecological connectivity and be a focal point of the scheme to guide users across the bypass. Greater pedestrian connectivity should also be accommodated over the bypass within the northern part of the site. The position of the foot/cycle bridges over the bypass needs careful consideration to avoid a scenario where residents of Hawthorn Village do not rely upon the uncontrolled crossing south of roundabout 4 at RDR1.	Comments are noted. <b>No action. Matter for detailed OPA discussions.</b>	<b>Pedestrian/Cycle Bridge Design</b>	The ambition/vision for these structures needs to be addressed in the DFD.	Bridges will be LTN 1/20 compliant. Ecological connectivity loss was effectively accepted by the approval of the North-East Bypass.
The RDR2 cuts off some small blocks of residential development; it will be difficult to integrate cohesive housing communities for the residential parts with the main settlement. Employment should be limited to the area shown.	Comments are noted. <b>No action. Ongoing discussions with OPA3 on housing north of RDR.</b>	<b>Residential Development - North of RDR2 (RDR2 Design approach)</b>	Information provided by Halley Developments. Meeting arranged 03.11. CCC and ECC to issue response.	A new character area page relating to the area north of the Northern RDR has been added at page 142 of the DFD this lists a range of uses, which by their very nature are less co-dependent upon access to services and facilities; any development of this land must be net zero / Passiv Haus.
In principle there should be more than one pedestrian and cyclist accesses to the Park and Ride site.	Comments are noted but access to the Park and Ride is determined by ECC <b>No action. Matter for detailed OPA discussions.</b>	<b>Park and Ride</b>	CCC to further discuss the function of the P&R as part of the CGC with ECC.	Discussion has been had with ECC who are seeking to protect the primary function of the Park and Ride and do not wish to see this undermined.
The extinguishment of Bridleways 39 and 42 Broomfield (east and south of Boueux Lake) has been completed. The Greenway that follows this should be removed unless the Consortium control the land.	Comments are noted. <b>No greenway shown. Walking route shown on land that is presently used.</b>	<b>Bridleway 39 and 42</b>	Point clarified.	No further action required.
Public Footpath 4 Little Waltham is not shown extending to Domsey Lane across third party land (unlike Footpath 33 which is shown to the north); this would be an example where cycling cannot be facilitated, but it is likely to become more popular for pedestrians. Signage will be needed and (potentially) barriers at such examples where new cycle routes or PROW that are legally upgraded to cycle routes intersect with pedestrian-only PROW (i.e., footpaths) e.g. 'cyclists dismount' signs and cycle inhibitors to assist walkers' safety and prevent trespass (in the form cycle usage of a non-cycle route) on third party land. The developers, can within their areas of landownership, permissively allow cycling at their liability provided this can be safely done, though such routes would need to make clear by signage that such usage is permissive only (as it would not change the status of a PROW).	The DFD will be updated to include An Active Travel Route Plan and the details of access and ownership etc will be addressed at the OPA Stage. <b>Plan updated on page 65.</b>	<b>Active Travel - Movement Framework</b>	Updated DFD and DRD received; this needs to be reviewed by CCC and ECC.	Appropriate signage would be agreed at RMA stage, if required, when the connections occur.
Each village needs to be distinctive in character, and therefore the document should clearly demonstrate how this is to be successfully achieved, to ensure this community does not become just an extension of suburbia.	Chapter 8 of the DFD describes the Character Areas including all Villages and Chapter 10 of the DFD further outlines the Design Code Framework and confirms that design codes will need to be approved before any RMA's are submitted to ensure CGC to ensure high quality design. <b>No action.</b>	<b>Village character</b>	Commitment to design coding.	The future design code will define the character of each of the villages
The Essex Quality Review Panel discussed how higher-density living could be promoted here, by reducing building footprint and proximity distances to each other; this may support the creation of more distinct settlement patterns reducing uniformity to ensure we move away from sprawl or monotonous suburbia to distinct villages with edges and spaces between.	Page 138 – 139 of the DFD outlines the approach to density and allows for densities of up to 150 dwellings per hectare and buildings up to four and five stories in the Village Centres which is considered high-density. In addition, the Design Codes will ensure high quality design across all Villages. <b>No action.</b>	<b>Density</b>	Updated diagram provided within DRD. CCC need to review this and respond.	The position of the village centres is agreed. The DFD shows they are within 15 minutes walking distance of each dwelling although the majority are within a 10 minute walking distance.
The garden village needs to feel like one single place as opposed to two separate east/west sites which is what it currently appears to be. The connection of the two most central local neighbourhood centres via wide, possibly landscaped, feature bridges across the bypass, will be an important moment to grasp for the masterplan to ensure this is seen and read as one community.	The DFD proposes two pedestrian/cycle bridges along with the already approved conveyor bridge that will link both sides and ensure the community acts as one. <b>No action.</b>	<b>Pedestrian/Cycle Bridge Design</b>	The ambition/vision for these structures needs to be addressed in the DFD.	Bridges will be LTN 1/20 compliant. Ecological connectivity loss was effectively accepted by the approval of the North-East Bypass.

			Further, it is also considered that more primary routes could be given towards pedestrian/cycle routes to increase east-west connections and permeability across the scheme, whilst also reducing the impact of vehicular usage.	The DFD will be updated to include the Active Travel Route Plan showing the key primary and secondary active travel routes across the site. The Plan on Page 65 already shows these and demonstrates there are numerous east/west routes across the site and the use of Bus Gates ensures travel by private car across the site is discouraged. <b>No action.</b>	<b>Active Travel - Movement Framework</b>	Updated DFD and DRD received; this needs to be reviewed by CCC and ECC.	Amendments have been made to the active travel network with a view to improve connectivity and directness of key routes. Final amendments to the proposed active travel network are in the process of being agreed between CCC officers, ECC and the Consortium.
55	55	<b>Illustrative Masterplan – Early Years &amp; Childcare</b>	The starting point for EYCC planning should be 5 standalone facilities, 4 are co-located with proposed schools therefore 1 is not proposed as required.	Page 52 of the DFD confirms that along with each school site providing co-located early years facilities, two standalone facilities will also be provided across the site. Page 107 confirms that the first will be located in Great Bealeads Village and the second in Park Farm Village and this is further confirmed in the Phasing and Delivery Table on pages 156 to 159. The IDP also provides for the provision of two stand-alone early years facilities (Ref: A1 & A2). No action.	<b>Early Years &amp; Childcare</b>	ECC to confirm expected provision.	The DFD has been updated at page 113 to confirm the early years provision across the CGC. The four schools will each provide a co-located facility along with two further standalone facilities. Depending on demand there is also the flexibility for two further facilities to be provided if required. The final level of provision will be determined by the outline planning applications when the precise number of dwellings is known.
57	57	<b>Guiding Framework Principles</b>	It would be clearer if the heading of this section was Guiding Framework Strategies.	DFD Text will be updated. <b>No update made. Strategies are the headlines, but key criteria are the principles applied. This is not considered critical to the DFD's determination.</b>	<b>Title Given to this section</b>	Not amended but agreed not material to approval.	No further action required.
58	58	<b>Movement Strategy</b>	<p>The Core Objective should include the single overarching numerical target of at least 60% of trips originating in the new settlement to be made by non-car means; this should then be further broken down, as proposed, into those trips with 'off-site' destinations and those whose destination is within the site; for clarity, the proportion of trips with origins and destinations in the development by Active Modes should be a simple majority (i.e., &gt;50%).</p> <p>Dukes Wood Nature Park is proposed within the north-eastern quadrant of the CGC; the opportunity to extend Bridleway 213-48 in a north-easterly direction to give access to the Nature Park and to then continue the bridleway, or a new multi-user Public Right of Way to the lane network at the north-eastern edge of the proposed development should be explored.</p> <p>Consideration should be given to a route that would allow equestrians the ability to ride a link route from, and through the Channels Discovery Park, Park Farm Meadows and Dukes Wood Nature Park.</p> <p>The proposed green spaces are to include running, walking and cycling trails of 2km, 5km and 10km loops; the option for these to be multi-user and potentially incorporated within the above aspiration could be explored.</p> <p>The Essex QRP has identified the use of the Chelmer Valley Park and Ride as a missed opportunity. Due to this service not operating at full capacity since the COVID pandemic and the likely change in working habits, they felt that the safeguarded land is no longer required, this could lead to detrimental master planning (infill) and inhibits permeability between the site and P&amp;R. Should additional capacity be required in the future then the P&amp;R could be decked.</p> <p>Further clarification is required as to how the implementation of RDR2 would work for the rest of the Garden Community, as it currently appears to be isolating a small section of housing to the north-west. The road also needs to be shown more clearly on the masterplan, as it appears similar to the north/south bypass link running down the centre of the site. RDR1 is to be downgraded in the future; this is essential to provide the connectivity to the south and onwards to Chelmsford City Centre.</p> <p>Bus routes can operate within the development at the 6m suggested width and do not necessarily need to be 6.75m to ECC design standards. The most attractive and convenient routes should be those for walking and cycling, in order to encourage people to use them as opposed to their cars which are normally parked right outside their homes. The routes should be intuitive (as they currently appear) with signing only there to reassure the pedestrian/cyclist. Further work appears to be necessary in order to provide safe and convenient links from the development onwards to the City Centre, especially with regard to cyclist.</p> <p>TSP site is isolated. The DFD needs to show how the residents here can also access facilities (e.g. Bypass bridge and Village Centre locations).</p>	<p>Comments are noted and the DFD and Evidence Base Documents will be updated as necessary following ongoing discussions between Mayer Brown, TPA and ECC.</p> <p><b>Matters being discussed as above.</b></p>	<p><b>Active Travel</b></p> <p><b>Active Travel - Movement Framework</b></p> <p><b>Active Travel - Movement Framework</b></p> <p><b>Active Travel - Movement Framework</b></p> <p><b>Park and Ride</b></p> <p><b>Residential Development - North of RDR2 (RDR2 Design approach)</b></p> <p><b>Active Travel - Bus Route width</b></p> <p><b>Active Travel - Movement Framework</b></p>	<p>General 'catch-all' response noted but no specific response or action discussed on this point.</p> <p>Updated DFD and DRD received; this needs to be reviewed by CCC and ECC.</p> <p>Updated DFD and DRD received; this needs to be reviewed by CCC and ECC.</p> <p>Updated DFD and DRD received; this needs to be reviewed by CCC and ECC.</p> <p>CCC to consult ECC on the aspired function of the P&amp;R as part of the CGC</p> <p>Information provided by Halley Developments. Meeting arranged 03.11. CCC and ECC to issue response.</p> <p>Decision to be made at OPA stage.</p> <p>Updated DFD and DRD received; this needs to be reviewed by CCC and ECC.</p>	<p>The core objective at page 58 clearly indicates the target that 60% of all trips originating within the CGC will be by non car means by the completion of the development.</p> <p>A plan showing existing and proposed bridleway provision is included at page 65 of the DFD.</p> <p>A plan showing existing and proposed bridleway provision is included at page 65 of the DFD.</p> <p>A multi user routes plan is shown on page 65 of the DFD.</p> <p>ECC have advised that they wish to protect the key function of the Park &amp; Ride.</p> <p>A new character area page relating to the area north of the Northern RDR has been added at page 142 of the DFD this lists a range of uses, which by their very nature are less co-dependent upon access to services and facilities; any development of this land must be net zero / Passiv Haus.</p> <p>No further action required.</p> <p>The Design Rationale Document confirms the position in relation to delivery of infrastructure. The precise trigger for provision of the bridges over the North-East Bypass would be agreed at outline planning application stage as part of the Site Specific s106 Agreement. The northernmost bridge would be provided prior to occupation of the Travelling Showpeople site as confirmed in the phasing section of the DFD.</p>
59	59	<b>Movement Strategy</b>	The Parking Strategy should be more ambitious; every parking space has a carbon footprint and other costs, which should be acknowledged and clearly set out; much lower on-plot car parking provision than 1 car space per dwelling is recommended even from the early dwellings.	<p>Comments are noted and the DFD and Evidence Base Documents will be updated as necessary following ongoing discussions between Mayer Brown, TPA and ECC.</p> <p><b>Matters being discussed as above.</b></p>	<b>Parking</b>	Phases are now defined in relation to the strategy but are problematic. The approach to off plot parking has been progressed with the inclusion of a phasing plan but the plans tabled to date lack ambition, suggest removal of parking 5 years into the development and are likely to face resistance from the community due to car borne established travel patterns.	The parking strategy is set out on Page 59; this confirms the intention to restrict on plot parking off site provision in parking clusters; over time, as car ownership decreases, then the parking clusters can be repurposed for other uses.



			The Parking Strategy is overly generous. On plot provision prevents this from being removed at a later stage. The standard for the 3+ bedrooms is ambiguous and provides no number of spaces. The Parking Strategy should contain a section that shows how to repurpose parking at a later stage.		<b>Parking</b>	Phases are now defined in relation to the strategy but are problematic. The approach to off plot parking has been progressed with the inclusion of a phasing plan but the plans tabled to date lack ambition, suggest removal of parking 5 years into the development and are likely to face resistance from the community due to car borne established travel patterns.	The parking strategy is set out on Page 59; this confirms the intention to restrict on plot parking off site provision in parking clusters; over time, as car ownership decreases, then the parking clusters can be repurposed for other uses.
60	60	<b>Bus Provision</b>	The guiding principle includes for every dwelling to be within 400m of a bus stop; this should be 400m walking distance from a bus stop.  The TCPA guidance states, 'buses should be available from the first occupation, offering services within and connecting to other networks outside the community'. A principle should be added to direct that this is the case for all properties. A commitment should be made in the DFD.	Comments are noted and the DFD and Evidence Base Documents will be updated as necessary following ongoing discussions between Mayer Brown, TPA and ECC. <b>Matters on distance being discussed as above.</b>  <b>Bus delivery a matter for further discussion and not subject to DFD commitment.</b>	<b>Guiding principle Bus Stops</b>	No change to DFD or response to this point.	The DFD has been updated on pages 59 and 66 to indicate that there will be a bus stop within a 400m walk of every house.
					<b>Guiding principle Bus Service delivery</b>	No change to DFD or substantive response.	The DFD indicates at page 67 that early provision of a bus service will be key to ensuring that bus travel becomes an embedded culture. The provision of bus services will be dealt with at outline planning application stage in accordance with the Outline Bus Strategy principles.
61	61	<b>Bus Routes Diagram</b>	5 bus gates are shown, however the primary street layout provides no advantageous routing for buses between those gateways and the main roads (RDR, RDR2 and ERW), thus retaining a competitive disadvantage for buses, as they will have to make stops on route as well; this must be addressed, as it stands the guiding principle is not achieved.  Provision should be shown for buses and active modes to access the site from Essex Regiment Way at the Pratts Farm Lane roundabout; this would provide the opportunity for local bus services to run along the east boundary to the Park & Ride site rather than along Essex Regiment Way, if that is seen as advantageous at any time.  Interim routing arrangements should be shown to accord with the phasing, notably the impact the mineral extraction will have on the delivery of infrastructure.  CIHT guidance recommends that bus route corridors are a maximum 600m wide to achieve the target maximum 400m walking distance. A plan with 300m off-sets from the bus routes is requested, as this would provide reassurance that 400m walking distances will be achieved.	Comments are noted and the DFD and Evidence Base Documents will be updated as necessary following ongoing discussions between Mayer Brown, TPA and ECC.  <b>Matters being discussed as above. OPA considered acceptable to establish further design updates.</b>	<b>Active Travel - Movement Framework</b>	Updated DFD and DRD received; this needs to be reviewed by CCC and ECC.	An updated bus provision diagram has been provided within the DFD. This demonstrates the coverage of bus services. The DFD includes a commitment to delivering these routes within 400m walk of new dwellings. The detailed phasing of routes will be addressed through OPAs.
					<b>Active Travel - Movement Framework</b>	Updated DFD and DRD received. This needs to be reviewed by CCC and ECC.	
					<b>Active Travel - Movement Framework</b>	Updated DFD and DRD received; this needs to be reviewed by CCC and ECC.	
					<b>Active Travel - Movement Framework</b>	Updated DFD and DRD received; this needs to be reviewed by CCC and ECC.	
63	63	<b>Bus Provision</b>	Concerns are raised that journey times will not be attractive in part due to circuitous routing. An example would be proposed service C13 (in green), which must service Hawthorn Village but also services Willow Hill and the north of Great Belsteads. Hawthorn Village is poorly served by bus provision.  The labels used to locate the Mobility Hubs are still imprecise due to their size, although they appear to be more accurately located. The Willow Hill Mobility Hub label would suggest it will be on route C14, whereas other plans show it at Willow Hill village centre, which only route C13 would serve. The bus service interchange should be delivered, so that it is easy to reach all the CGC Village Centres by bus from any one of the new mobility hubs; without this it cannot be said that the villages are interconnected. An exercise to show how this would be done in the medium and long term, i.e., showing when the Village Centres are constructed, is needed. Proposed service C13 would miss the Great Belsteads Village Centre / mobility hub.  The route of service C10 is a cul-de-sac one, which is not generally preferred and would require turning facilities; it should be made to serve the Great Belsteads Mobility Hub and Chelmer Valley Park & Ride site. The provision of a bus turnaround would be unacceptable as this would be an intrusive feature.  A plan showing 300m off-set lines from each route (as recommended by the CIHT) is needed to demonstrate that everywhere is within the 400m walking distance target, as allowance must be made for indirect walking routes to stops; without plans to scale this is not feasible to check.  The DFD demonstrates that some areas could have three routes in close proximity whereas others have only one, notably Hawthorn Village and the area south of Park Farm, which means they will be less attractive for car-free living. The neighbourhoods should be linked but none of the proposed services alone will do this (whereas there is a shuttle service for Beaulieu and Channels).  Interim bus route arrangements are needed to support the earlier phases that will not have the benefit of primary streets through the mineral extraction areas. Proposed services C12, C13 and C14 will not be possible until the requisite carriageway network is made available in Phase 3, following restoration of the mineral extraction area.  The plan should include indicative bus stop locations to demonstrate that the routes proposed can achieve 400m walking distance.	Comments are noted and the DFD and Evidence Base Documents will be updated as necessary following ongoing discussions between Mayer Brown, TPA and ECC.  <b>Matters being discussed as above. OPA considered acceptable to establish further design updates.</b>	<b>Bus Routes</b>	General 'catch-all' response noted but no specific response or action discussed on this point.	The provision of bus services across the CGC will be dealt with at outline planning application stage in accordance with principles set out in the Outline Bus Strategy.
					<b>Bus Routes</b>	General 'catch-all' response noted but no specific response or action discussed on this point.	A detailed Bus Strategy will form part of the outline planning applications and included within the s106 agreement as per the arrangement at Beaulieu.
					<b>Bus Routes</b>	General 'catch-all' response noted but no specific response or action discussed on this point.	The provision of bus services across the CGC will be dealt with at outline planning application stage in accordance with principles set out in the Outline Bus Strategy.
					<b>Bus Routes</b>	General 'catch-all' response noted but no specific response or action discussed on this point.	The provision of bus services across the CGC will be dealt with at outline planning application stage in accordance with principles set out in the Outline Bus Strategy.
					<b>Bus Routes</b>	General 'catch-all' response noted but no specific response or action discussed on this point.	The provision of bus services across the CGC will be dealt with at outline planning application stage in accordance with principles set out in the Outline Bus Strategy.
					<b>Bus Routes</b>	General 'catch-all' response noted but no specific response or action discussed on this point.	An updated bus provision diagram has been provided within the DFD. This demonstrates the coverage of bus services. The DFD includes a commitment to delivering these routes within 400m walk of new dwellings.

64	64	Active movement	Guiding Principle 2 is acceptable, however, it could be more comprehensive, stating that the Core and Summary Principles of LTN 1/20 shall be achieved, and it should be consistent with the first Movement Strategy Guiding Principle (p56); this is important. After the principle that cycling should be accessible to all, LTN 1/20 and the Government's policy 'Gear Change' clearly state that 'cycles must be treated as vehicles and not as pedestrians. On urban streets, cyclists must be physically separated from pedestrians and should not share space with pedestrians'. The principle should apply by default to other routes to avoid actual or perceived risk, and make cycling as efficient and attractive as possible, thus assisting to promote a culture of cycling (second only to walking in the mode hierarchy, as set out in the Local Plan).	Comments are noted and the DFD and Evidence Base Documents will be updated as necessary following ongoing discussions between Mayer Brown, TPA and ECC.  <b>Extra detail not considered necessary at DFD stage.</b>	Active Travel - Movement Framework	Updated DFD and DRD received; this needs to be reviewed by CCC and ECC.	The guiding framework principle 2 on page 60 is acceptable and sets out compliance with LTN1/20.
			The core principles set out in LTN 1/20 are: Networks and routes should be Coherent; Direct; Safe; Comfortable and Attractive. Inclusive design and accessibility should, run through all five of these core design principles, whilst acknowledging they will not be so direct, interim proposals for the active movement network, to show how the mineral extraction workings limitations will be addressed, need to be shown.		Active Travel - Movement Framework	Updated DFD and DRD received; this needs to be reviewed by CCC and ECC.	
65	66	Proposed Active Travel Routes Diagram	Opportunities for active travel should be considered seriously to comply with LTN 1/20 principles - Networks and routes should be Coherent; Direct; Safe; Comfortable and Attractive.	Comments are noted and the DFD and Evidence Base Documents will be updated as necessary following ongoing discussions between Mayer Brown, TPA and ECC.  <b>Matters being discussed as above. OPA considered acceptable to establish further design updates.</b>	Active Travel - Movement Framework	Updated DFD and DRD received; this needs to be reviewed by CCC and ECC.	No update. Principles confirmed to be complied with within DFD
			Routes within the masterplan are in some instances (e.g. A & B) obviously sinuous or not as direct as they appear they could be on plan; more direct routes to these should be provided, where possible. The east-west spine primary street is missing (C) south of Willow Hill village. Referencing the illustrative masterplan, the active route would be longer, and it would cross primary streets three times; this would not meet the core objectives above.		Active Travel - Movement Framework	Updated DFD and DRD received; this needs to be reviewed by CCC and ECC.	
			The direct route should be provided for active travel and conflict points with vehicles should be avoided where practicable; there are one or two links (e.g. D - a fenced in public footpath) where it is unlikely to be feasible to widen to facilitate cycling but they will become a more popular walking route; others based on the Public Rights of Way, need to be addressed carefully to ensure cycling is facilitated.		Active Travel - Movement Framework	Updated DFD and DRD received; this needs to be reviewed by CCC and ECC.	
			The new pedestrian and cyclist access point at the eastern apex of Dukes Wood Nature Park would be welcomed, to provide connectivity to the rights of way network to the east. The blue 'potential future active travel route' is noted. An alternative route would be along the entire length of Holts Lane, which may be feasible with the owner's agreement (instead or as well as the one shown) and an access point should be added to this plan accordingly to cover this possibility; either option would require the permission or agreement from the third-party landowner(s), if that is not forthcoming it may be possible for a bridleway to be created an order. Costs would need to be covered either way and consideration should be given to securing this through S106 contributions. A potentially long-term alternative process would be to secure it through the Local Plan review and future development.		Active Travel - Movement Framework	Updated DFD and DRD received; this needs to be reviewed by CCC and ECC.	
			The walking and cycling strategy must include a hierarchy defining primary and secondary routes. A discussion is required between CCC and ECC.		Active Travel - Movement Framework	Updated DFD and DRD received; this needs to be reviewed by CCC and ECC.	
			An off-site route network needs to be included with key routes to Broomfield Hospital, Little Waltham, Great Leighs, the city centre and the Regiment Gate Business Park; all on one Plan.		Active Travel - Movement Framework	Updated DFD and DRD received; this needs to be reviewed by CCC and ECC.	
66	68	Active Movement – Walking and Cycling	Springfield Employment area rather than Boreham (village) is the final key destination although Boreham Village is likely to be a source for uses on CGC.	Comments are noted and the DFD and Evidence Base Documents will be updated as necessary following ongoing discussions between Mayer Brown, TPA and ECC. To be actioned. Bullet will be updated, though this is not considered a material impact on the DFD's acceptability.	Key destinations - Small amendment	Response confirms this will be updated but DFD unchanged.	The DFD has been updated to reference the Springfield Employment Area.
67, 68	68, 69	Diagrams - Active Travel Connections to City Centre & to Broomfield Hospital	The diagrams need to be carefully revised in line with the Active Movement and Walking and Cycling Strategy, when it has been agreed with ECC and CCC. Examples include the omission of the Generals Lane route through to the new Railway Station and the inference that cycling will be acceptable on the RDR, when there are no segregated cycling facilities alongside RDR (existing or proposed). Routes to the north must also be addressed.	Comments are noted and the DFD and Evidence Base Documents will be updated as necessary following ongoing discussions between Mayer Brown, TPA and ECC.  <b>Matters being discussed as above. Final update to be provided once updated.</b>	Active Travel - Movement Framework	Updated DFD and DRD received; this needs to be reviewed by CCC and ECC.	Amendments have been made to the active travel network with a view to improve connectivity and directness of key routes. Final amendments to the proposed active travel network are in the process of being agreed between CCC officers, ECC and the Consortium. A active travel plan showing the wider network has also been provided. This includes a route to Broomfield Hospital via Croxtons Mill.
			A zoomed-out plan of the off-site active travel network needs to be included which shows the key network to destinations e.g. City centre, Hospital, University, new train station		Active Travel - Movement Framework	Updated DFD and DRD received; this needs to be reviewed by CCC and ECC.	
68	70	Active Movement-Walking and Cycling	A direct foot and cycle path should be provided between CGC and Broomfield Hospital;	Comments are noted and the DFD and Evidence Base Documents will be updated as necessary following ongoing discussions between Mayer Brown, TPA and ECC.  <b>Matters being discussed as above. OPA considered acceptable to establish further design updates.</b>	Active Travel - Movement Framework	Updated DFD and DRD received; this needs to be reviewed by CCC and ECC.	The reference to Croxtan Mill has now been removed.
			The reference to Mill Lane on the map is confusing as it is assumed the reference should refer to Croxtons Mill Lane.		Plan annotation - Small amendment	No change to DFD.	
70	72	Parking, Vehicle Access & Mobility Hubs	The case for presenting the parking strategy within the 'Mobility Hubs' (strategy) is accepted however, vehicle access warrants its own 'strategy'.	Comments are noted and the DFD and Evidence Base Documents will be updated as necessary following ongoing discussions between Mayer Brown, TPA and ECC.  <b>Agreed to review Parking Standards for DFD Parking standards shown in DRD. Can be added to DFD if required.</b>	Parking, Vehicle Access & Mobility Hubs	No change to DFD.	Vehicle Access shown on primary street network plan. Further strategy need has not been justified and can be incorporated in OPA discussions.
			The northeast corner of Hawthorn Village abuts an Essex Police facility; an access that could be used by the police or in the event of an emergency only, would be welcomed; this could be gated off have a suitable TRO.		Parking, Vehicle Access & Mobility Hubs	No change to DFD.	Not proposed. Road is private access and DFD cannot commit to this. Potential future active travel connection is possible.

			<p>The Parking Strategy is not entirely consistent with the Modal Share Target and Active Mode Target.</p> <p>The Objective is largely a statement, not an objective per se; it should be revised into an objective and alternative wording set down, such as 'to facilitate the sustainable, healthy transport culture expected and better balance the negative impacts of keeping and using cars with their benefits, as appropriate for a Garden Community' or similar should be used.</p>
71	73	<b>Primary Street Network</b>	<p>The E-W primary street across Park Farm Village and the access street off RDR roundabout 3 aside, the network of Primary Streets during mineral extraction is shown to be complete; this must be incorrect as it does not correspond with the Mineral Extraction Process (page 20) or the phasing plans for Phases 1 and 2 (pages 152- 153).</p> <p>General traffic access from Pratts Farm Lane Roundabout is not supported; any additional motor-vehicular access demand proposed, even for a limited area such as for the proposed 'Innovation Hub', will be resisted if it risks negatively impacting the performance and attractiveness of bus services, in particular the Park &amp; Ride using this junction. Additional delays to Park &amp; Ride service users in accessing / egressing the site by car due to additional vehicular use of the junction to access the CGC site will affect the attractiveness of the service too and will be viewed similarly.</p> <p>A strategy will be required to manage the transition of the area affected by the relocation of the temporary bus gate in Park Farm Village, if the parcel is delivered prematurely in isolation, as this is highly likely to be unpopular with affected occupants even with consistently good prior engagement.</p> <p>The primary route north from roundabout 3 (Channels Drive/ Beaulieu Parkway/ Commonwealth Link) is not proposed to carry a bus service according to the early bus provision diagrams; therefore it would simply be an 'all traffic route'; it has been realigned into Phase 3 to the east, which suggests a significant area of housing will have access to it, bypassing the bus gate; clarification is required. Greater detail generally as to which parcels and numbers of dwellings that would be proposed to take vehicular access from each of the primary Streets and respective access junctions from the RDR2, ERW, Channels and RDR would be helpful to form a view on the Movement Strategy. The Primary Street Network diagrams show the whole of Park Farm, for example, being allocated to Zone 2 (vehicle access from RDR2/ Roundabout), which would suggest that there is no access proposed from the area nearest the RDR via the new road (off roundabout 3) that runs along the west edge; this contrasts with the relatively small area of Zone One that is shown with access from the RDR by the new access.</p> <p>The bus only gateways shown on the primary street/ bus route network only restrict car movement across the centre of the development; while significant, this would provide competitive advantage for buses and cycles over cars for only a limited number of trips between villages. Most local trips can be expected to be within each village and no advantages, nor even any off-setting of the competitive disadvantages that bus services have over easily accessed cars (i.e., having to make stops and passenger walk-time to the stop in the first place compared to jumping in the car on the driveway), would be provided from the layout for the trips that buses need to compete with cars for i.e., the medium distance trips to key off-site destinations. Bus lanes on Essex Regiment Way will only provide an advantage for relevant trips when the network is congested.</p> <p>The primary streets should not be designed to make them more attractive than using the strategic roads eg: a driver approaching CGC from the north going to the southern area of Great Belsteads, should not be tempted to use the primary street to the east of Wheelers Hill instead of Essex Regiment Way and the new access from it</p> <p>Necessary alternative off-site routes will be available for walking and cycling off-site to key destinations (e.g., to Broomfield Hospital), there is similarly little or no advantage for pedestrians and cyclists over cars from the primary street layout unless a bus gate is in place.</p> <p>Some primary streets (e.g. N-S through Willow Hill and Park Farm), appear to be overly sinuous for good bus routes, which is contrary to recognised design guidance for bus routes.</p> <p>Additional non-car gateways should be introduced on the primary street network (subject to other matters such as the number of RDR2 accesses being addressed) with significant diversions for general traffic, as per TCPA advice.</p> <p>The copy of the illustrative masterplan primary street network has been annotated with green, to show suggested bus and active mode only links that unlike the bus gates, would be circumventable by cars and other vehicles (except to the Pratts Farm Lane access and perhaps roundabout 3 of RDR1).</p> <p><b>A discussion is required between CCC and ECC.</b></p>

		<b>Parking, Vehicle Access &amp; Mobility Hubs</b>	The Parking Strategy remains inconsistent with the Modal Share Target and Active Mode Target.	Disagree. No change to be made. Strategy is consistent with targets.
		<b>Parking, Vehicle Access &amp; Mobility Hubs</b>	No change to DFD.	Narrative statement. No update required.
		<b>Primary Street Network</b>	Updated DFD and DRD received; this needs to be reviewed by CCC and ECC.	DFD has been updated to address this.
		<b>Primary Street Network</b>	Updated DFD and DRD received; this needs to be reviewed by CCC and ECC. Clarification re: general vehicle access from Pratts Farm Lane not provided.	Responses considered to be too detailed for DFD. To be addressed at OPA and RMA stages where relevant.
		<b>Primary Street Network</b>	Updated DFD and DRD received; this needs to be reviewed by CCC and ECC.	Responses considered to be too detailed for DFD. To be addressed at OPA and RMA stages where relevant.
		<b>Primary Street Network</b>	Updated DFD and DRD received; this needs to be reviewed by CCC and ECC. Access arrangements from roundabout 3 of RDR1 need to be understood at the DFD stage and not left to the outline planning application.	Responses considered to be too detailed for DFD. To be addressed at OPA and RMA stages where relevant.
		<b>Primary Street Network</b>	Updated DFD and DRD received; this needs to be reviewed by CCC and ECC. The approach to bus only gateways requires further discussion.	Responses considered to be too detailed for DFD. To be addressed at OPA and RMA stages where relevant.
		<b>Primary Street Network</b>	Updated DFD and DRD received; this needs to be reviewed by CCC and ECC.	Responses considered to be too detailed for DFD. To be addressed at OPA and RMA stages where relevant.
		<b>Primary Street Network</b>	Updated DFD and DRD received; this needs to be reviewed by CCC and ECC.	Responses considered to be too detailed for DFD. To be addressed at OPA and RMA stages where relevant.
		<b>Primary Street Network</b>	Updated DFD and DRD received; this needs to be reviewed by CCC and ECC. No mention is made of non-car gateways.	Responses considered to be too detailed for DFD. To be addressed at OPA and RMA stages where relevant.
		<b>Primary Street Network</b>	Updated DFD and DRD received; this needs to be reviewed by CCC and ECC. No feedback provided regarding the CCC/ECC annotated copy of the illustrative masterplan.	Responses considered to be too detailed for DFD. To be addressed at OPA and RMA stages where relevant.

			<p>Limited detail is provided on proposed urban blocks, as such it is not possible to suggest detailed diversion routes for general traffic now; however, it is assumed that each block would have vehicular access with internal streets, so the cost of providing these diversions should not be prohibitive. Further, having alternative loops provides resilience. Subject to enforcement practicalities, the actual length of traffic restriction could be short gateways at the main road end of relevant streets to enable direct vehicular access off them but by a much longer route than the standard estate (not Garden Community) proposal shown. Retrofitting such measures, as is happening widely across the country to deliver Walkable Neighbourhoods in existing communities, is much more challenging than installing them originally.</p> <p><b>A discussion is required between CCC and ECC.</b></p> <p>Each bus gateway will need suitable arrangements either side to enable prohibited vehicles to turn around to avoid the gateway. Exemptions would apply to such prohibitions, such as for emergency services and authorised waste and recycling collection vehicles. Consideration also needs to be given to the location of bus gates and how turning heads can be integrated into residential parcels not located in areas of open space becoming an engineered and intrusive feature. Clarification is required to show how bus gates would operate (e.g. bi-directional or one direction?)</p>		<p><b>Primary Street Network</b></p> <p>Updated DFD and DRD received; this needs to be reviewed by CCC and ECC.</p> <p>Responses considered to be too detailed for DFD. To be addressed at OPA and RMA stages where relevant.</p>
				<p><b>Primary Street Network</b></p> <p>Updated DFD and DRD received; this needs to be reviewed by CCC and ECC.</p> <p>Responses considered to be too detailed for DFD. To be addressed at OPA and RMA stages where relevant.</p>	
71	73	<b>Drawing - Parking, Vehicle Access &amp; Mobility Hubs</b>	<p>Clarity is required as to what year the "Primary Street Network - during mineral extraction" represents; whilst it does seem to anticipate the CNEB being built, so potentially 2024/25, if this is intended to represent a time when mineral extraction will be ongoing in Park Farm (likely from 2023 to 2029), then there can be no access for non-quarry traffic east-west using the bridge that will carry the conveyor, nor the north-south route east of Park Farm as this seems to pass through the Park Farm quarry area.</p> <p>The key does not explain the two headed arrows that cross the CNEB, although they are inferred to be foot and cycle bridges.</p>	<p>Comments are noted and the DFD and Evidence Base Documents will be updated as necessary following ongoing discussions between Mayer Brown, TPA and ECC.</p> <p><b>Dates not possible to confirm.</b></p> <p><b>Item 2 to be actioned.</b></p>	<p><b>Primary Street Network - Mineral Extraction</b></p> <p>Clarity is required regarding timescales to understand how the CGC would function in relation to movement.</p> <p>Plan removed and explained in latter phasing section plans.</p>
				<p><b>Primary Street Network - Pedestrian &amp; Cycle Access</b></p> <p>Detail still to be provided regarding the foot and cycle bridges.</p> <p>DFD updated.</p>	
72	74	<b>Parking</b>	<p>The second paragraph should be deleted; relinquishing ownership of a vehicle can be a very quick process, once an owner's mind is made up. Further, the desire to have a home is an overriding reason to do so. Developers' mindset requires multiple parking spaces for ease of use of private cars; that needs to change now, bearing in mind the Climate Emergency and Garden City Principles; as demonstrated elsewhere, pioneer or early-stage adopters of low-car (not necessarily car-free) lifestyles will be attracted and be satisfied, provided that promised infrastructure and services are delivered in good order.</p> <p>Details of vehicle specifications and locations of Car Club spaces will need to be provided at reserved matters stage, however, the principle and number of Car Club vehicles should be secured at the outline planning application stage and form part of the s106 Agreement.</p> <p>Reference to a simple numeric set of standards for early phases does not pin down when exactly they will change. Noting that there are only 4 phases presented in the DFD this would imply that traditional standards may be applied for over 2500 dwellings; this is in line with the TCPA Garden City principles and climate emergency objectives.</p> <p><b>A discussion is required between CCC and ECC as to how best to deliver off-plot provision with EV charging and temporary spaces in early phases.</b></p>	<p>Comments are noted and the DFD and Evidence Base Documents will be updated as necessary following ongoing discussions between Mayer Brown, TPA and ECC.</p> <p>Agreed to review Parking Standards.</p> <p><b>RE paragraph 2. This should remain as 'pioneer' residents will not represent the majority of occupations and development cannot be delivered without a phased approach.</b></p> <p><b>Discussion ongoing. Section to be updated where relevant following final agreements.</b></p> <p><b>DRD identifies parking</b></p>	<p><b>Parking</b></p> <p>No change made.</p> <p>The baseline Parking Standards are set out on page XX of DFD; these baseline standards which limit provision on-plot whilst allowing additional off-plot parking in parking clusters within walking distance of, but not adjacent to residential properties; the intention is that the parking clusters can be genuinely repurposed for alternative uses at an appropriate time.</p>
				<p><b>Parking - Car Club</b></p> <p>The DFD needs to be clear that car club spaces are to be provided as this is an integral part of the series of sustainable transport measures necessary to ensure attainment of the modal targets. The use of wording 'where practical and feasible' is not affirmative and gives plenty of scope not to provide the car club spaces.</p> <p>A car club is to be provided at an early stage in the development; all dwellings would be within a 400m walk of the car club.</p>	
				<p><b>Parking - Strategy</b></p> <p>Phases are now defined in relation to the strategy but are problematic. The approach to off plot parking has been progressed with the inclusion of a phasing plan but the plans tabled to date lack ambition, suggest removal of parking 5 years into the development and are likely to face resistance from the community due to car borne established travel patterns.</p> <p>The baseline Parking Standards are set out on page 74 of DFD; these baseline standards which limit provision on-plot whilst allowing additional off-plot parking in parking clusters within walking distance of, but not adjacent to residential properties; the intention is that the parking clusters can be genuinely repurposed for alternative uses at an appropriate time.</p>	
73	75	<b>Mobility Hubs</b>	<p>Clarification is required as to how Mobility Hubs are counted in the 'Rule of 10'; to maximise use of transport services provided at these hubs there needs to be other reasons for people to go to them.</p> <p>Fixed bicycle pumps for public use as an easy and quick way to keep people cycling would be welcomed.</p> <p>12 minutes walking time, to reach a transport interchange, whilst a target maximum is significant however worthy the options there may be. Provision of 'tertiary' hubs to reduce this to 5 minutes maximum (commensurate with access to the nearest bus stop) should be provided and used, for example, to better disperse Car Club vehicles and electric cycles.</p>	<p>Comments are noted and the DFD and Evidence Base Documents will be updated as necessary following ongoing discussions between Mayer Brown, TPA and ECC.</p> <p><b>Discussion ongoing. Section to be updated where relevant following final agreements.</b></p>	<p><b>Mobility Hubs</b></p> <p>Changes made; clarification now provided as to the services provided at the mobility hubs and the distinction between primary and secondary hubs.</p> <p>Page 73 has been updated to show the services typically contained at a mobility hub.</p>
				<p><b>Mobility Hubs</b></p> <p>No change made but easily accommodated.</p> <p>Evidence base to be updated.</p>	
				<p><b>Mobility Hubs</b></p> <p>No change made.</p> <p>The text on page 72 has been updated to confirm that mobility hubs will be spread across the site to support a range of sustainable modes of travel.</p>	
74	76	<b>Landscape Strategy</b>	<p>The NE Bypass provides severance in the masterplan and difficulty in achieving a cohesive community. Alternative treatments, such as land bridges should be explored, to enable greater cohesiveness, integration and connection between different neighbourhoods. The central bridge across the bypass could if widened be an iconic green bridge feature acting as a marker signposting the new village, its intent, whilst reducing severance.</p> <p>A land bridge is also recommended to promote access to areas that are exclusive to pedestrians and cyclists, further encouraging active travel and sustainable green links.</p>	<p>The Central Bridge has been approved under the CNEB Application by ECC and will be constructed by ECC. It is designed to accommodate a conveyor during the course of the minerals extraction and following this it can be retrofitted to accommodate a vehicular crossing for buses and cars as well as pedestrian and cycle crossing. The additional two bridges are proposed as pedestrian/cycle crossings only. <b>No action.</b></p>	<p><b>Landscape Strategy</b></p> <p>Bridge already approved by ECC - noted it could be retrofitted to accommodate a vehicular crossing for buses and cars and a pedestrian and cycle crossing.</p> <p>No further action required.</p>
				<p><b>Landscape Strategy - Pedestrian &amp; Cycle Bridges</b></p> <p>Two additional bridges are to be provided; worth exploring if there is scope for introducing additional landscaping.</p> <p>Landscaping will not be proposed due to significant increased costings and no ecological requirement.</p>	
		<b>Guiding Framework Principles: Green &amp; Blue Infrastructure</b>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p><b>No action. Principles considered sufficient and good design would dictate severance.</b></p> <p>The principles should refer more specifically to mitigating severance by roads and other uses both within and outside the site.</p>	<p><b>Landscape - Guiding Principles</b></p> <p>No changes made - comments could be added re: good design addressing severance.</p> <p>Guiding principle 1 on page 76 has been updated to indicate that the green and blue infrastructure will be a network for safe movement of wildlife and people.</p>	

75	77	<b>Green Infrastructure</b>	Shared surface paths are proposed where possible for pedestrians, cyclists (and presumably other micro-modes) and, where appropriate, for equestrians too. Cyclists should be segregated from pedestrians by default as a matter of principle for several good reasons; as the Greenways network is to be heavily relied on for encouraging cycling, it should only be when links have been considered more closely that sharing them with pedestrians should be accepted. The decision should be finally determined at reserved matters stage. <b>A discussion is required between CCC and ECC as to an approach to Primary and Secondary routes and segregated vs shared routes; this cannot be left to reserved matters phase. The surface finish of footpaths and cycle tracks will need to be bound.</b>	Comments are noted and the DFD and Evidence Base Documents will be updated as necessary following ongoing discussions between Mayer Brown, TPA and ECC. <b>To be further detailed at OPA stage.</b>	<b>Green Infrastructure - Pedestrian &amp; Cycle Routes</b>	Updated DFD and DRD received. This needs to be reviewed by CCC and ECC. The approach to shared routes need to be agreed at DFD stage as this has spatial implications.	Greenways which run through the CGC will form an important part of the pedestrian and cycle movement strategy; each outline application will set out within their respective Green Infrastructure Strategies and Parameter Plans where the Greenways will be delivered and how wide these will be.
76	78	<b>Guiding Framework Principles: Green and Blue Infrastructure – Cultural Heritage (Guiding Principles)</b>	The guiding principles require amendments. Guiding Principle 2: ‘Through positive masterplanning seek to respect and protect the setting of heritage assets to ensure their significance is preserved and wherever possible enhanced and any harm minimised’ should be amended to ‘Through positive masterplanning seek to respect and protect the setting of heritage assets to ensure their significance is preserved and wherever possible enhanced, where harm is unavoidable it will be minimised and mitigated.’ Guiding Principle 5: ‘Retain or reinterpret the historic layout of hedgerows where possible in order to respect the historical context and evolution of the site’. Amend to include ‘lanes and historic landscape features.’	Agree amended text as suggested <b>Actioned</b>	<b>Cultural Heritage - Guiding Principles</b>	Change made to DFD.	The guiding principle (Number 2) has been updated on page 78.
76-78	80	<b>Heritage</b>	A stronger point to use the heritage assets as a way to shape aspects of the character of the villages should be made. Beaulieu used the context of New Hall, farmstead and traditional buildings to create areas of mews and farmstead style development. Opportunities to build upon this should be developed for the rest of the community, whilst also relating back to Beaulieu. How will the character of Domsey Lane be preserved within the development?  The findings of the heritage assessment are not fully integrated into the DFD; it is important that the scope of the report fully informs the masterplan and any variations are justified. The DFD notes that detailed heritage assessments are to be undertaken to inform the OPA’s. The work should be undertaken at an early stage to ensure the DFD fully reflects the heritage constraints and opportunities; where there is an impact on the setting text should note potential mitigation methods.  The DFD includes objectives to protect the setting of the heritage assets with the hedgerows retained and the former line of the deer park defined; these features are welcomed but the DFD needs to be amended to protect the historic environment and maximise enhancement opportunities. The opportunities to use the heritage of the site to inform the development are not fully realised.  The Heritage Assessment identifies three important views between heritage sites - between Powers and Little Waltham, powers and Peverels and Park Farm and Mount Maskall; this provides a strong concept to define local character, gives legibility to the new development and mitigates the impacts on the listed buildings and their settings. The opportunity for these views to be incorporated into the DFD and reflected in the framework layouts is not fully realised. The view from the high ground near Powers Farm to Little Waltham is not reflected in the layout. The corridor between Powers and Peverels orientation is incorrect, as it does not link the listed farmstead and the intervening landscape corridor is too narrow.  The heritage trail concept is welcomed. The concept of greenways (incorporating landscaping, public art and interpretation) through the site gives the opportunity to celebrate the heritage of the site. The trail should be extended to include both the deer park pales and to link to the Grade II listed buildings. The eastern and western parts of the site should also be linked and the trails should be extended beyond the site boundary to New Hall, Little Waltham and Pratts Farm. The trail should also be informed by the ongoing archaeological assessment and where appropriate celebrate these features.  The heritage mitigation is not well defined and should include no build areas, open space, landscaping, creation of views, woodland planting, landscaping, density, design, layout, scale and materials; it is important there is a clear mitigation strategy to ensure there is a framework to minimise harm and help define character in future OPA’s.  The proposals should be sufficiently flexible to accommodate significant archaeological finds where necessary.  The heritage aspects of the site are a fundamental consideration in the identity and character of the new places; there is still work to be done to clearly demonstrate how heritage contributes to all aspects of the future masterplan and design codes.  Heritage on site should be reviewed as its own true layer, with greater research behind the ecological and built heritage evident on site to substantiate the design strategies of the proposed scheme. Heritage is evident below and above ground, within local landscapes and woodlands, etc. and should not be considered as just purely cultural assets. New buildings should not be hidden from listed buildings, they can co-exist if a clear heritage strategy is used to inform design development.  Spaces between buildings should be reviewed to create experiences for people moving through the site. Looking at the site from a micro scale, there is no reason why the setting of a cluster of historical buildings cannot provide the character of a conservation area, as this does not have to cover a large surface area.	Comments are noted and the DFD text will be updated where appropriate. <b>Matter for Design Code</b>  <b>DFD reflects critical constraints. Details are a matter for OPA.</b>  <b>Covered in GP 2 update.</b>  <b>DFD reflects critical constraints. Details are a matter for OPA.</b>	<b>Cultural Heritage - Assets</b>  <b>Cultural Heritage - Assets</b>  <b>Cultural Heritage - Assets</b>  <b>Cultural Heritage - Assets</b>	Greater consideration should be given to the character of Domsey lane through the inclusion of a specific section within the DFD.  Confirmation needed as to the scope of work already undertaken in parallel with the DFD to inform the outline planning applications.  Change made to DFD.  Work to understand key views and their implications required at DFD stage.	Domsey Lane is referenced as a specific character area at pages 144 and 145 of the DFD. The document details how the Design Framework intends to minimise the impact of development on the existing community and character of Domsey Lane.  No further action required at this stage.  Changes made in the guiding principles update.  Detail sufficient for this stage. Further matters to be discussed at OPA stage.
				<b>To be reviewed at OPA stage.</b>	<b>Cultural Heritage - Assets</b>	Confirmation needed as to the scope of work already undertaken in parallel with the DFD to inform the outline planning applications.	A discovery trails plan has been added to the DFD at page 82. Information about the discovery trails on page 80.
				<b>To be reviewed at OPA stage.</b>	<b>Cultural Heritage - Assets</b>	A clear mitigation strategy is required now, as per the approach at Beaulieu where the NCAAP identified the areas to be kept free from built development and land to form part of the compensatory measures; this then informed the Parameter Plans which formed part of the outline planning applications.	The DFD sets parameters in relation to Green Infrastructure and areas to encompass built development. Further detail in relation to mitigation would be provided at outline planning application stage.
				<b>To be reviewed at OPA stage subject to finds.</b>	<b>Cultural Heritage - Assets</b>	Confirmation needed as to the scope of work already undertaken in parallel with the DFD to inform the outline planning applications.	No further information required at this stage. Matter to be reviewed and agreed as part of the outline planning applications.
				<b>To be reviewed at OPA stage and as part of Design Code.</b>	<b>Cultural Heritage - Assets</b>	Confirmation needed as to the scope of work already undertaken in parallel with the DFD to inform the outline planning applications.	The discovery trails information is set out on page 80. The map on page 82 also indicates new public art landmarks.
				<b>To be reviewed at OPA stage.</b>	<b>Cultural Heritage - Assets</b>	Confirmation needed as to the scope of work already undertaken in parallel with the DFD to inform the outline planning applications.	No further information required at this stage. Matter to be reviewed and agreed as part of the OPA’s.
				<b>To be reviewed at OPA stage.</b>	<b>Cultural Heritage - Assets</b>	Confirmation needed as to the scope of work already undertaken in parallel with the DFD to inform the outline planning applications.	No further information required at this stage. Matter to be reviewed and agreed as part of the outline planning applications.

			A review of how the bridge and other built forms could be created as a progression of a heritage narrative, could help to highlight the key features of the masterplan in terms of the new vernacular for Chelmsford Garden village.	<b>To be reviewed at OPA stage.</b>	<b>Cultural Heritage - Assets</b>	Confirmation needed as to the scope of work already undertaken in parallel with the DFD to inform the outline planning applications.	No further information required at this stage. Matter to be reviewed and agreed as part of the outline planning applications.
80	82	<b>Green and Blue Infrastructure - Biodiversity Net Gain (Guiding Principles)</b>	The prioritisation of BNG delivery onsite is supported; this is to be achieved via the provision and retention of existing GI features and the provision of new features, however, it is recognised that this might not always be conceivable, and that offsite delivery could provide additional benefits and be used to protect areas of land that are of local natural and wildlife value. Off-site provision, where necessary should be located within close proximity of the site and should feed into the delivery of the Essex GI Strategy, supporting the enhancement and protection of the wider Essex GI network. <b>The removal of the residential area to the north of RDR2 provides an opportunity to achieve the BNG.</b>	Comments are noted. <b>No action.</b>	<b>Biodiversity Net Gain Guiding Principles</b>	The opportunity for biodiversity net gain to be delivered off site, but within close proximity should be recognised; this could include land beyond the northern RDR.	The DFD indicates on page 84 that off-site biodiversity net gain would only be considered if the 10% on site provision cannot be attained.
81	83 - Wrong location	<b>Guiding Framework Principles: Green and Blue - Biodiversity Net Gain (Delivery Timeframe)</b>	A greater ambition is required on the delivery of net zero in the residential and non-residential elements and in particular the details of how the design intent will be realised in operation. Technologies will improve and new approaches to net zero carbon emissions will evolve within the timelines of the project, however further clarification is sought on how homes and offices will be 'used' and how energy use will be monitored and if necessary, remedial actions carried out.  Further details on a climate change resilience plan should be provided so that impacts, adaptation, and mitigation are collated into a single strategy. Elements with respect to the blue and green infrastructure strategy are set out, although how this 'works' spatially would be clearer in a single strategy.	Meeting set up on 3rd October with ECC, CCC, Consortium and Turley <b>Discussions ongoing. CCRP for OPA stage.</b>	<b>Biodiversity Net Gain - Delivery Timeframe</b>	Meeting arranged between CCC, ECC, Consortium and Turley on 03.11; this remains a key issue.	A Carbon Framework has now been agreed which sets out an ambitious pathway to achieving a net zero carbon development. The timescale for the implementation of higher sustainable design and construction targets over the lifetime of the Garden Community has been the subject of a number of meetings between the Consortium and CCC and ECC officers, including specialist advice from the County and its appointed consultant.
82-83	85	<b>Guiding Framework Principles: Green and Blue Infrastructure - Sustainable Surface Water Management (Guiding Principles)</b>	A brief explanation of how the drainage will affect the layout would be welcomed e.g.; will any strategic drainage corridors need to be installed early on and become a restriction to later phases.	A fully detailed explanation of the proposed drainage strategy is provided in the submitted Onsite Civil Engineering Infrastructure Statement Evidence Base Document. Further details will be provided for each Zone in the submitted EIA at OPA Stage. <b>No action.</b>	<b>Sustainable Surface Water Management</b>	On-Site Civil Engineering Infrastructure Statement Evidence Base Document to be further reviewed by CCC.	The DFD sets out the sustainable surface water drainage details on pages 86 and 87 of the DFD.
85	87	<b>Guiding Framework Principles: Green and Blue Infrastructure - Arboriculture (Woodland and Tree Planting Strategy).</b>	Ideally, strategic elements of the green infrastructure network should be brought forward in phase one of the development to create a landscape structure and to allow early establishment.	Chapter 9 (Delivery and Phasing) provides a detailed breakdown of what green infrastructure will be delivered and when. This includes a series of Phasing Plans. <b>No action. Further detail via OPAs.</b>	<b>Green Infrastructure - Delivery</b>	Further internal discussion required re: Green Infrastructure Plan and timing of delivery with Parks and Leisure.	Matters in relation to phasing and delivery can be dealt with via PFA and the Site Specific s106 Agreements.
86	88	<b>Open Space, Play and Sport</b>	The even distribution of formal sports pitches shown across three locations within the DFD differs from the paper (CCC Pitch Provision North-East Chelmsford Briefing Paper) which suggested two outdoor sports grounds with a critical mass of sports provision. <b>A discussion is required with CCC Parks Services; joint use at the school should be encouraged and the phasing also makes relocation difficult. The question as to whether provision at Great Belsteads could be increased needs to be considered.</b>	The DFD proposes formal sports provision in two locations to be managed by CCC at Dukes Wood Sports Hub and Great Belsteads Sports Hub. The third location will be managed by the All Through School Academy as is done at Beaulieu Park School. The Zone 2 OPA Team are meeting with CCC's Sport and Recreation Team on the 28th September to discuss the joint use of school facilities and this will be secured via the Zone 2 OPA S106. <b>Mix shown on page 90. All subject to OPA agreements.</b>	<b>Formal Sports Provision</b>	The principle of two locations for formal sports provision (Dukes Wood and Great Belsteads) together with joint use provision at the all through school campus is fully supported. The level of provision at Great Belsteads Sports Hub remains inadequate and would not support a viable club. The areas must be agreed at DFD stage as there are clear spatial implications / issues for displacement of other land uses where the sports provision needs to be enlarged. The level of parking provision at each sports hub is now undefined rather than referencing an agreed number of spaces - 120 as per Beaulieu.	Formal sports provision is to be provided at two standalone sites (Great Belsteads and Dukes Wood) and at the all through school. The provision at the standalone sites would match the proposed provision at Beaulieu. The precise level of parking provision would be agreed as part of the outline planning applications.
87	89	<b>Guiding Framework Principles: Green and Blue Infrastructure - Open Space, Play and Sport.</b>	Indoor Provision: School Site – Little reference is made to indoor sporting needs / use save for reference in the Health and Community Facilities document, that a four court sports hall is needed. The school could also potentially offer studios, activity rooms, fitness facilities, outdoor courts etc.	The DFD text will be updated to clarify and the provision of a four court sports hall is to be delivered in the All Through School. A further multi-purpose indoor hall will be provided in the Community Centre to be delivered in Great Belsteads Village. Added in middle column on p89.	<b>Indoor Sports Provision</b>	Change made to DFD.	The DFD clarifies that an four court sports hall to meet Sport England Standards will be provided at the all through school. Provision will also be made for community fitness within the community centres and any commercial gyms accommodated within the village centres.
89	90	<b>Open space, Play and sport-productive landscapes</b>	Provision should be made for formal allotments the DFD should be clear where these are located.  Outdoor Sports Courts: School Site – Clarity is required as to what, if any, multi-purpose outdoor sports court provision is to be accommodated at the all through school site and how this might impact upon the quantity and usage patterns of those proposed at Dukes Wood Sports Hub.  • Car Parking Study/Management Plan: School Site – Should two 3G and two grass pitches be made available at the all through school at the same time, a car parking study/management plan is recommended at the appropriate stage, especially if use coincides with indoor sports facilities being made available to the public. <b>Parking for Great Belsteads could be partly accommodated at the Park &amp; Ride site at weekends; this requires a discussion with ECC.</b>  Specification of Facilities – CCC would wish to agree the specification of any facilities in conjunction with Sport England Design Guidance prior to adoption / future operation e.g.: sports pitches, multi-use courts, ancillary sports accommodation; it is essential that courts are flood lit.  Dukes Wood Sports Hub – No reference is made to a pavilion / clubhouse / changing facilities / car parking at the sports hub unlike the Great Belsteads Sports Hub; such facilities are essential at sports hub sites for successful delivery and sustainability.  Dukes Wood Sports Pitches – The largest quota of sports pitches at Dukes Wood would not be online until Phase 4 of the development, circa 2040-2044; this may strain existing sports sites in the interim. – <b>Discuss with Parks</b>  The DFD should include a table that specifies the provision of outdoor and indoor sports alongside the adopted standards (including Hanger at Hawthorn Village?)	The Green Infrastructure Plan on page 118 – 119 confirms 4ha of allotments and community gardens will be provided and indicative areas are shown for each Zone. The exact location will then be shown on the Parameter Plans at OPA Stage. <b>No action.</b>  To be discussed at the OPA Stage <b>No action.</b>  The detailed planning applications for each school will be prepared and submitted by ECC and will be determined by ECC. Car Parking Management is therefore outside the control of the Consortium. The Zone 2 OPA S106 will ensure the sports facilities at the All Through School Site are made available to the wider public in perpetuity. <b>No action.</b>  The specification of the Sports Facilities will be agreed at OPA Stage. <b>No action.</b>  A pavilion will be provided and the DFD Text will be updated. <b>Actioned on 90.</b>  The Great Belsteads Sports Hub will be delivered in Phase 1, the joint use Sports Facilities will be delivered in Phase 2 which will take pressure off existing sports sites. <b>No action.</b>	<b>Allotments</b>	Areas are identified on the Green Infrastructure Plan.	Page 91 of the DFD confirms that 4 hectares of allotments and community gardens will be provided.
					<b>Outdoor Sports Courts</b>	Discussion required between ECC and CCC.	A multi-use games area (MUGA) will be provided at the All Through School or Dukes Wood as set out in the DFD.
					<b>Car Parking Study</b>	The DFD needs to acknowledge that a study is required to ensure issues do not arise as were experienced in the early stages of joint use provision at the Beaulieu Park School Campus. This can form part of the OPA	Page 92 of the DFD indicates that a car park study and management plan will be submitted as part of the reserved matters application for the All Through School.
					<b>Sports Facilities Specification</b>	Clarification noted.	The provision will comply with Sport England standards.
					<b>Sports Pitch Pavilion</b>	Change made to DFD.	A pavilion is now referenced as part of the provision for Dukes Wood.
					<b>Formal Sports Provision - Delivery</b>	Discussion required with CCC Parks Services. Early delivery of Great Belsteads Sports Hub welcomed but it needs to be provided with a compliant level of sports pitch provision, a pavilion, groundsman's store and welfare facilities and car parking.	The formal sports provision has been the subject of extensive discussion with CCC Parks & Green Spaces and officers are satisfied that the areas set aside are sufficient to accommodate the required sports provision. Detailed phasing is for discussion at outline planning
					<b>Indoor &amp; Outdoor Sports Provision - Table</b>	Changes are required to the DFD.	The DFD does not propose to use the hanger for sport.

			<p>Whilst the proposed outdoor sports ground based in the center of Park Farm Village and the area located west of the Dukes Wood Nature Park are of a size/scale which would allow resident clubs to flourish and be sustainable (including club base for social activities), the proposed area in Great Belsteads Village is not as it only provides 2 pitches/cricket facility. The new sports ground located east of new Hall School is also shown and whilst this to serve already establishing communities, the size, scale and facilities proposed is a good model to compare too.</p>	<p>DFD will be updated to include a detailed development spec. <b>Appendix 4 Comments noted. Pitch mix indicatively confirmed on page 90.</b></p>	<p><b>Formal Sports Provision - Pitch Provision</b></p>	<p>The inclusion of a table is welcomed, however it remains clear that the level of provision at Great Belsteads is deficient and would not support a viable club.</p>	<p>The DFD has been updated. The sports provision is now acceptable and marries with the level of provision proposed at Beaulieu.</p>
			<p>Further detail may follow, but neighbourhood equipped play facilities are not specifically referred to on the illustrative master plan. Informal outdoor youth facilities such skateboard ramps, half sized 3 a side basketball courts for informal use and kickabout spaces (informal recreational use as opposed to use for competitive sports use) are also not specifically mentioned. The distribution of these facilities need to be considered as part of the development and need to reference to the Local Plan Making Places standards and guidelines.</p>	<p>Comments noted. <b>Matter for OPAs and RMAs</b></p>	<p><b>Neighbourhood Equipped Play</b></p>	<p>The spatial implications of accommodating these facilities needs to be understood at DFD stage.</p>	<p>The DFD has been updated to show Neighbourhood Equipped Area for Play (NEAPs) and Local Equipped Areas for Play (LEAPs) on the Green Infrastructure Framework Parameter Plans. 5 NEAPs are to be provided and 10 LEAPs.</p>
			<p>The Great Belsteads and Dukes Wood sports hubs should be future proofed to ensure that they are suitably located to accommodate a floodlit AGP, regardless of whether a 3G AGP is provided initially. The location needs to have regard to planning and environmental considerations such as ecology, noise, lighting impacts.</p>	<p>Comments noted and a detailed specification will be secured at OPA Stage. <b>No action.</b></p>	<p><b>3G Provision</b></p>	<p>The siting of the 3G provision needs to be considered at DFD stage as this will need to take account of the location of existing/future residential development and ecological receptors.</p>	<p>Two 3G pitches are to be provided. One at the All Through School and one at Dukes Wood.</p>
			<p>Rugby – The proposals for rugby union may be indicative however the value of providing a single rugby pitch in the Great Belsteads sports hub is questioned; unlike other sports, rugby union is an entirely club based sport and rugby clubs do not usually use remote sites, especially single pitch sites. A financial contribution towards improving the capacity of the rugby pitches at Coronation Park, where Chelmsford RFC are based would be considered more appropriate than on-site provision being made. <b>A discussion is required with CCC Parks Services.</b></p>	<p>Comments noted. <b>Comments noted. Pitch mix indicatively confirmed on page 90.</b></p>	<p><b>Rugby Provision</b></p>	<p>Rugby pitches are no longer incorporated at Great Belsteads Sports Hub. The provision of a financial contribution still needs to be considered - ref: IDP. Discussion required with Parks Services</p>	<p>Contributions towards rugby will be addressed within the IDP.</p>
			<p>Cricket – consideration should be given to the provision of a second square at the sports hub, or at the Dukes Wood sports hub, as this would help with the all year sustainability of the sports hub. The cricket square should be supported by an artificial wicket and training nets to provide practice match and training facilities to support the natural turf square. Hockey – Off site provision in the form of enhancing off-site facilities at Chelmer Park would be more appropriate than additional on-site provision.</p>	<p>Comments noted <b>Matter for OPAs and RMAs</b></p>	<p><b>Cricket Provision</b></p>	<p>Provision is made for a cricket square at both sports hub. Provision should be made for artificial wicket and training nets.</p>	<p>The matter will be addressed within the outline planning applications.</p>
			<p>Tennis – The provision of multi-purpose courts at the Dukes Wood sports hub is welcomed however, provision for tennis should also be made in the development's main parks to encourage informal tennis. The All Through School multi-use games area should also be designed for community use; these measures would help allow the additional tennis needs (and the needs of other court based sports) generated by the earlier phases of the development to be met, given that the Dukes Wood sports hub would not be delivered until the later phases of the development. <b>A discussion is required with CCC Parks Services.</b></p>	<p>Comments noted <b>Item removed as spec confirmed was as per Beaulieu. Final mix can be agreed as part of OPAs.</b></p>	<p><b>Tennis Provision</b></p>	<p>CCC Parks had agreed that the specification for sports provision should marry with that being delivered at Beaulieu. Clarification required as to whether provision is to be accommodated within the development's main parks.</p>	<p>Page 92 confirms that the open spaces and greenways within the CGC will also include areas for informal sport.</p>
			<p>All Through School – Natural turf pitches proposed at the school for community use would need to be in addition, to the natural turf pitches proposed to meet the school's educational needs as the pitches would not have the carrying capacity for meeting educational and community needs. The outline planning applications should consider how a sports hub, shared with the all through school, would be managed as the success of the approach would be dependent on the facilities being available and suitably maintained for meeting their educational needs. The principle of the approach is welcomed however, it is requested, that this be discussed with ECC and CCC to determine whether the model can be pursued in practice. A high level options appraisal may need to be undertaken to inform this process. Should the school manage the sports hub, a formal community use agreement would be an essential requirement of any planning permission.</p>	<p>Comments noted and discussions are ongoing with ECC and CCC Sport and Recreation Team. <b>Comments noted. Pitch mix indicatively confirmed on page 90. Final mix and use to be discussed at OPA stage.</b></p>	<p><b>All Through School</b></p>	<p>Discussion required with ECC.</p>	<p>Four senior pitches will be provided at the All Through School. A 3G pitch and a MUGA are also to be provided.</p>
90	92	Waste	<p>• Mass waste collection systems, such as an underground waste system have advantages of hiding waste underground, including minimising the visual impact of bins on pavements and streets and managing odour and noise issues; they also mean many streets do not need to be designed to accommodate large collection vehicles, as they historically have needed to. Streets could be made more attractive for active modes and people and would be recommended for Walkable Neighbourhoods; such a system would need to be incorporated across CGC for the scale needed to invest in appropriate vehicles and other off-site systems, as such this is the last opportunity to pursue these advantages. The City Council should clarify its position on this matter. <b>Further discussion is required with CCC Operations Services.</b> <b>Further information is required in relation to the recycling strategy; in particular how the scheme will deliver a diversion from landfill.</b></p>	<p>Comments are noted however the specification of the waste system will meet CCC's standards, and a bespoke system is not considered appropriate or feasible. <b>No action.</b></p>	<p><b>Waste</b></p>	<p>No further action required.</p>	<p>No further action required at this stage.</p>
94	96	Energy	<p>Wider renewable energy, and innovative smart opportunities across the site, have not been designed into the masterplan i.e. not only inside and on individual buildings, but within the wider community layout.</p>	<p>Meeting set up on 3rd October with ECC, CCC, Consortium and Turley <b>No action. Pending agreement.</b></p>	<p><b>Energy</b></p>	<p>Meeting arranged between CCC, ECC, Consortium and Turley on 03.11; this remains a key issue.</p>	<p>A Carbon Framework has now been agreed which sets out an ambitious pathway to achieving a net zero carbon development. The timescale for the implementation of higher sustainable design and construction targets over the lifetime of the Garden Community has been the subject of a number of meetings between the Consortium and CCC and ECC officers, including specialist advice from the County and its appointed consultant.</p>

<p>Objectives and principles have been amended; these are generally supported but a principle for BREEAM non- residential buildings has been removed (page 94); clarity on this is recommended.</p>	
<p>Principle 6 would cover embodied carbon emissions from the quantity of private car parking spaces, which is another reason to go further in avoiding provision of on-plot parking spaces.</p>	
<p><b>Energy Section - Objective</b></p> <p>The objective of being 'net zero ready by 2025' should be strengthened to ensure that homes and buildings are designed and delivered as net zero from the outset of the development; it is essential to ensure that new developments are truly net zero in their operation, which is measured in terms of both carbon and energy, to keep the UK on track to meet its legally binding target of net zero by 2050 (as required by the Climate Change Act 2008).</p> <p>The DFD should contain a commitment to meeting the operational energy demands of the development through on-site renewable energy generation or, if not all demand can be met on-site, then seek to meet the residual energy demands of the development through provision of additional renewable energy installations nearby or off-site.</p>	<p>Meeting set up on 3rd October with ECC, CCC, Consortium and Turley</p> <p><b>No action. Pending agreement.</b></p>
<p><b>Energy Section - Guiding Principles</b></p> <p>Guiding Principle 1 - the aim should be for CGC to be designed and delivered as net zero carbon from the start not by 2050. The CGC provides an opportunity to deliver net zero development at scale, this should be embraced from the outset.</p> <p>Guiding Principle 2 - The DFD should contain a commitment to prepare (and update) a net zero Energy Strategy for the site. The TCPA guidance (Section 3.3) advises that 'A robust net zero energy strategy will be central to successful energy masterplanning for a Garden City'. Section 3.4 goes on to state 'A net zero energy strategy should consider the energy demands, generation, storage, supply and management opportunities for each stage in the development process, as well as interaction with the wider energy system.'</p> <p>Guiding Principle 3 - there is now a need to design to very high standards (better than Building Regulations), particularly for air tightness (in order to achieve the energy targets included in LETI approach to net zero, and which are close to Passivhaus standards).</p> <p>Guiding Principle 4 - more could be made of this within the DFD eg: state that it will be a gas free development in the objective, and also in the Key Metrics section on page 30. The wording of this principle is that 'all electric' could open the door for inefficient resistive electric heating eg: electric panel heaters would not be appropriate in the development – they are costly and inefficient. The space heating targets set through LETI would address this issue though.</p> <p>Guiding Principle 5 - The reliance upon grid decarbonisation to achieve net zero for CGC is not supported; this approach would not keep the UK reach of its ambition to limit global temperature rise to 1.5 degrees, and it puts unnecessary strain on the grid at a time when huge demands will be made on it through the electrification of transport and heating.</p>	<p>Meeting set up on 3rd October with ECC, CCC, Consortium and Turley</p> <p><b>No action. Pending agreement.</b></p>

<p><b>Energy</b></p>	<p>Meeting arranged between CCC, ECC, Consortium and Turley on 03.11; this remains a key issue.</p>	<p>A Carbon Framework has now been agreed which sets out an ambitious pathway to achieving a net zero carbon development. The timescale for the implementation of higher sustainable design and construction targets over the lifetime of the Garden Community has been the subject of a number of meetings between the Consortium and CCC and ECC officers, including specialist advice from the County and its appointed consultant.</p>
<p><b>Energy</b></p>	<p>Meeting arranged between CCC, ECC, Consortium and Turley on 03.11; this remains a key issue.</p>	<p>A Carbon Framework has now been agreed which sets out an ambitious pathway to achieving a net zero carbon development. The timescale for the implementation of higher sustainable design and construction targets over the lifetime of the Garden Community has been the subject of a number of meetings between the Consortium and CCC and ECC officers, including specialist advice from the County and its appointed consultant.</p>
<p><b>Energy</b></p>	<p>Meeting arranged between CCC, ECC, Consortium and Turley on 03.11; this remains a key issue.</p>	<p>A Carbon Framework has now been agreed which sets out an ambitious pathway to achieving a net zero carbon development. The timescale for the implementation of higher sustainable design and construction targets over the lifetime of the Garden Community has been the subject of a number of meetings between the Consortium and CCC and ECC officers, including specialist advice from the County and its appointed consultant.</p>
<p><b>Energy</b></p>	<p>Meeting arranged between CCC, ECC, Consortium and Turley on 03.11; this remains a key issue.</p>	<p>A Carbon Framework has now been agreed which sets out an ambitious pathway to achieving a net zero carbon development. The timescale for the implementation of higher sustainable design and construction targets over the lifetime of the Garden Community has been the subject of a number of meetings between the Consortium and CCC and ECC officers, including specialist advice from the County and its appointed consultant.</p>
<p><b>Energy</b></p>	<p>Meeting arranged between CCC, ECC, Consortium and Turley on 03.11; this remains a key issue.</p>	<p>A Carbon Framework has now been agreed which sets out an ambitious pathway to achieving a net zero carbon development. The timescale for the implementation of higher sustainable design and construction targets over the lifetime of the Garden Community has been the subject of a number of meetings between the Consortium and CCC and ECC officers, including specialist advice from the County and its appointed consultant.</p>
<p><b>Energy</b></p>	<p>Meeting arranged between CCC, ECC, Consortium and Turley on 03.11; this remains a key issue.</p>	<p>A Carbon Framework has now been agreed which sets out an ambitious pathway to achieving a net zero carbon development. The timescale for the implementation of higher sustainable design and construction targets over the lifetime of the Garden Community has been the subject of a number of meetings between the Consortium and CCC and ECC officers, including specialist advice from the County and its appointed consultant.</p>
<p><b>Energy</b></p>	<p>Meeting arranged between CCC, ECC, Consortium and Turley on 03.11; this remains a key issue.</p>	<p>A Carbon Framework has now been agreed which sets out an ambitious pathway to achieving a net zero carbon development. The timescale for the implementation of higher sustainable design and construction targets over the lifetime of the Garden Community has been the subject of a number of meetings between the Consortium and CCC and ECC officers, including specialist advice from the County and its appointed consultant.</p>
<p><b>Energy</b></p>	<p>Meeting arranged between CCC, ECC, Consortium and Turley on 03.11; this remains a key issue.</p>	<p>A Carbon Framework has now been agreed which sets out an ambitious pathway to achieving a net zero carbon development. The timescale for the implementation of higher sustainable design and construction targets over the lifetime of the Garden Community has been the subject of a number of meetings between the Consortium and CCC and ECC officers, including specialist advice from the County and its appointed consultant.</p>
<p><b>Energy</b></p>	<p>Meeting arranged between CCC, ECC, Consortium and Turley on 03.11; this remains a key issue.</p>	<p>A Carbon Framework has now been agreed which sets out an ambitious pathway to achieving a net zero carbon development. The timescale for the implementation of higher sustainable design and construction targets over the lifetime of the Garden Community has been the subject of a number of meetings between the Consortium and CCC and ECC officers, including specialist advice from the County and its appointed consultant.</p>



			<p>New build development can, and should, meet its own energy needs on-site providing very high fabric standards are achieved.</p>		<b>Energy</b>	Meeting arranged between CCC, ECC, Consortium and Turley on 03.11; this remains a key issue.	A Carbon Framework has now been agreed which sets out an ambitious pathway to achieving a net zero carbon development. The timescale for the implementation of higher sustainable design and construction targets over the lifetime of the Garden Community has been the subject of a number of meetings between the Consortium and CCC and ECC officers, including specialist advice from the County and its appointed consultant.
			<p>Reference should be made to LETI guidance. New development can be energy positive and contribute to grid decarbonisation, grid efficiency and UK energy security – this is what CGC should be aiming for. The principle should be revised accordingly.</p>		<b>Energy</b>	Meeting arranged between CCC, ECC, Consortium and Turley on 03.11; this remains a key issue.	A Carbon Framework has now been agreed which sets out an ambitious pathway to achieving a net zero carbon development. The timescale for the implementation of higher sustainable design and construction targets over the lifetime of the Garden Community has been the subject of a number of meetings between the Consortium and CCC and ECC officers, including specialist advice from the County and its appointed consultant.
			<p>Guiding Principle 6 - The reporting and reduction of embodied carbon emissions is supported. Latest best practice should be used to guide the methodology and to set targets. Targets for reducing embodied carbon would be useful to include. Reference should be made to the LETI guidance which also signposts to UKGBC, RICS and RIBA technical advice and toolkits.</p>		<b>Energy</b>	Meeting arranged between CCC, ECC, Consortium and Turley on 03.11; this remains a key issue.	A Carbon Framework has now been agreed which sets out an ambitious pathway to achieving a net zero carbon development. The timescale for the implementation of higher sustainable design and construction targets over the lifetime of the Garden Community has been the subject of a number of meetings between the Consortium and CCC and ECC officers, including specialist advice from the County and its appointed consultant.
			<p>Guiding Principle 7 - The wording is too vague and with too many caveats to be meaningful; there needs to be greater clarity in the wording because if a net zero carbon development is going to be delivered, then it will require all the elements listed: highly efficient building fabric, heat pumps, renewable energy generation technology, and possibly battery storage as the market develops.</p>		<b>Energy</b>	Meeting arranged between CCC, ECC, Consortium and Turley on 03.11; this remains a key issue.	A Carbon Framework has now been agreed which sets out an ambitious pathway to achieving a net zero carbon development. The timescale for the implementation of higher sustainable design and construction targets over the lifetime of the Garden Community has been the subject of a number of meetings between the Consortium and CCC and ECC officers, including specialist advice from the County and its appointed consultant.
			<p>Guiding Principle 8 – The approach is supported; there need to be comprehensive handover packages for occupiers, and access to on-going support preferably too.</p>		<b>Energy</b>	Meeting arranged between CCC, ECC, Consortium and Turley on 03.11; this remains a key issue.	A Carbon Framework has now been agreed which sets out an ambitious pathway to achieving a net zero carbon development. The timescale for the implementation of higher sustainable design and construction targets over the lifetime of the Garden Community has been the subject of a number of meetings between the Consortium and CCC and ECC officers, including specialist advice from the County and its appointed consultant.
			<p>Guiding Principle 9 – The commitment to post occupancy monitoring of energy performance is supported.</p>		<b>Energy</b>	Meeting arranged between CCC, ECC, Consortium and Turley on 03.11; this remains a key issue.	A Carbon Framework has now been agreed which sets out an ambitious pathway to achieving a net zero carbon development. The timescale for the implementation of higher sustainable design and construction targets over the lifetime of the Garden Community has been the subject of a number of meetings between the Consortium and CCC and ECC officers, including specialist advice from the County and its appointed consultant.
			<p>Guiding Principle 10 - Active capacity should be provided across the development.</p>		<b>Energy</b>	Meeting arranged between CCC, ECC, Consortium and Turley on 03.11; this remains a key issue.	A Carbon Framework has now been agreed which sets out an ambitious pathway to achieving a net zero carbon development. The timescale for the implementation of higher sustainable design and construction targets over the lifetime of the Garden Community has been the subject of a number of meetings between the Consortium and CCC and ECC officers, including specialist advice from the County and its appointed consultant.
94/96	98	<p><b>Guiding Principle 10 – Residential On Plot and Off Plot Parking</b></p>	<p>Meeting set up on 3rd October with ECC, CCC, Consortium and Turley</p> <p><b>No action. Pending agreement.</b></p> <p>Clarity is required as to how properties with off-plot parking can be future-proofed to add EV smart charging devices in the future. All car club vehicles should be battery electric vehicles, therefore the capacity for charging them should be provided directly not passively.</p>		<b>Energy</b>	Meeting arranged between CCC, ECC, Consortium and Turley on 03.11; this remains a key issue.	A Carbon Framework has now been agreed which sets out an ambitious pathway to achieving a net zero carbon development. The timescale for the implementation of higher sustainable design and construction targets over the lifetime of the Garden Community has been the subject of a number of meetings between the Consortium and CCC and ECC officers, including specialist advice from the County and its appointed consultant.
95	97	<b>Energy</b>	<p>Meeting set up on 3rd October with ECC, CCC, Consortium and Turley</p> <p><b>No action. Pending agreement.</b></p> <p>The DFD contains no specific date for the consideration of hydrogen and district heating.</p>		<b>Energy</b>	Meeting arranged between CCC, ECC, Consortium and Turley on 03.11; this remains a key issue.	A Carbon Framework has now been agreed which sets out an ambitious pathway to achieving a net zero carbon development. The timescale for the implementation of higher sustainable design and construction targets over the lifetime of the Garden Community has been the subject of a number of meetings between the Consortium and CCC and ECC officers, including specialist advice from the County and its appointed consultant.

		<b>Energy Section – Introductory Paragraph</b>	The commitment to be guided by best practice, such as LETI, is welcomed, however, this has not been fully reflected in the timescales and targets set out; these need to be revised accordingly.	Meeting set up on 3rd October with ECC, CCC, Consortium and Turley <b>No action. Pending agreement.</b>	<b>Energy</b>	Meeting arranged between CCC, ECC, Consortium and Turley on 03.11; this remains a key issue.	A Carbon Framework has now been agreed which sets out an ambitious pathway to achieving a net zero carbon development. The timescale for the implementation of higher sustainable design and construction targets over the lifetime of the Garden Community has been the subject of a number of meetings between the Consortium and CCC and ECC officers, including specialist advice from the County and its appointed consultant.
		<b>Energy Section - 4th Paragraph</b>	The paragraph also refers to 'designing out fossil fuels where possible'; this does not reflect the guiding principle set out in page 94, and if delivering a net zero carbon is a serious ambition then there must be a clear commitment to making CGC a gas free development. The paragraph should be revised accordingly.	Meeting set up on 3rd October with ECC, CCC, Consortium and Turley <b>No action. Pending agreement.</b>	<b>Energy</b>	Meeting arranged between CCC, ECC, Consortium and Turley on 03.11; this remains a key issue.	A Carbon Framework has now been agreed which sets out an ambitious pathway to achieving a net zero carbon development. The timescale for the implementation of higher sustainable design and construction targets over the lifetime of the Garden Community has been the subject of a number of meetings between the Consortium and CCC and ECC officers, including specialist advice from the County and its appointed consultant.
		<b>Energy Section - 5th Paragraph</b>	The paragraph should be revised to refer, and reflect, the LETI guidance; in addition, the wording 'where possible' should be removed from the last sentence in relation to the supply of low carbon heating and hot water; if this is to be a net zero carbon development then low carbon heating and hot water is not optional.	Meeting set up on 3rd October with ECC, CCC, Consortium and Turley <b>No action. Pending agreement.</b>	<b>Energy</b>	Meeting arranged between CCC, ECC, Consortium and Turley on 03.11; this remains a key issue.	A Carbon Framework has now been agreed which sets out an ambitious pathway to achieving a net zero carbon development. The timescale for the implementation of higher sustainable design and construction targets over the lifetime of the Garden Community has been the subject of a number of meetings between the Consortium and CCC and ECC officers, including specialist advice from the County and its appointed consultant.
		<b>Energy Section – 8th &amp; 9th Paragraphs</b>	It is considered that the specific targets, and the timescales, need to be revisited to deliver a net zero carbon exemplar development which reflects the latest best practice and thinking.	Meeting set up on 3rd October with ECC, CCC, Consortium and Turley <b>No action. Pending agreement.</b>	<b>Energy</b>	Meeting arranged between CCC, ECC, Consortium and Turley on 03.11; this remains a key issue.	A Carbon Framework has now been agreed which sets out an ambitious pathway to achieving a net zero carbon development. The timescale for the implementation of higher sustainable design and construction targets over the lifetime of the Garden Community has been the subject of a number of meetings between the Consortium and CCC and ECC officers, including specialist advice from the County and its appointed consultant.
			The development needs to aim for these standards from the outset, not delay to 2030 and 2040. A clear commitment needs to be made to make CGC an exemplar development that delivers net zero (using a robust definition, such as LETI) at scale; there will be much learning and skill development needed along the way to deliver it in practice, but the commitment needs to be made from the outset to aim for these standards. A commitment would also help stimulate the supply chain and skills training, by providing certainty.		<b>Energy</b>	Meeting arranged between CCC, ECC, Consortium and Turley on 03.11; this remains a key issue.	A Carbon Framework has now been agreed which sets out an ambitious pathway to achieving a net zero carbon development. The timescale for the implementation of higher sustainable design and construction targets over the lifetime of the Garden Community has been the subject of a number of meetings between the Consortium and CCC and ECC officers, including specialist advice from the County and its appointed consultant.
96	98	<b>Energy Section 1st Paragraph</b>	Low carbon heating – The first sentence needs to have greater clarity. A clear commitment to using heat pumps to provide low carbon energy efficient heating in the early phases should be stated. The wording needs to say 'will' not 'should', and the caveats 'where practical, feasible and viable' removed. Passing reference is made to the possible consideration of district heating; to be successfully implemented, district heating scheme needs to be designed and planned for at the earliest possible stage of the development. Early consideration of district heating opportunities is encouraged. The BEIS heat network development unit may be able to help with this.	Meeting set up on 3rd October with ECC, CCC, Consortium and Turley <b>No action. Pending agreement.</b>	<b>Energy</b>	Meeting arranged between CCC, ECC, Consortium and Turley on 03.11; this remains a key issue.	A Carbon Framework has now been agreed which sets out an ambitious pathway to achieving a net zero carbon development. The timescale for the implementation of higher sustainable design and construction targets over the lifetime of the Garden Community has been the subject of a number of meetings between the Consortium and CCC and ECC officers, including specialist advice from the County and its appointed consultant.
96	98	<b>Energy Section 2nd &amp; 3rd Paragraphs</b>	Renewable energy generation and energy storage – The wording needs to be firmed up – eg: it should state battery storage will be considered, rather than 'may'. Similarly with exploring opportunities for renewables it states 'may be explored' – this should be rephrased to 'will be explored'.	Meeting set up on 3rd October with ECC, CCC, Consortium and Turley <b>No action. Pending agreement.</b>	<b>Energy</b>	Meeting arranged between CCC, ECC, Consortium and Turley on 03.11; this remains a key issue.	A Carbon Framework has now been agreed which sets out an ambitious pathway to achieving a net zero carbon development. The timescale for the implementation of higher sustainable design and construction targets over the lifetime of the Garden Community has been the subject of a number of meetings between the Consortium and CCC and ECC officers, including specialist advice from the County and its appointed consultant.
			A commitment should be made to maximise renewable energy opportunities on residential and non-residential buildings and, where appropriate, within the wider site; this will support wider energy system objectives (grid decarbonisation, efficient and resilient grid), and the Essex Climate Commission target for Essex renewables to meet all the county needs by 2040. A decision to make best use of buildings for renewable energy generation, will mean that less greenfield renewables are required in Essex.		<b>Energy</b>	Meeting arranged between CCC, ECC, Consortium and Turley on 03.11; this remains a key issue.	A Carbon Framework has now been agreed which sets out an ambitious pathway to achieving a net zero carbon development. The timescale for the implementation of higher sustainable design and construction targets over the lifetime of the Garden Community has been the subject of a number of meetings between the Consortium and CCC and ECC officers, including specialist advice from the County and its appointed consultant.
			A target to ensure the amount of renewable energy generated on-site is equal to, or preferably exceeds, the average annual energy demand of the site is encouraged; this would really demonstrate an exemplar development.		<b>Energy</b>	Meeting arranged between CCC, ECC, Consortium and Turley on 03.11; this remains a key issue.	A Carbon Framework has now been agreed which sets out an ambitious pathway to achieving a net zero carbon development. The timescale for the implementation of higher sustainable design and construction targets over the lifetime of the Garden Community has been the subject of a number of meetings between the Consortium and CCC and ECC officers, including specialist advice from the County and its appointed consultant.

		<b>Energy Section – 5th Paragraph</b>	The wording should be firmed up, so that 'should be considered' is replaced with 'will be considered'.	Agree and DFD text will be updated <b>Updated</b>	<b>Energy</b>	Meeting arranged between CCC, ECC, Consortium and Turley on 03.11; this remains a key issue.	A Carbon Framework has now been agreed which sets out an ambitious pathway to achieving a net zero carbon development. The timescale for the implementation of higher sustainable design and construction targets over the lifetime of the Garden Community has been the subject of a number of meetings between the Consortium and CCC and ECC officers, including specialist advice from the County and its appointed consultant.
		<b>Energy Section – 6th, 7th &amp; 8th Paragraphs</b>	The DFD should include further information on EV charging for on and off plot parking, and at mobility hubs (note tertiary also referred to here).	Meeting set up on 3rd October with ECC, CCC, Consortium and Turley <b>No action. Pending agreement. Tertiary to be removed.</b>	<b>Energy</b>	Meeting arranged between CCC, ECC, Consortium and Turley on 03.11; this remains a key issue.	A Carbon Framework has now been agreed which sets out an ambitious pathway to achieving a net zero carbon development. The timescale for the implementation of higher sustainable design and construction targets over the lifetime of the Garden Community has been the subject of a number of meetings between the Consortium and CCC and ECC officers, including specialist advice from the County and its appointed consultant.
		<b>Mobility Hubs – Rapid Charge Points</b>	Concentrating rapid charge points only at the Park Farm Village primary mobility hub means that none would be made available until Phase 3 (2035-2039); this is far too late and should not be accepted. The Great Belsteads hub should have some rapid charger provision for residents' benefit at the very least.	Meeting set up on 3rd October with ECC, CCC, Consortium and Turley <b>No action. Pending agreement.</b>	<b>Energy</b>	Meeting arranged between CCC, ECC, Consortium and Turley on 03.11; this remains a key issue.	A Carbon Framework has now been agreed which sets out an ambitious pathway to achieving a net zero carbon development. The timescale for the implementation of higher sustainable design and construction targets over the lifetime of the Garden Community has been the subject of a number of meetings between the Consortium and CCC and ECC officers, including specialist advice from the County and its appointed consultant.
102-104	106	<b>Health and Community Infrastructure</b>	Stronger reference should be made to outdoor spaces for preventative health care, allocation of space for non-traditional health measures such as community gardens, allotments	DFD will be updated to include reference to healthy communities. Reference added at para 3. Not considered critical to DFD.	<b>Health and Community</b>	Minor reference added to DFD.	Page 108 - Point 7 references the benefits of open space in supporting healthy communities.
104	106	<b>Health and Social Infrastructure</b>	There are limited references to arts and culture throughout the DFD. – Require an overarching public art strategy that could include but not limited to building designs, bridges, trails and routes.	DFD to be updated by BMD to add paragraph regarding public art <b>Public art referenced throughout document. Strategy is a matter for OPAs and Design Codes</b>	<b>Public Art</b>	The DFD must acknowledge the importance of public art and provide a commitment to developing a strategy as part of each of the outline planning applications.	A section relating to public art has been added to the DFD on page 110; it is also referenced further throughout the document.
		<b>Indoor Sports Provision</b> Sports Hall – The DFD refers to the masterplan being informed by Sport England's Sports Facility Calculator, with the suggestion that a four court sports hall be provided. Clarity is required as to where the sports hall would be accommodated on site: the obvious opportunity is as part of the All Through School as the school will require access to a sports hall. The option would only be acceptable were the sports hall designed as a community sports hall in accordance with Sport England's design guidance rather than a school sports hall being provided in response to DfE guidance. A community four court sports hall has different dimensions to a school sports hall and different ancillary facility requirements. Community access would also need to be secured. – Discuss with Parks and Leisure	Comments are noted and DFD text will be updated following review with Quod and Fabric and additional meetings with CCC's Sport and Recreation Team. <b>Hall at ATS confirmed. Final details to be established at OPA.</b>	<b>Indoor Sports Provision</b>	To be provided at the All Through School.	The DFD clarifies that a four court sports hall to meet Sport England Standards will be provided at the All Through School; there will also be other opportunities for community fitness in the community halls and any commercial gyms within the village centres.	
		<b>Indoor Sports Facilities</b> – No reference is made to how other indoor sports facility needs generated by the development would be met eg: swimming pools, health and fitness suites (gyms) and activity studios. The capacity of existing off-site facilities could be enhanced to address additional needs. Sport England's established Sport Facilities Calculator can help to provide an indication of the likely demand that will be generated by a development for certain facility types. The SFC indicates that a population of 13,300 (based on the estimated population referenced on page 103 of the Development Framework Document) in Chelmsford City will generate a demand for 0.95 sports halls (£2,445,018), 0.68 swimming pools (£2,678,390) and 0.21 rinks of an indoor bowls centres (£83,254). Detailed calculations are provided within a word document appended to the consultation response.	<b>Matter for IDP, not DFD.</b>	<b>Indoor Sports Provision</b>	Matter for the IDP.	The matter will be addressed within the IDP.	
		<b>Swimming Pool Provision</b> – The development would generate demand equivalent to 0.68 swimming pools which is a substantial proportion of a new facility. Given the scale of the additional demand, there would be concerns over whether the existing swimming pools in Chelmsford would have sufficient capacity, to accommodate this scale of demand, together with demand from other planned major developments. The Council's Indoor/Built Sports Facility Strategy was prepared over 6 years ago and would not account for changes in demand in the intervening period, or the major change in supply associated with the recent redevelopment of the Council's Riverside Leisure Centre, which provides the principal community swimming pool in Chelmsford. CCC is requested to review swimming pool needs in Chelmsford to assess whether existing swimming pools would have the capacity to accommodate the additional demand associated with this development together with the other major developments planned in the Local Plan. One option would be the provision of a conventional sized swimming pool in the development, that could be part funded by other smaller major developments, while another option would be a neighbourhood sized swimming pool. Sport England and Swim England have recently published details of a Leisure Local concept to assist in this regard; details have been attached to the consultation response. <b>A discussion is required with CCC Leisure Services.</b>	<b>Matter for OPA's. Discussion too late in process for DFD.</b>	<b>Indoor Sports Provision</b>	Accept that it is unreasonable to include in the CGC.	The issue is not a matter for the DFD.	
		<b>Fitness Provision</b> - A development of this scale would also justify on-site health & fitness (gyms) and activity studio provision; provision could be accommodated as a dual use facility on the All Through School site, or through a separate leisure or community facility (such as the Leisure Local concept).	<b>Gyms are class E and therefore would be considered commercial. Final layout of ATS to be reviewed at OPA and RMA stage.</b>	<b>Gym Provision</b>	Accept that it is Class E so will form part of the OPA discussions.	The DFD clarifies that a four court sports hall to meet Sport England Standards will be provided at the all through school; there will also be other opportunities for community fitness in the community centres and any commercial gyms within village centres.	
		<b>Indoor Facility Needs</b> – Some indoor facility needs can be met in part through multi-purpose community facilities such as community halls, places of worship and pavilions. Sport England's Village and Community Halls design guidance may be helpful in this regard.	<b>Confirmed at 106 that halls to include sports where appropriate.</b>	<b>Indoor Sports Provision</b>	DFD updated; no further action required.	The DFD clarifies that an four court sports hall to meet Sport England Standards will be provided at the all through school; there will also be other opportunities for community fitness in the community centres and any commercial gyms within village centres.	

106	108	<b>Guiding Principles</b>	The Guiding Principles are all good principles, but omit some key elements (highlighted below): 1.Address the educational needs of all children living in the Garden Community, including those with additional and/or special needs. 2.Facilitate new schools in a timely manner, that support high quality learning, inclusivity and integration with the wider community. 3.Set schools in locations that make active travel the most attractive mode of transport; minimise school run traffic and enable school buildings to face onto high quality traffic free public realm. 4.Deliver a sustainable built and natural environment around each school that enhances learning, health and well-being. 5.Support life-long learning, community use and local sports clubs through spaces that can be hired outside of school hours.	DFD text will be updated to incorporate these proposed changes. <b>Text updated. Some overlapping proposals removed.</b>	<b>Education Principles</b>	The changes do not fully meet our required changes with regards Point 2.	The first point of the guiding principles on page 112 has been amended to include the word integrated; this is acceptable.
		<b>Education Strategy</b>	The new school central to the masterplan close by the main heart of the garden village should not follow the typical typology of educational buildings that are closed off to their surroundings. The project should consider an exemplar school design starting from first principles for a future garden village; there is potential for a more permeable school site that integrates with the wider movement network, local landscape features, and provides a local community function rather than creating severance, separating housing areas; this will ensure that the school integrates into the townscape and environmental character while pushing for more innovative design.	Meeting took place with ECC on 14th September and a further meeting will take place on 26th September. ECC will deliver the All Through School however ECC's Education Site Suitability Checklist specifically states that School Sites should not be "crossed by any public rights of way or access wayleaves The Education GFS on Pages 106 to 108 confirm each OPA will be accompanied by a Land Compliance Study. <b>No action. OPA and RMA to determine final layout.</b>	<b>Education Principles</b>	Discussions ongoing with Consortium, ECC and CCC.	The positioning and level platform in relation to the All Through School is considered acceptable.
106-107	109	<b>Guiding Principles &amp; Objectives</b>	An objective should be included that caters for the education and training (skills) of post-16 adults, who would form a substantial population of the Garden Community.	Financial Contributions towards 6th form and offsite specialist provision is included in the IDP. <b>No action.</b>	<b>Over 16's Education</b>	No commitment in the DFD to addressing this matter. ECC to confirm whether contribution is sufficient, or if on site provision is required.	A contribution to education and training of over 16's will be included in the IDP; this is confirmed on page 113 of the DFD.
108	110	<b>Locational requirements</b>	Proximity to public transport is not a priority for the stand-alone primary school sites, as safe direct walking and cycling routes and the 800-metre target should ensure no-one needs to catch a bus to these schools.	The Active Travel Route Plan will be updated and included in the DFD. <b>Within movement section.</b>	<b>Active Travel</b>	DFD updated to state that schools within 800m of homes but this is only 'where possible', which is not acceptable; the matter forms part of the wider discussion regarding the location of village centres; CCC to discuss with ECC.	The local centre locations are not proposed to be amended and therefore 'where possible' allows for the possibility a small percentage of edge houses will not be within 800m.
111	112	<b>Employment strategy</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>-No requirement is included for the delivery of the first phase of business accommodation in each employment area to be tied to occupation of housing.</li><li>-No requirement is included for residential design and layouts to provide flexible and adaptable spaces to support homeworking, or how this would be determined in planning decisions.</li><li>-No references are made to training / lifelong learning, working with existing skills and training providers, knowledge transfer, supporting supply chains / international trade, or boosting economic productivity</li><li>-The CGC relates to the whole area including Beaulieu and Channels and not just the Local Plan allocation area. Employment is not being fully integrated with the Business Park close to the station (Beaulieu Exchange) and the whole offer needs to be fully integrated. CCC have not been provided with a copy of the Savills report on the proposals for Beaulieu Exchange and this needs to be considered alongside the wider CGC offer. A wider Employment Strategy for the CGC should be developed linking this all together and making the connections on the softer side of employment growth, including the skills agenda for example, and the opportunities that the CGC presents. The village centres also play an important role in the future of employment and this needs to be developed further within a wider CGC employment strategy.</li></ul>	Comments are noted and DFD text will be updated where appropriate and include reference to flexible home working and co-working spaces. <b>No update. Matters of delivery, obligations and detailed design are subject to OPA's.</b> <b>Work on employment ongoing and report (not yet complete) to be discussed as part of future focus meeting.</b>	<b>Employment</b>	Work is still ongoing with regard to delivery. Further discussion required.	Further consideration will be given to the phasing of employment as part of the outline planning applications. Homeworking design is a matter for the outline planning applications and the Site Wide Design Principles Document. Training is a matter for the outline planning applications and will require further input from CCC / ECC on any policy requirements. The Employment Strategy is to be developed further as part of the outline planning applications due to need for further evidence base work and trend shifts over time.
112-113	115	<b>Guiding Framework Principles – Stewardship</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>-The scope, scale, and structure of the stewardship body should be formulated in collaboration with CCC and ECC. Early and meaningful engagement will be essential to make sure future stewardship arrangements meet the needs and aspirations of all parties. Concerns are raised with the proposed reliance on service charges to fund stewardship activities. Service charges may be a necessary component of financing, however, they should constitute only a part of a varied blend of capital and revenue-generating assets that the stewardship body has at its disposal; this aspect underlines the importance of formulating stewardship arrangements in collaboration with the Councils.</li><li>-The text introduces confusion as to whether one stewardship body or multiple are proposed (e.g. bullet 1 v 8). Bullet 8 appears to be largely covered by others.</li><li>- "Consider the potential for income generating assets" should be a standalone principle.</li><li>-Community Led Housing – Given the supposed ethos and focus on stewardship, it is disappointing that the document does not reference this type of housing. The stewardship section has a very narrow focus on what the group will consist of and how it will tackle open space.</li><li>-The masterplan must be flexible enough to include temporary and meanwhile recreational spaces within the green infrastructure, with options such as temporary sports pitches and opportunities for communal areas within open public zones to ensure the amenity, connectivity and desirability of the place is maximised at every stage.</li><li>-Community growing must be a key deliverable of the masterplan. A vibrant circular economy is an important aim which will promote the strength of the future community, by encouraging people to co-habit and live together within a special Garden Community. Opportunities exist for private/public growing spaces that require more emphasis within the landscape strategies of the scheme. The masterplan stewardship should set out the governance and processes that will best promote local economy.</li><li>-The re-use of the old farmstead buildings should be explored as they are appropriate for land management functions. The plan would require a commercial working 'farm' or organisation which undertakes the land stewardship including harvesting and the point of sale for local produce to the wider community.</li><li>-Increased commentary should be added regarding playable spaces within the open space strategies moving forwards, not just within large open spaces but also how recreational and leisure spaces are connecting people with their homes.</li><li>-An exemplar approach is encouraged to ensure no use of imported soil. Additionally, the opportunity not to use topsoil but working with existing sub soils to provide a growing medium for the landscaped areas should be explored.</li><li>-Several statements within the DFD appear to be rather vague and may lack teeth to achieve results</li></ul>	Comments are noted and the DFD text will be reviewed by the Consortium and updated accordingly. <b>Not yet updated. Matters of stewardship subject to ongoing discussions.</b>	<b>Stewardship</b>	The matter is not yet resolved; consultants report awaited.	Reference added for: <i>"1. One stewardship body across the CGC. 2.Promoting community led and high levels of community participation and engagement. 3.Appropriately costed and capped service charges (subject to democratic changes). 4.The Body being a not for profit entity. 5.The inclusion of income producing assets."</i> Officers commissioned a stewardship report and are currently considering its content. Further discussion will be required with the Development Consortium ahead of the finalisation of the DFD for approval at Cabinet.

117	119	<b>Access Parameter Plan</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Masterplan and Access Parameter plan(s) should clearly show the pedestrian and cyclist accesses connecting directly with the external network, as well as the Vehicle Access Points.</li> <li>Two 'indicative bridge locations' are shown across CNEB, no such locations are shown across ERW; it is anticipated that failure to provide grade separated crossing(s) of ERW will not be acceptable.</li> <li>The assumption is that there is no third-party land between Channels and the site to the east and that the red and blue lines should abut.</li> <li>The Plan does not note a comprehensive cycle network. The Key only shows 'Primary Streets' and 'Primary Bus Routes' in relation to movement; this should be corrected.</li> </ul>	<p>Comments are noted and the DFD text will be updated where appropriate.</p> <p><b>Accesses updated.</b></p> <p><b>Bridges updated.</b></p> <p><b>Lines updated.</b></p> <p><b>Plans is for land use and access, not active travel.</b></p>	<b>Access Parameter Plan</b>	Plan has been updated but requires key to be added to cover arrows of the bridges.	The plan has been updated to bridge arrows in the key.
117	119	<b>Drawing – Land Use and Access Plan</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The lake is shown far too small, but it is unclear at what stage this drawing is aimed at, however it appears to be at the end stage.</li> <li>The area of residential development to the south-west of Pratts Farm Lane at the edge of the discovery park is not supported. A density plan is recommended.</li> </ul>	<p>During the consultation process CCC requested that it was preferable not to be too specific about the size of the lake or the time it will take to fill. There are numerous variables and the exact size and time to fill it are unknown at this stage and therefore we cannot state this in the DFD as it may be misleading. An indicative density plan is included on page 139</p> <p><b>No action.</b></p>	<b>Lake</b>	No action has been taken with regard to the size of the lake or how it is filled. Appreciate exacts are unknown, but need to gauge a rough size and approximate period of time (perhaps by 5-year intervals) to anticipate how the lake may be able to serve/be utilised by the future community.	Page 20 of the DFD confirms that following extraction, the area proposed to accommodate Dukes Wood Nature Park, would be left with a large extraction area of lower ground; this will fill with water and become the lake over a period of approximately 20 years.
119	121	<b>GI Parameter Plan</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An understanding as to how severance would be overcome/ mitigated both within the road and with the surrounding area would be welcomed.</li> </ul>	<p>Comments are noted</p> <p><b>Matter for OPA and detailed designs in RMA and Design Code.</b></p>	<b>Parameter Plan</b>	Matter for OPA.	The matter will be addressed as part of the outline planning applications.
123	125	<b>Character Areas - Park Farm Village</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The grey rectangular area to the north of the school site is presumed to be a car park. The design rationale for this should be explained, noting advice under Education Strategy above.</li> <li>Having regard to the size of the school site, a walking and cycling route along the external side of the west boundary of the school (as shown on the Illustrative Masterplan) is warranted and should be shown on the Illustrative Plan of the Village Centre.</li> <li>The plan further demonstrates how disconnected to residential parcels and orientated toward vehicular access the "village centre" is; it should be relocated, along with the school buildings, further south.</li> <li>Noting the illustrative nature of the plan, the alignment of the north-south pedestrian and cycle boulevard with the ongoing route southward (to the east of (6) Park Farm Community hub) is disjointed; it should be a direct cross-path like that to the south of (5).</li> <li>The illustrative plan does not marry with the masterplan on page 55 and the inset plan also shows a different layout.</li> </ul>	<p>Comments are noted and the DFD text will be updated where appropriate.</p> <p><b>Plans are indicative. Further detail for OPAs.</b></p>	<b>Character Area</b>	Agreed. Further details to be provided and outstanding matters to be resolved at OPA stage.	The precise details of the character area will be determined at outline planning application stage.
125	127	<b>Great Belsteads</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Several hundred residential properties, most of which will have private parking, are located to the east of the centre; therefore, all their vehicular trips generated by them have to pass through the Village centre which will inevitably reduce the attractiveness of it for pedestrians, regardless of any 'landscape buffer'. The difficulty in making a truly pedestrian friendly and still trafficked square should not be underestimated. A more successful place is likely by avoiding this scenario and relocating the village centre to the east.</li> <li>The location of the bridge over Essex Regiment Way is missing.</li> <li>The Park &amp; Ride terminal is a significant walk to the south, as such it should not make a major difference for the Mobility Hub to be to the east of (14) traffic calmed public square, where it would be more accessible to more people.</li> </ul>	<p>Comments are noted and the DFD text will be updated where appropriate.</p> <p><b>Plans are indicative. Further detail for OPAs.</b></p> <p><b>Bridge added</b></p>	<b>Character Area</b>	Bridge over ERW has been added but a label is needed to indicate its provision.	A label has been added to the plan on page 133 to show the pedestrian bridge.
125	127	<b>Great Belsteads Village</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The primary school should not be located adjacent to the main spine road/primary route; such a location is likely to attract drop off by car and the road represents a barrier to the creation of an attractive active travel route from homes to the south. The following would address these concerns: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Move the school directly to the north of its current location on the opposite side of the greenway.</li> <li>(ii) Move the residential block to the current location of the school.</li> <li>(iii) The village centre and school would still have a close relationship similar to the all-through school and Park Farm Village centre.</li> <li>(iv) The school would have a safer and healthier setting in line with ECC policy and guidance.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Comments are noted and the DFD text will be updated where appropriate.</p> <p><b>Plans are indicative. Further detail for OPAs.</b></p>	<b>Great Belsteads</b>	Plans are indicative and can be dealt with via OPA's.	The matters will be resolved at outline planning application stage.
126	128	<b>Great Belsteads Village – Village Centre Primary Street Plan</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The new plan shows details of what appears to be a proposed bridge ramp and a 4th arm to the ERW access roundabout on the west side of Essex Regiment Way; this is outside of the land within the control of the Developer Consortium. No assurance can be given at this stage that either could be accepted. Clarification is required.</li> <li>One of the buildings at (2) cuts the greenway to the north.</li> <li>The plan shows the 'Village Square' (5) as the one through which every vehicle trip generated from the housing to the east and south of the village will pass through and not the one identified on the previous page that would front the school building; it is suggested that the removal of the block between them could make for a more substantial, statement place with room for the mobility hub.</li> <li>Having regard to the likely vehicle movement that will be generated, a successful shared surface street (2) is highly unlikely to be achieved here. Evidence from real examples should be provided to show its feasibility or the proposal should be revised.</li> <li>The area reserved for the Park and Ride site expansion is not clearly shown on this plan.</li> <li>Concerns are raised about the introduction of a five arm roundabout after the entrance/exit to the Park and Ride both from functionality and the message that this sends at the entrance of a garden village where the aim is to reduce vehicle movements.</li> </ul>	<p>Comments are noted and the DFD text will be updated where appropriate.</p> <p><b>Plans are indicative. Further detail for OPAs.</b></p> <p><b>Greenway cutting building updated.</b></p>	<b>Great Belsteads Village</b>	Agreed. Further details to be provided and outstanding matters to be resolved at OPA stage.	The matters will be resolved at outline planning application stage.

128	130	<b>Character Area - Hawthorn Village</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Work should be undertaken to explore whether the remaining WWII airfield can form part of the setting to the retained aircraft hangar.</li> <li>•No information on the specific nature of the commercial and community use within the hangar has been provided.</li> </ul>	<b>Plans are indicative. Further detail for OPAs</b>	<b>Hanger</b>	Reference to Hangar is included within the DFD with the notion that it is to be repurposed for commercial uses. Accept that exact details of uses will come further into OPA stage.	Use of the hanger will be agreed at outline planning application stage.
131	133	<b>Channels Village Extension</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•The label 'Village Centre' is inconsistent with the other villages, as it does not appear it will have the range of facilities and not meet the 'Power of 10' concept. The employment hub could potentially become such a place as it is on a bus route.</li> <li>•The dominant primary street would provide vehicular access directly from the RDR; however, if it is not to be provided until Phase 3, is it necessary to the south of the vehicle entrance from Channels (6) for general vehicular traffic from the Channels Village Extension.</li> <li>•Domsey Lane could be changed to an active travel route, to the west of the primary street (subject to consultation and necessary procedures).</li> <li>•The Greenway to Park Farm (4) would appear to be next to an access street (of unclear connection to the Primary Street), which could dominate the Greenway; as a matter of detail, the footway/cycletrack along the east side of the Primary Street deviates away from the Primary Street at the Greenway. The consequence would be pedestrians and cyclists having a less direct route compared to vehicles. It should not be like this without overriding reasons. A discussion is required between CCC and ECC.</li> <li>•Given there is a bus gate, there may be scope for cyclists to share carriageway to the north of the primary street as shown, subject to detailed design. A discussion is required between CCC and ECC.</li> <li>•The greenways which permeate the site and link the heritage assets are a strong concept which use historic landscape features to provide a landscape setting between the historic farmsteads. The greenway between Park Farm and Channels is important in giving a landscape link but is too minimal, as is that between Peverels and Powers. Historic landscape features, including hedgerows appear to be retained in the greenways, but there are some areas where they would be removed, particularly in the western part of the site. Treatment of the active travel routes between the farmsteads needs careful consideration.</li> <li>•The orchard between Channel and Belsteads should be retained. Car parking needs to be integrated into the landscaping.</li> <li>•The historic lanes within the site are an important feature; it is unclear from the proposals how their rural character will be maintained and the built form used to reinforce character. The historic lane towards Park Farm from Channels Drive should be defined within the layout.</li> </ul>	<p>Comments are noted and the DFD text will be updated where appropriate.</p> <p><b>Plans are indicative. Further detail for OPAs.</b></p> <p><b>Label updated.</b></p>	<b>Channels Village</b>	The label has been updated. Unclear what text has been updated, confirmation is required.	The labels on the key on page 137 have been updated.
132/133	135	<b>Willow Hill</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Clarification is required as to how the newly inserted residential block(s) to the north of the primary school would be accessed; this must not detract from the traffic free village square (1).</li> <li>•Cycle tracks will be needed from the RDR2, south along the primary street due to traffic. The ones either side of the RDR2 terminate abruptly and are not shown separated from the carriageway by verges of generous width as they should be. A discussion is required between CCC and ECC.</li> <li>•The illustrative Plan shows CNEB Phase 1 but omits the pedestrian and cyclist bridge over the CNEB, which according to the masterplan would be at the bottom of the plan.</li> </ul>	<p>Comments are noted and the DFD text will be updated where appropriate.</p> <p><b>Plans are indicative. Further detail for OPAs</b></p>	<b>Willow Hill</b>	Plans are indicative and the detail will be examined at OPA stage.	No further information is required at this stage.
133	135	<b>Willow Hill Village</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•The proximity of RDR2 to the school remains a significant concern despite some buffer buildings; there is also a primary street to the north. Noise and air quality are likely issues with this location. The following is recommended to overcome the concern: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i)Move the school site south of its current location.</li> <li>(ii)Move the residential block currently proposed to the south of the school, to the north so it is situated between the school and RDR2.</li> <li>(iii)The village centre and school would still have a close relationship.</li> <li>(iv)The residential block would form an important barrier between the school and the road and improve its setting in line with ECC policy and guidance.</li> </ul> </li> <li>•Residential buildings form a buffer between the school and RDR2, however, this should be reflected on all other plans including the illustrative masterplan (page 55), land use and access plan (page 117).</li> </ul>	<p>Comments are noted and the DFD text will be updated where appropriate.</p> <p><b>Plans are indicative. Further detail for OPAs.</b></p>	<b>Willow Hill</b>	Plans are indicative and the detail will be examined at OPA stage.	No further information is required at this stage.
134	136	<b>Willow Hill Employment Hub</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•The promotion of parking to the front of the buildings sends a poor message, encouraging people to drive to the hub. Drivers should feel that using active modes or bus services are more attractive at the trip end by having to walk further to access the buildings.</li> <li>•Car parking and servicing may be better between warehouses and be broken up with landscaping. Employment space should still be design in response to urban design principles such as active frontages.</li> <li>•The key implies traffic calming will apply to RDR2, which will not be the case; however, the text states that this will apply to access roads and parking areas, which is appropriate.</li> <li>•Clarity is required as to how the employment site would be accessed off RDR2 (page 134).</li> <li>•A pedestrian crossing of RDR2 between Willow Hill Centre and the employment hub is referred to (page 134) but is not shown on land use and access plan (page 117).</li> <li>•The proximity of built form adjacent to Peverels, Channels and Wheelers Hills/Cranham Road is of concern (P134); it is important that adequate breathing space is provided to reflect the rural setting and mitigate the impacts. Development beyond RDR2 is not justified and the mitigation measures proposed are inadequate; it erodes the applicant's concept of a settlement wrapped in landscape and is severed from the main community. The area is very sensitive due to the close proximity to heritage assets. The definition of the two of the phases of the former deer park pale and north ride from New Hall is welcomed.</li> <li>•Some variation in density across the site is delivered, with the highest densities at neighbourhood centres, however, there is an opportunity to use density to define local character and mitigate heritage impacts. The development is largely of uniform density; there is an opportunity to have landscape led development within the inner deer park and in other sensitive areas to give a sense of landscape setting. The high ground in the northeast portion of the site is sensitive in views from Little Waltham and in the setting of the adjacent heritage assets, this area should have a lower density.</li> </ul>	<p>Comments are noted and the DFD text will be updated where appropriate.</p> <p><b>Plans are indicative. Further detail for OPAs.</b></p>	<b>Willow Hill Employment Hub</b>	Unclear what text has been updated, please confirm.	The plan (page 140) showing the traffic calming around the employment hub has been updated.

136/7	139	<b>Innovation Hub</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*General access from the Pratts Lane Roundabout is not supported in principle. The arrangement shown would detract from the P&amp;R users experience and potentially have safety concerns.</li> <li>*The existing footpath is shown on the Illustrative Masterplan linking through the Innovation Hub. The four active travel links to Essex Regiment Way shown on the Illustrative Plan would all need to have appropriate crossing facilities, if they were to connect directly with the path on the west side of ERW; so many crossings would unacceptably impact traffic, notably buses, on Essex Regiment Way. Alternatively, a footway/ cycletrack on the eastern side would also be needed to consolidate the crossings; there is no apparent transport need for the southern (1st) and 3rd paths.</li> <li>A discussion is required between CCC and ECC regarding the position of the crossings.</li> <li>*Access by active modes to Regiment business park to the south should be facilitated from the north.</li> <li>*The network of paths in Channels Discovery Park could be consolidated but must maintain a comprehensive, attractive network appropriate for walking and wheeling.</li> </ul>	<p>Comments are noted and the DFD text will be updated where appropriate.</p> <p><b>Plans are indicative. Further detail for OPAs.</b></p>	<b>Innovation Hub</b>	Unclear what text has been updated, please confirm.	The plan is indicative at this stage. A detailed plan will be provided as part of the outline planning application.
138/139	141	<b>Density</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*Four density bands are delivered, not three as stated. Housing density is a site wide subject warranting its own chapter and parameter plan; this should be related to accessibility on foot, cycle and bus.</li> <li>*Moving the Village Centres to more central locations within each village area should enable more complete rings of higher densities (like Hawthorn Village as shown on the Heat Map).</li> </ul>	<p>Comments are noted and the DFD text will be updated where appropriate.</p> <p><b>4 bands shown. Location subject to OPA discussions and DRD.</b></p>	<b>Density</b>	Amended to show 4 bands as requested. Further response re updated density plan to be provided by CCC.	The DFD has been updated to show four density bands.
140	142	<b>Key Boundary frontages</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*B – The frontage should be extended to the north of the Willow Hill Primary School to reflect the presence of a residential block between the school and RDR2 as per the illustrative plan (page 133). A landscaped buffer is referred to but an indication of depth as per other frontages would be helpful. Unlike other frontages, the width of the landscape buffer (B) is not stated. 3m verges on each side of RDR2 will need to be more generous in places depending on tree species proposed (if any is agreeable with Essex Highways for safety, lighting and operational reasons).</li> <li>A discussion is required between CCC and ECC regarding the approach to the RDR.</li> <li>*C – The proposed primary street to the east of Domesey Lane would be inconsistent with the screening and connection of wildlife corridors objectives.</li> <li>*E – A broad buffer of 20m is referred to. Clarity on whether this would remain 20m upon dualling of CNEB would be welcomed.</li> <li>*I – The illustrative plan on page 137 indicates that buildings will be set back to retain the existing trees and hedgerows along Essex Regiment Way with parking in-between. Reference to this retained buffer and an indication of depth would be welcomed. Further this does not show the proposed 30m landscaped buffer between Great Beistead Primary School and the primary street.</li> <li>*The building density parameter plan shows medium density housing closest to the Little Waltham Conservation Area and the registered park and garden at New Hall school. If the density were dropped to lower density around heritage assets, this could assist with the feel of some of their more historically rural setting.</li> </ul>	<p>Comments are noted and the DFD text will be updated where appropriate.</p> <p>Frontage extended.</p> <p><b>As per the image, the 20m is based on dualling.</b></p> <p><b>Plans are indicative. Further detail for OPAs</b></p>	<b>Key Boundaries</b>	Frontages have been extended and plans updated; no further action required.	The page is now referenced as illustrative boundary frontages. The frontage to the northern RDR has been extended.
142	144	<b>Heritage interventions</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*The language throughout the document is not strong enough to ensure deliver of key mitigation measures, for instance page 142 incorporates greening where possible, there are similar caveats throughout the document; it is essential the principles within the document are strong enough to ensure delivery.</li> <li>*The extent of the historic woodland appears to be taken from the 1874 OS plan; it would be more appropriate to use the 1799 map as this reflects the earlier extent prior to the beginning of the removal of the woodlands. The document is very two dimensional. 3d modelling should be used to show levels across the site.</li> </ul>	<p>Comments are noted and the DFD text will be updated where appropriate.</p> <p><b>The OPAs have full power to ensure delivery as required.</b></p> <p><b>3D modelling is not appropriate for the DFD illustrative details.</b></p>	<b>Heritage</b>	Wording remains weak; unclear why 3D images cannot be used.	The heritage intervention plan has been moved to page 81. Information on pages 156 and 157 is considered acceptable information at this stage.
143	145	<b>Street Typology</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*Manual for Streets recommends 3.6.21 'Street character types set out not only the basic parameters of streets, such as carriageway and footway widths, but also the street's relationship to buildings and the private realm, and other important details, such as parking arrangements, street trees, planting and lighting'; these important elements above have not been incorporated adequately or acceptably. Provision for direct access to properties where necessary and accommodating utilities and drainage are other street functions to consider. Design codes are recommended for the level of detail required for this in due course.</li> <li>*The limited approach taken here to defining streets further is appropriate at this stage; it is noted that only illustrative Primary Street concepts are shown and that detailed primary, secondary and tertiary street typologies are proposed to be developed as part of each OPA. No agreement to the details shown is therefore provided by the highway authority now, although there is clearly potential in the future.</li> <li>A discussion is required between CCC and ECC regarding the street typologies to be defined at this stage.</li> <li>*Further visual exercises, such as producing vignettes of the housing communities and local centres are encouraged; this will help to provide some meaning to the blocks of development and start to realise the key design and aesthetic aims that make up the distinctive and 'Place' goals of the Garden Village.</li> <li>*Potential exists to utilise the already excavated zones required for mining operations within the emerging proposals. Potential usages of this space are wide ranging, and could include basement car parking, refuse collection and landscaping; these level changes require further study and should examine the potential to save costs by eliminating unnecessary backfill, as well as reduce carbon emissions by reducing earthworks.</li> </ul>	<p>Comments are noted and the DFD and Evidence Base Documents will be updated as necessary following ongoing discussions between Mayer Brown, TPA and ECC.</p> <p><b>Section expanded with additional typology information. Further discussions can be had at OPA stage.</b></p>	<b>Street Typology</b>	Street typologies provided on page 147. CCC to review.	Specific details in relation to path materials will be addressed as part of the Site Wide Design Principles Document.
144	148	<b>Landscape character areas</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*Self-binding gravel will not be acceptable for any paths to be adopted by Essex highways; they will need to have a bound surface.</li> </ul>	<p>Comments noted</p> <p><b>Further detail for OPAs.</b></p> <p><b>Site Wide Design Principles Document to establish key design factors.</b></p>	<b>Landscape Character</b>	Site wide design principles document to be submitted.	Specific details in relation to path materials will be addressed as part of the Site Wide Design Principles Document.

146	150	Drawing- Dukes Nature Park	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The lake feature is still being shown as significantly smaller, than proposed within the minerals application, even if the areas shown for "read and marginal planting" were assumed to be water upon filling of the lake, the lake within the mineral application extends much closer to Cranham Road.</li> </ul>	<p>During the consultation process CCC requested that it was preferable not to be too specific about the size of the lake or the time it will take to fill.</p> <p><b>No action.</b></p>	Lake	The size and scale of the lake still needs to be resolved.	Page 20 of the DFD confirms that following extraction, the area proposed to accommodate Dukes Wood Nature Park, would be left with a large extraction area of lower ground; this will fill with water and become the lake over a period of approximately 20 years.
146	150	Dukes wood nature park text	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The text states "As the final form of the Nature Park will only be known once mineral extraction is finished it is proposed that a Design Brief be consulted upon, prepared and submitted along with the relevant RMA at the appropriate time." While there may be some variation from the details submitted within the mineral application, the differences are unlikely to be significant, so to change the landform substantially. Areas of the Nature Park would be completed prior to overall completion of mineral extraction within the Boreham Airfield eg the area in the NW east of the CNEB; would seem sensible to develop a phased plan for the Park so that some areas can be available earlier, not leave until the end.</li> </ul>	<p>Comments noted</p> <p><b>Phasing in detail is a matter for OPAs.</b></p>	Dukes Wood Phasing	Indicative phasing of the park should be provided to give an indication of what provision is going to be available at what times to the community. Confirmation of how the extracted area is going to be handed across - i.e. piecemeal or in large parcels should also be provided. General statement required to convey anticipated delivery.	The phasing of the park is indicatively shown on the Phase 4 plan on page 165 of the DFD.
147	151	Park pale and ride	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The bridge over the RDR should be in this frame.</li> <li>The Illustrative Masterplan shows a primary street (bus route C14) touching the Park Pale, but it is not shown on this plan; it could be an awkward detail to reconcile between Park Farm and the Park Pale and should be addressed here.</li> </ul>	<p>Comments are noted and the DFD text will be updated where appropriate.</p> <p><b>Bridge shown.</b></p> <p><b>Updated plan being undertaken.</b></p>	Park Pale	Bridge is shown but a key is needed. A new plan needs to be provided when updated for CCC to review.	Bridge removed as out of frame and not relevant to heritage or landscaping.
151	155	Delivery and phasing objective	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>'Self-Build – The DFD makes no mention of self-build until a narrow reference in the Phasing section of the document.</li> <li>'The illustrative Masterplan shows a primary healthcare facility, none are shown on the phasing and delivery information, this should be rectified to include the proposed healthcare facility in one of the neighbourhood centres.</li> <li>'Reference should be made to the PFA being the tool for controlling site wide phasing and to secure commitments that the site wide infrastructure will be delivered at the relevant triggers. The 'Monitoring and Review' section should acknowledge that the process for monitoring and review will be set out in the PFA.</li> </ul>	<p>Comments are noted and the DFD text will be updated where appropriate.</p> <p>Self-build subject to policy. Further detailed discussions needed on this.</p> <p>Reference to surgery added as footnote to p162.</p> <p>PFA referenced in initial sections of DFD.</p> <p>'Monitoring and Review' PFA section added.</p>	Self-Build	Reference to self-build needs to be included.	Self build now referenced within the Illustrative Masterplan section of the DFD.
151	155	Minerals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The timing of mineral extraction does often change, particularly depending on the buoyancy of the economy, so critical facilities should avoid locations which are dependent on mineral being extracted in time, e.g. the all-through school which is located within the Park Farm extraction area.</li> <li>A discussion is required between CCC and ECC regarding the location of the all through school</li> </ul>	<p>Comments are noted and the DFD text will be updated where appropriate.</p> <p><b>ATS location proposed in only reasonable location. See DRD.</b></p>	Minerals Extraction Process	Require confirmation that ECC are happy with location and terracing.	The phasing plans in relation to mineral extraction have been acceptably updated.
151	155	Phasing and delivery tables	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A plan is needed to ensure all areas are covered and to see in one view the phases.</li> <li>A Gantt chart showing the number of dwellings (phases to reasonably small size, e.g., approx. 250 dwellings) and strategic infrastructure would greatly help appreciate the phasing.</li> <li>Clarity on how the phasing fits with the drainage strategy for CGC would be welcomed.</li> <li>The interdependencies (strategic and more localised infrastructure) between the 4 phases and 3 outline planning applications in terms of delivering a high-quality, comprehensive Garden Community should be referenced within the Phasing Strategy Key Principles.</li> </ul>	<p>Comments are noted and the DFD text will be updated where appropriate.</p> <p><b>Additional plan would not serve notable function.</b></p> <p><b>Gantt chart not considered appropriate. Delivery of homes and infrastructure subject to IDP/PFA/S106.</b></p> <p><b>Drainage to be confirmed as part of OPAs .</b></p> <p><b>No update made. Clarity on interdependencies and delivery to be confirmed as part of OPA 2.</b></p>	Drainage Strategy and Phasing	Feedback remains unactioned. Site wide Drainage Strategy will be required and would be helpful to see how phasing of development interacts with this. Greater reference/acknowledgement to be added to DFD.	New plans have been added showing the phasing and delivery of the development.
152	156	Delivery and phasing- Phase 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Given the lack of facilities within a short walk and it mostly being beyond 400m walking distance to bus route C9 on Remembrance Avenue, the housing areas shown accessed off the RDR should be delayed to when Park Farm Village Centre is to be provided (in Phase 3) and or at least bus services can pass through.</li> <li>The housing in Willow Hill in Phase 1 will be remote from local amenities until the Willow Hill Village Centre is provided. The Interim Bus Access Strategy is not presented, so it is recommended that this area too should not be brought forward until a link to the main E-W Primary Street can be established. The Illustrative Masterplan shows indicates this link would require a carriageway in Phase 3; however, an interim or alternative layout may be possible.</li> <li>The housing to the south side of RDR2 and nearest the west side of Domsey Lane, will be over 800m walk from Great Belsteads Village Centre and the mobility hub; as it is closer to Willow Hill, it is suggested that this area should be delivered later.</li> <li>The details presented in relation to Channels Village Centre do not suggest that this will provide the day-to-day amenities required for walkable neighbourhoods; if this is the case, then parts of the Channels Extension will also be remote and should not be built so early.</li> <li>Clarity is needed on how the disconnected parcels of land in Phase 1 east of Domsey Lane and west of the bypass will access everyday facilities to deliver the walkable neighbourhoods concept/ ethos, and encourage active travel from the outset.</li> </ul>	<p>Comments are noted and the DFD text will be updated where appropriate and will include a detailed development specification.</p> <p><b>Final detailed phasing to be discussed as part of OPA's.</b></p>	Phasing	Phasing as part of the OPA's is acknowledged, but remaining comments have not been addressed.	Matters to be dealt with via detailed outline planning application phasing plans and Site Specific s106 Agreements.



153	157	delivery and phasing- phase 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The area of Willow Hill cannot be connected to the E-W spine primary street unless this is done through the parcel in phase 1; it would seem sensible to do this and obviate any need for the primary street in the phase 1 parcel.</li> <li>Delivering the all-through school in Phase 2 cannot happen if the Park Farm village centre is left until Phase 3 as the main access to the school is from the traffic free public square – clarity is needed on how this will be accessed before Park Farm village centre is delivered.</li> </ul>	<p>Comments are noted and the DFD text will be updated where appropriate.</p> <p><b>Final detailed phasing to be discussed as part of OPA's.</b></p>	Phasing and Delivery	Comments have not been addressed.	Matters to be dealt with via detailed outline planning application phasing plans and Site Specific s106 Agreements.
152-159	163	Phasing objective and strategy key policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Garden Community is to be delivered on a landownership blind basis. The Great Belsteads Village is divided between the master developers, which may mean unforeseen, and possibly less than optimal access arrangements (looking from a wider perspective), being proposed, as one developer seeks not to be dependent on another.</li> <li>The parcel of the Channels Extension to the east of Domsey Lane (next to the all-through school) would appear to better identify Park Farm Village but given access constraints is also reliant on fellow consortia members for access too.</li> <li>The four overarching phases are indicative; however, further work to inform the DFD and IDP and changes made is recommended before the DFD is adopted. The goal should be to deliver the Village Centre amenities as early as possible to enable residents to relinquish car use for day-to-day needs. Priority active travel routes need to be delivered to key destinations to temporarily mitigate any local deficiency and provide for additional amenities and connections.</li> <li>The four overarching phases do not appear to tally with the IDP. The rationale for the phasing is not clear or justified in the DFD and this could result in dwellings being proposed in less than preferable locations from a sustainable transport perspective.</li> <li>A continuum of building is more likely in line with the IDP assumptions; there must also be a risk that it will not be possible to coordinate the OPAs and reserved matters sustainable transport and result in more highly car-dependent development than it should be.</li> <li>The phasing should be broken down into a more detailed sequence in the DFD for the first 5-10 years to ensure that the necessary sustainable transport infrastructure and amenities are delivered to achieve the transport objectives; thereafter this 5-10-year pipeline should be reviewed periodically to ensure delivery of later phases is sustainable in transport terms and allow flexibility.</li> <li>A risk exists that housing will be delivered but supporting amenities and local jobs are not, leaving some areas seriously deficient and vehicle dependent and yet the overall mode share targets are still achieved; this must be avoided.</li> <li>The provision of jobs in step with, or ahead of the delivery of houses, is important to the maximising active travel, as it affords the opportunity for some workers to live close to their place of work.</li> </ul>	<p>Comments are noted and the DFD text will be updated where appropriate.</p> <p><b>Final detailed phasing to be discussed as part of OPA's.</b></p>	Phasing	Comments have not been addressed.	Matters to be dealt with via detailed outline planning application phasing plans and Site Specific s106 Agreements.
156-159	163	Phasing and delivery tables	No reference is made to establishing a stewardship body or any associated activities/ measures within the phasing and delivery tables. Clarity on who would deliver habitat severance mitigation measures would be welcome. Reference should also be made to a base/office for the new parish council. This would ideally be accommodated within one of the village centres and at an early stage.	<p>Comments are noted and the DFD text will be updated where appropriate.</p> <p><b>Discussions on stewardship ongoing. Habitat mitigation subject to OPAs Village hall proposed in PFV in DRD. Final location subject to OPA's and discussions on delivery timeframes.</b></p>	Stewardship	Ongoing discussions to resolve the Stewardship matters. Habitat mitigation has not been resolved in the DFD.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Officers commissioned a stewardship report and are currently considering its content. Further discussion will be required with the Development Consortium ahead of the finalisation of the DFD for approval at Cabinet.</li> <li>Habitat mitigation is not relevant to the Phasing section.</li> <li>A Parish Hall would be delivered in Phase 3 of the development, but it is envisaged that a temporary base would be provided within the Great Belsteads Village Centre. A Parish Hall has been included within the village centre character areas as reference and a footnote added to Phasing Table. The detail of the future proofing is included within the DFD and no further changes are required.</li> </ol>
160	164	Future proofing	The DFD should helpfully recognise that the PFA will set the mechanism for review/approach for monitoring, to aid with the formal process for building in the approach to future-proofing the development proposals.	<p>Comments are noted and the DFD text will be updated where appropriate.</p> <p><b>Comment added in para 3.</b></p>	Future Proofing	Changes made; no further action required.	Future proofing is included within the DFD and no further changes are required.
164	168	CGC site wide and detailed design code- scopes	The section refers to the working up of a site wide design framework for all areas of CGC; whilst the individual applications can have conditions on the outline planning permission to secure the relevant design code compliance, the PFA will need to secure the allocation site wide framework	<p>Comments noted and as set out on page 164, following the approval of each OPA a Site-Wide Design Coding Framework will be submitted for approval prior to RMA's being submitted. Each OPA will submit its own Site-Wide Design Coding Framework to cover each Zone. <b>No action.</b></p>	Design Code	Site wide Design Code to be submitted. Each OPA will have its own code. Design Code section in DFD has been updated - CCC to review.	The approach to design coding and the process of agreeing a Site Wide Design Principles Document is still the subject of discussion between the Developer Consortium and CCC officers. The matter is intended to be addressed before the Cabinet meeting on 24th January.
168	172	Implementation. Planning Application Requirements - Pre Application/PPA	The implementation of a Design Code outlining the key deliverables and objectives, ensuring the robustness of the Garden Village and embedding future stewardship by the community will be required. The design principles need to be clearly outlined for future developers to follow and maintain the level of quality through different phases of construction. Potential exists for increased density and increasing the footfall of buildings with particular focus towards denser Village Centres to create a sense of identity, while also increasing space for further green infrastructure.	<p>Comments are noted and the DFD text will be updated where appropriate.</p> <p><b>Design code is referenced in a separate section of the DFD. This would technically form part of the OPAs.</b></p> <p><b>Noted, but unclear on relevance to this section.</b></p>	Design Code	Site wide Design Code to be submitted. Each OPA will have its own code. Design Code section in DFD has been updated - CCC to review.	The approach to design coding and the process of agreeing a Site Wide Design Principles Document is still the subject of discussion between the Developer Consortium and CCC officers. The matter is intended to be addressed before the Cabinet meeting on 24th January.
169	173	Implementation planning application requirements- pre application/PPA	The outline planning application criteria need to acknowledge that the applications will need to comply with the relevant PFA obligations in terms of infrastructure delivery and compliance with the framework documents.	<p>Comments are noted and the DFD text will be updated where appropriate. <b>Section states "Each stage 2 masterplan OPA will be required to be based upon and in broad conformity with the stage 1 approved documents including this DFD and associated documents"</b></p>	Implementation	DFD clarifies the position with the PFA.	The PPA is referenced on the implementation pages of the DFD.