

CHELMSFORD CITY COUNCIL

MINUTES OF AN EXTRAORDINARY MEETING OF THE COUNCIL

held on 27 May 2020 at 7pm

PRESENT:

The Mayor (Councillor J A Deakin)
The Deputy Mayor (Councillor L A Mascot)

Councillors

R H Ambor	N Gulliver	I C Roberts
L Ashley	P V Hughes	S J Robinson
H Ayres	R J J Hyland	T E Roper
K Bentley	A M John	C M Shaw
M W Bracken	D G Jones	R J Shepherd
D J R Clark	G B R Knight	A B Sosin
P H Clark	J C S Lager	J E Sosin
W A Daden	J S Lardge	M S Steel
A E Davidson	R J Lee	C R Tron
C K Davidson	M J Mackrory	N M Walsh
S M Dobson	R Massey	M D Watson
N A Dudley	L A Millane	R T Whitehead
J A Frasca	R J Moore	T N Willis
I D Fuller	G H J Pooley	I Wright
J Galley	J A Potter	S Young
M C Goldman	R J Poulter	
S M Goldman	S Rajesh	
I S Grundy	J M Raven	

Opening the meeting, the Mayor reminded those attending of the protocols to be followed in its conduct. She also took the opportunity to say how encouraged she had been to see so many Chelmsford residents volunteering to help others during the coronavirus emergency and to thank staff of the City Council who had risen to the challenge and maintained vital services to the community.

1. Attendance and Apologies for Absence

The attendance of members was confirmed. Apologies for absence had been received from Councillors E Sampson and M Sismey.

2. Declarations of Interest

Members were reminded to declare at the appropriate time any personal and prejudicial interests in the business on the meeting's agenda.

3. Minutes of Previous Meetings

The minutes of the meetings on 26 February and 13 May 2020 were confirmed as correct records.

4. Public Questions

Forty-eight written questions and statements on the Local Plan had been received from the public by the deadline of 24 hours before the meeting. They were considered and responded to during Item 5 below and they and the detailed responses are attached as an appendix to these minutes.

5. Chelmsford City Council Local Plan 2013-36

The Council considered a report recommending the adoption of the Chelmsford Local Plan following its Independent Examination by a planning inspector appointed by the Secretary of State. Members were also requested to approve for publication an updated Chelmsford Local Plan Policies Map and to formally revoke existing adopted Development Framework Plan Documents and Supplementary Planning Documents which would be superseded by the adoption of the Chelmsford Local Plan.

Members received a presentation which outlined the statutory context in which the Plan had been produced, the stages in its development, its vision and key content and the importance of having an up to date plan.

Three members of the public attended the meeting to put in person the questions they had submitted. They concerned:

- The B1012 to the north of South Woodham Ferrers and the adequacy of plans to accommodate additional traffic associated with the allocation of land in that area for housing development and from the planned Bradwell B project. The questioner argued that future growth in the area required the provision of a ring road or by-pass to prevent the town becoming grid-locked and that funding available for junction and crossing improvements would be better used for that purpose.
- Objections to the proposed development of three sites in and bordering on Great Baddow which centred on concerns about the green wedge along the river Chelmer; the lack of provision of local amenities and facilities; the exacerbation of parking problems in the village; the increasing pressure on local schools and GP practices; traffic congestion at the new access roads and junctions and the Army and Navy roundabout; and the need for more affordable housing.

- The evidence that schools in Baddow East and Sandon were currently over-subscribed and why there was no provision in the Local Plan for the construction of primary and secondary schools in Site 3a.

Responding to those questions, the Cabinet Member for Sustainable Development said that:

- The A132 and B1012 were primary routes and acted as main arteries for through traffic. Pedestrian crossings would be considered as part of the master planning and planning application process for the development site to the north of South Woodham Ferrers and would include capacity analysis to establish a balance between the provision of safe crossings and the free flow of traffic on the roads. The idea of building a new road to the north of the proposed development site had been considered during the preparation of the Local Plan and by the Inspector at its Examination in Public but it had been concluded that its provision would not outweigh its impact on the landscape and natural habitats.
- The Planning Inspector had considered all the representations about development in Great Baddow and had concluded that the Local Plan was sound, including those parts relating to development in that area. The master planning process would take into consideration all the concerns raised by the questioner, and the Parish Council and local residents would have the opportunity to contribute to the production of the master plan.
- The County Council had indicated that planned growth in Baddow East and Sandon could be accommodated in existing schools or through their expansion funded through financial contributions from the developers.

Moving on to the other questions and statements received from the public, the Cabinet Member said that responses to all would be published after the meeting but that he wished to respond in general terms to some of the issues that had been raised.

- Regarding the West Chelmsford development site allocations and concerns about flooding and traffic, flood prevention measures would be taken as part of new development and adjustments to the road network would be sufficient to accommodate the planned growth.
- Consultation on the impact of the Bradwell B development was currently taking place and the Council's response to it would be considered by the Chelmsford Policy Board on 4 June 2020. The Council was likely to raise objections to the proposals relating to planned highways measures and the provision of park and ride.
- With regard to the John Shennan playing fields, the planning system did not deal with the designation of village greens, but it was the wish of the Council to retain the site as public open space to make up for the lack of such space in that part of Chelmsford.
- Infill developments, such as those in Danbury, were regarded as windfall sites and to avoid double counting were not included in the housing figures in the Local Plan.
- The Council was not intending to allow development on playing fields and recreational land.

- With regard to housing infrastructure, the Planning Inspector had concluded that there was a sound evidence base for level of future growth in the Local Plan. The mix of dwellings, their size and type, was covered in detailed policies and there would be a significant proportion of affordable housing.

Turning to the report before the meeting, the Cabinet Member said that the production of the Local Plan had been a long and detailed process, involving four rounds of public consultation and its Examination by a Planning Inspector. He thanked all officers and members involved in its preparation for their hard and diligent work. The government had set the Council targets for new housing in Chelmsford and a comprehensive plan-led and evidence-based approach to achieving them was essential to meet those targets in the most sustainable way possible. The Cabinet Member believed that the Local Plan before the meeting achieved that objective and, noting that it would be subject to regular review and would be rigorously monitored, he commended it to the Council. The motion to approve the 10 recommendations in the report was seconded and debated.

During the discussion of the Local Plan, reference was made to its importance in enabling the Council to control and focus development in an appropriate and sustainable way, in areas best able to accommodate it, and to ensure that it was supported by the necessary infrastructure. Failure to adopt the Plan could lead to development over which the Council would have little or no control and which would be to the detriment of local communities.

Questions were asked and comments made on:

- whether the adoption of the Plan should be deferred to enable the impact of Bradwell B to be taken into account;
- whether the Plan could be amended to refer to the need for traffic regulation on the B148 and surrounding roads and negotiation on this with the future developer and Essex Highways;
- in view of the current economic conditions facing the UK as a result of coronavirus and the government's already unprecedented spending commitments, whether the adoption of the Plan should be deferred until it was clear whether funding for the necessary infrastructure schemes in north Chelmsford could be guaranteed, particularly as no contract for the funding had been agreed with the government; and
- whether the funding available for road schemes associated with development in South Woodham Ferrers could be used to provide a by-pass, whether the by-pass would be included in the master plan for the development, and whether developers or those behind Bradwell B would fund the junction improvements.

On those points, the Cabinet Member replied that the Local Plan needed to be adopted before traffic regulations associated with individual developments could be considered; that the Bradwell B development would need to take into account the requirements of the Local Plan, rather than the other way round; that the government had given a commitment to fund infrastructure in north-east Chelmsford, that the contract with it was at an advance stage, but

that funding would only be forthcoming if there was some degree of certainty that the development would take place, which the adoption of the Local Plan would help provide; and that the City Council would need to work with the highway authority on whether there was a justified need and scope for providing a by-pass around development area 7 in South Woodham Ferrers, especially in the light of Bradwell B.

Other contributors to the discussion:

- Emphasised its value in giving the Council more power to address the climate emergency and housing crisis; said that it would help provide housing, employment and their associated infrastructure in a sustainable way; and pointed out that it had already led to the production of associated documents that promoted the creation of strong communities, ensured that developers would contribute to the cost of infrastructure, and increase the provision of open space and the protection of biodiversity.
- Questioned whether the Plan represented a commitment to the provision of sustainable, plan-led infrastructure and, accordingly, should be deferred to allow a detailed assessment of infrastructure needs.
- Referred to the important role played by master plans in shaping future development in the city and the provision of the required infrastructure.

When put to the vote, the recommendations to adopt the Local Plan and to take the steps associated with that were carried by 46 votes to two, with three abstentions. (Councillor Potter was not present for the vote.)

RESOLVED that:

1. The content of the Inspector's Final Report into the Examination of Chelmsford Local Plan, presented in Appendix 2 to the report to the meeting, be noted.
2. The Chelmsford Local Plan 2013-2036, presented in Appendix 6, incorporating the Main Modifications as set out in the Inspector's Final Report and other Additional Modifications, presented in Appendix 3 be adopted and that they will replace the current Local Development Framework Development Plan Documents (DPDs).
3. The updated Policies Map, presented in Appendix 4 in line with changes set out in Appendix 3, be adopted in order to reflect the policies of the Chelmsford Local Plan, and that it be published alongside the Chelmsford Local Plan 2013-2036.
4. The content of the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Post Adoption Statement (PAS) and Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) Adoption Note, presented in Appendices 7 and 8, be noted and that the PAS and the HRA Adoption Note be published alongside the adopted Chelmsford Local Plan 2013-2036 in accordance with Regulation 16 of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004.
5. The Director of Sustainable Communities in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Sustainable Development be authorised to make any necessary minor textual, presentational or layout amendments to the Chelmsford Local Plan 2013-2036 (Appendix 6), Local Plan Adoption Statement (Appendix 5), Sustainability Appraisal Post Adoption Statement (PAS) (Appendix 7) and Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) Adoption Note

- (Appendix 8) before publication, and to undertake all the necessary legal and procedural adoption processes.
6. It be noted that with the adoption of the Chelmsford Local Plan 2013-2036 the following Local Development Framework Development Plan Documents (DPDs) and Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) are revoked and should not be used for decision making:
 - a. Core Strategy Development Plan and Development Control Policies DPD, February 2008
 - b. Chelmsford Town Centre Area Action Plan DPD, August 2008
 - c. North Chelmsford Area Action Plan DPD, July 2011
 - d. Site Allocations DPD, February 2012
 - e. Core Strategy Development Plan and Development Control Policies Focused Review DPD, December 2013
 - f. Making Places SPD, June 2008
 - g. Building for Tomorrow SPD, June 2013
 - h. Planning Obligations SPD, June 2014.
 7. The Main Modifications Feedback Report, presented in Appendix 9, be noted and delegated authority be given to the Director of Sustainable Communities in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Sustainable Development to make any necessary minor amendments for its publication.
 8. The Sustainability Appraisal Addendum and Habitats Regulation Assessment Feedback Report, presented in Appendix 10, be noted and delegated authority be given to the Director of Sustainable Communities in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Sustainable Development to make any necessary minor amendments for its publication.
 9. Delegated authority be given to the Director of Sustainable Communities in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Sustainable Development to undertake the necessary procedural processes associated with the revocation of Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) listed in recommendation 6.
 10. It be noted that on adoption of the Chelmsford Local Plan 2013-2036 the Interim Recycling and Waste Guidance, September 2013, Affordable Housing Implementation Guide, March 2015 and Interim Residential Parking Guidance, March 2015 should not be used for decision making.

The meeting closed at 8.55pm

Mayor

APPENDIX

QUESTIONS AND REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED ON THE ADOPTION OF THE LOCAL PLAN

1. Paul Atkins - Proposed new estate between the North of Roxwell Road (A1060) and Chignall Road

The main sewer down Roxwell Avenue takes sewerage from the Chignall estate and fills up, bursting drains on the avenue's residences from time to time. It is worse with persistent rainfall.

If this new development goes ahead, is a new sewerage system being proposed so that the Roxwell Avenue sewer system is not further overloaded?

CCC Response:

A foul water retention and pumping station is proposed to serve the West Chelmsford (SGS2) site. The detailed specification of this infrastructure will form part of any future planning application for development to be agreed by the City Council, the Environment Agency and Anglian Water.

As required by the relevant Local Plan policies, surface water from future development will be intercepted and stored to manage flood risk. This is in the form of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS) such as new balancing ponds, swales and reed beds. The detailed specification will form part of any future planning application for development to be agreed by the City Council and Essex County Council as Lead Local Flood Authority.

2. Kevin Green, South Woodham Action Group – Implications of Bradwell B

In light of the report that has been published this week in respect of Bradwell B, I call on you to postpone this extraordinary meeting until the contents of that report can be fully examined.

The new report has massive implications for the proposed new development site at South Woodham Ferrers that was not available in the public consultation or for the Government Inspectorate. If CCC knew about the report then it should have made the information fully available to consider in line with the consultation.

CCC now needs to do the right thing and re-examine its local plan in all areas including infrastructure and sustainability.

CCC Response:

The consultation on proposals for Bradwell B, including the potential road routes for freight traffic accessing the site, was launched by the promoters of the new power station in March 2020 after the receipt of the Inspector's Report into the Examination of the Local Plan. The City Council was

not aware of the contents of the proposed consultation on Bradwell B.

Although the City Council actively engages with other bodies and authorities through the duty to co-operate, it cannot control what new development proposals outside its area that comes forward. This may not always align with the timing of the Local Plan.

The Stage 1 consultation on Bradwell B is the start of a long period of consultation. It could be several years until a Development Consent Order is submitted, followed by a year-long examination in public process.

Crucially in preparing their proposals, the Bradwell B promoters will need to take the contents of Chelmsford's Local Plan fully into account and may need to change their proposals in response. They will also need to provide up to date traffic modelling and other evidence to inform their proposed transport and highway strategy. The promoters of Bradwell B will need to look at all options that ensure that the additional traffic generated by their proposals, in addition to the new development contained within the Local Plan, can be fully mitigated.

Since the publication of the Bradwell consultation, the City Council has been working closely with neighbouring councils and Essex County Council. The City Council is considering its formal response to Bradwell B consultation at a meeting of the Chelmsford Policy Board on 4 June. Officers are recommending that formal objections are made to the freight traffic proposals.

It is important to note that the need to build at least 805 new homes a year does not disappear if the Local Plan is not adopted. Withdrawing the Local Plan would mean Chelmsford would be open to speculative unplanned development in potentially less sustainable locations and reduce opportunities to secure new infrastructure.

3. Donald King – Housing in Danbury

I understand that as part of the plan 100 houses are to be built in Danbury. It puzzles me that since the plans were announced a number of dwellings have been built or are being built in the parish but do not count. ! 5 new dwellings have been built within sight of my house. As far as I can make out the plans are only related to estates of many houses and any that have been built so far are ignored. Why?

CCC Response:

Small development sites across Chelmsford, including Danbury, come forward for development at any time. These include redevelopments, conversions and small infills. As the City Council does not know when or if these types of development might come forward for development, they are counted as windfalls in the Council's overall housing need number.

To ensure the supply of new windfall homes are counted against Chelmsford's housing numbers, Strategic Policy S6 contains a projection of future windfalls based on past records.

To count the windfalls again against the allocation for Danbury of around 100 houses in the Local Plan, would amount to double counting.

4. Sophie Gibbs – Improvement of A132

My question is with regard to London bound traffic leaving South Woodham Ferrers, whilst there are plans to expand the population locally are there any plans to improve and expand the A132 out of Woodham as this is already an extremely heavily used road in a poor state of repair.

CCC Response:

Strategic Growth Site Policy 10 – North of South Woodham Ferrers requires improvements to the local and strategic highway network, alongside sustainable transport measures.

The improvements to the strategic highway network include capacity improvements to the A132 between South Woodham Ferrers and Rettendon Turnpike. Traffic modelling has shown that it is the capacity of the junctions rather than the road between them which causes congestion. ECC is preparing a 'A132 Corridor Study' which will focus on improvements which will be required to improve the flow of traffic, including both highway mitigation and sustainable transport measures.

The condition of the road is a matter for Essex County Council. However, we are advised that some localised resurfacing will take place this financial year, followed by resurfacing of the roundabouts at either end. These will progress as planned, rather than waiting for any longer-term junction improvements identified in the corridor study.

Sustainable transport measures are also envisaged including improved pedestrian/cycle links to the rail station, improved bus services including a potential direct service to Wickford Railway Station, and a period of free bus travel for new residents. These measures will enable people to make sustainable travel choices. The details of these will come forward later for consideration as part of the planning application.

5. Ray Avis – Development in South Woodham Ferrers

I would like to object to the plan of the development for South Woodham Ferrers.

The additional traffic that will be created for Bradwell B of up to 700 additional vehicles coming through South Woodham Ferrers should be taken into consideration. The traffic surveys they have been done are now proven to be out of date.

Please consider this as our roads cannot cope with both the development and Bradwell B additional traffic.

CCC Response:

Refer to response to Q2.

6. Linda Denston – Impact of Bradwell B on South Woodham Ferrers Traffic

With regard to the implications of Bradwell B and the expectation of 500 - 700 HGV movements on the B1012 alongside 'Site 8' - North of South Woodham Ferrers.

What considerations need to be taken to ensure the safety of residents given the additional traffic across multiple pedestrian crossings?

CCC Response:

Bradwell B promoters will need to take the proposals within Chelmsford's Local Plan into account and may need to change their proposals in response. They will also need to provide up to date traffic modelling and other evidence to inform their proposals for freight and other traffic management.

The promoters of Bradwell B will need to look at all options that ensure that the additional traffic generated by their proposals, in addition to the new development proposed in the Local Plan, can be fully mitigated. This will need to include consideration of pedestrian and cycle safety for all users of Burnham Road.

The City Council is already working closely with neighbouring Councils and Essex County Council in terms of the proposals at Bradwell and the implications this may have for South Woodham Ferrers.

7. Helen Wood – John Shennan Playing Field

I am delighted that John Shennan Playing Field is to be officially removed today from the local plan from the Local Plan. Would Chelmsford City Council now consider registering the site as a 'Village Green' to protect it for future generations?

This site is extremely valuable to the local community as an informal, recreational open space in a very built up area. This has been particularly highlighted in recent weeks during the current COVID 19 Pandemic. John Shennan Playing Field is a space that enables community members of all ages to exercise in a safe way and to maintain social distancing that is crucial at the current time. In addition, it is providing residents with a natural environment that is positive for physical, emotional and mental health which is of paramount importance at all times.

It is a space that is increasingly proving itself to be the 'Green Lungs' of the local community. This will be further enhanced by the planting of new trees that Chelmsford City Council has pledged for the site to fulfil their promise to "plant a tree for every resident in Chelmsford."

Chelmsford City Council's Overview and Scrutiny Committee 13 January 2020 conducted a performance review of parks and green spaces and recognises six strong benefits of green spaces as listed below by the City Council.

1. Physical and mental health and wellbeing ...
2. Sustainable travel...

3. Community cohesion and identity...
4. Biodiversity and access to nature...
5. Local economy and growth...
6. Climate change and the environment...

John Shennan Playing Field is the only large open space in close proximity for families and residents in the Moulsham Lodge area and beyond. Our community needs this green space preserved for future generations.

Chelmsford City Council's Local Plan includes a Garden Village to the North East of Chelmsford with a new country park, walking and cycling routes, and neighbourhood centres with community spaces. In July 2019 Councillor Stephen Robinson leader of Chelmsford City Council said "We want Chelmsford to be a leading example of a place where safer, greener, fairer and better-connected communities are built. We will work hard to consult with residents to ensure that the Garden Village delivers on its principles."

Bearing this in mind, it seems only reasonable that like the residents of the new Garden Village, our urban community should be able to preserve its only existing, significant, informal recreational green space.

So, I repeat my original question. Having removed John Shennan Playing Field from the Local Plan will Chelmsford City Council now consider registering the site as a 'Village Green' to protect it for future generations?

Thank you for considering my question.

CCC Response:

The proposed development of the John Shennan site was removed from the Local Plan as part of the City Councils' suggested Main Modifications to the Local Plan Inspector.

As such the site is now notated solely as Open Space on the Local Plan Policies Map. Policy DM21 – Protecting Community Facilities sets out the criteria for protecting open spaces.

The dedication of village greens is not a matter for the planning system to determine and follows a separate statutory process. Any future application for village green status would need to be considered on its individual merits through this separate process after the planning context has been established through the adoption of the Local Plan.

8. Jane Gutteridge – John Shennan Playing Field

As a resident of Moulsham Lodge I would like to say how encouraging it is to see John Shennan Playing Field being removed from the Local Plan.

In the summer of 2019 The Friends of John Shennan Playing Field group posted a questionnaire into the 2,400 houses in Moulsham Lodge to ask residents which uses John Shennan Playing Field could be put to which would best serve the community. 420 households (ie 17.5%) responded and the results were displayed. The top six most important uses listed were

- To create a Wildlife meadow/Conservation area
- To have an improved play area for all ages
- To keep an open grass area for informal games
- To have a cycle path/pedestrian walkway to Princes Road
- To plant trees and create a community garden
- To have a dog walking area

I understand Chelmsford City Council took an interest in these results and intend to plant a number of trees on the playing field. Please could you tell me whether you have any further intentions which are in line with the resident's needs and, if possible when these might be put in place?

CCC Response:

This is not directly a matter for the Local Plan, but emerging strategy for the site does take into account the feedback from the Friends of John Shennan Playing Field survey and is likely to involve a substantial amount of new tree planting, wildlife areas and space for informal recreation activities. However, these plans have not yet been finalised.

9. Derek Bain – Upgrading the Transport System

As a commuter to London where I am a Company Director how will the transport system be upgraded in order to deal with additional people, the rail system is already nearing capacity between 0630-0800, coupled with new station proposed for the New hall school area it would mean by the time the train gets to Chelmsford main station it will be even closer to capacity, with less available seating, it is already a service that cannot cope.

Maldon road is already busy, how will the road facilities be increased in order to accommodate additional cars, the park and ride is not the answer as that does not start early enough in the morning for me and therefore presumably others

No fly over at the army and navy, I think all would agree that the army and navy roundabout is already a bottleneck, presumably there is a plan to replace with a 2 lane system in order to alleviate additional traffic from new sites congestion

Whilst I understand and welcome additional housing as it is clearly a nationwide necessity I do not appreciate additional housing when all it does its add additional burden to existing systems that clearly are already in need of upgrade/renewal.

I have lived in Great Baddow for over 20 years and have never felt more at home anywhere, I have brought up 2 sons here and believe it is a family friendly place, but please do not strangle a city that is already in need of additional air.

CCC Response:

One of the key infrastructure proposals within the Local Plan is a new rail station at Beaulieu which alongside the Chelmsford North East By-pass has been awarded £218m from the Government's Housing Infrastructure Fund to deliver.

The new rail station will help relieve significant passenger congestion at Chelmsford's existing rail station and provides a passing loop to enable faster trains to overtake slower services. The precise timetabling of services will be finalised ahead of the new station opening. In addition, £1.5 billion is being invested in new fleet of trains which are currently being rolled out on the Great Eastern Mainline which is providing around 30% more seats in the peak period.

The principles of any highway requirements will be agreed through the Masterplan process and the detail to be set out in subsequent planning applications for the sites. The traffic modelling which supported the Local Plan indicated that there is sufficient capacity on the Highway network to support the development.

The Inspector assess the traffic modelling as part of consideration of the soundness of the Local Plan.

The City Council is working with Essex County Council who are responsible for the Army and Navy junction. The County Council has consulted on options for the Army and Navy and the City Council will continue to actively engage in this process to help shape the proposals.

10 – Alan Brunning – Highway Considerations in South Woodham Ferrers

I wish to table the following public questions relating to South Woodham Ferrers area 7 and have them discussed at the New Town Plan full council meeting 27 May 2020.

I would like to submit them personally if there is sufficient time. Written reply for each item is requested.

1. When will the masterplan be available for public review
2. Have Essex Highways agreed that the A132 and B1012 is a primary route off the Dengie
3. Why has the plan ignored the additional 500-700 average daily HGV movement for Bradwell B planned to be routed through South Woodham Ferrers (represents a 2.4 times increase in hourly HGV traffic)
4. Can Essex Highways provide data that shows 6 signalised crossings on the B1012 will not significantly reduce traffic flow. Slowing am peak traffic 'gridlocks the town.
5. How often does Essex Highway expect the crossings on the B1012 to be used

6. How will the effect of vehicle pollution and stop start noise vibration be mitigated for properties and schools adjacent to the B1012 crossings, Ferrers Road and the new street..
7. Does Essex Highways consider that policy S12 can be met for safe and easy access with multi user crossing to the town centre schools and facilities without reducing traffic flow.
8. What improvements to the local strategic and local network around SWF are proposed by Essex Highways authority (P468)
9. What improvements will be made to the A132 and B1012 from the A130 to the Maldon boundary. P250 map 2 indicates improvements to the whole length. Documents indicate it will be restricted to junction modifications and adding pedestrian crossings, none of which are indicated shown on the map.
10. Ref P103 and P362 policy S9 claims traffic capacity improvements. Has the detailed traffic modelling for the A132 and B1012 junctions and crossings been completed where is it published? How will the results be verified. Models for the Sainsbury's development have proven to be in error.
11. If the modelling has not been completed how can these proposals for SWF be accepted
12. P128, MM56 how will Essex Highways and planning deliver the declared high-quality sustainable extension to the existing town neighbourhood, with the traffic volume that will be routed through the town.
13. Is SOCG20b still valid and when will it be open for public consultation
14. Why doesn't Map 6 P256 not show crossings for Ferrers Road
15. Why isn't the £12.5m set aside for junction and crossing sufficient to fund a 3-4km northern ring road saving money on crossings and a bridge. (Chelmsford own figures in the plan show the cost @£1.5m per km)
16. How does planning reconcile the inconsistencies of pleasant green frontages on the B1012 and 'rat run' roads through the new development with the volume of traffic needing to use these roads'
17. Can Chelmsford Planning and Essex Highways provide a written guarantee that the design proposals future proofs the traffic flow around South Woodham Ferrers up to 2036,



SWF Map showing all crossing proposed



a.m. 360 degree Gridlock 23rd January 2020 caused by slowing B1012 traffic at Fenn Farm

CCC Response:

- 1) The consultation publication date has not yet been finalised for this. However, it will be widely publicised when consultation starts.
- 2) The A132 and B1012 are Priority One Route (PR1) in ECCs functional route hierarchy. As such they provide the main arteries for the movement of people, goods and through traffic wishing to access the trunk road network. PR1 routes feed traffic to and from the inter-urban routes (to their final destination) and carry large volumes of traffic during the peak hours when people are trying to access/leave town centres.
- 3) Refer to response to Question 2.
- 4) The details, location and number of crossings will be agreed as part of the Masterplan and subsequent planning application process. This will include capacity analysis to ensure that there is

a balance between the provision to cross Burnham Road safely whilst maintaining the function of the B1012 as an important traffic route.

5) The important thing is enabling the safe crossing of Burnham Road by pedestrians and cyclists. The signal timings of formal crossings can be controlled to give priority to one approach, be that to road traffic or pedestrians. The principle of providing a number of controlled crossing points has been established through the Local Plan evidence and discussed at the Examination, the detail, however, will be agreed through the Masterplan and Planning application processes.

6) Supporting information will be required as part of the planning application for the site.

7) The details, location and number of crossings will be agreed as part of the Masterplan and subsequent planning application process. This will include capacity analysis to ensure that there is a balance between the provision to cross Burnham Road safely whilst maintaining the function of the B1012 as an important traffic route.

8) The improvements to the strategic highway network include capacity improvements to the A132 between South Woodham Ferrers and Rettendon Turnpike.

Local mitigation will be considered as part of the full Transport Assessment which will be required as part of the planning application for the site.

9) Traffic modelling has shown that it is the capacity of the junctions rather than the road between them which causes congestion. The County Council is preparing a 'A132 Corridor Study' which will focus on improvements which will be required to improve the flow of traffic, including both highway mitigation and sustainable transport measures.

10) The detailed modelling of the junctions and crossings will be undertaken by the developer and reviewed by the highway authority, as part of future planning applications. As such is the documents will be on Chelmsford City Council's website as part of the planning application supporting information.

11) The Local Plan Inspector has confirmed that robust traffic modelling has been carried out for the purposes of the Local Plan. A full Transport Assessment will be required as part of the planning application for the site.

12) Sustainable transport measures are also envisaged including improved pedestrian/cycle links to the rail station, improved bus services including a potential direct service to Wickford Railway Station, and a period of free bus travel for new residents.

13) Statements of Common Ground are a matter of agreement between the parties concerned and are not for public consultation. The Local Plan examination closed on the 25 February 2020 with the issuing of the Inspector's Final Report.

14) The Local Plan policy maps do not show crossings for any sites as their precise location will be agreed through the Masterplan process and subsequent planning applications.

15) The question of a new road to the north of proposed development at South Woodham Ferrers was addressed through the Local Plan preparation and examination process. At that time, it was considered that the harm of providing a new road to the north of development on the wildlife site, biodiversity and landscape, would be unlikely to outweigh the benefits to traffic flows on other roads. Any alternative road would also need junction improvements where it joins existing roads, and crossings linking into countryside.

16) The design of roads and their capacity and how this sits within the development will all be considered through the Masterplan process and subsequent planning applications.

17) An appropriate mitigation strategy will be considered as part of the full Transport Assessment which will be required as part of the planning application for the site.

11. Mrs R Richards – Housing in Maldon Road

Please could the committee consider extremely carefully at their meeting on 26.5 2020 the following concerns regarding the proposed housing along Malden Road Great Baddow

With so many new houses planned where is the planning for

Schools

Doctors surgery

Roads - Malden Road in normal times is already very heavily congested and with further housing AND the possibility of up to 700 extra lorries each day using the road for the reconstruction of Bradwell Power Station the road will be totally over run with heavy traffic.

Mental health - further stress will be caused for families because of road congestion, schooling issues and surgeries if these are not thoroughly considered AND the removal of some of the lovely country public footpaths that are so important for pleasant outside space and walking and everyones mental health.

Finally the lack of trust in politicians. The leaflet I have received on this says that the liberal democrats were against this when they were in opposition -hence they got my vote - now in power they are for it. Can we ever have trust in councillors and politicians?

Please consider these issues which are of great concern to me.

CCC Response:

The Inspector considered all these issues as part of the Local Plan Examination and concluded that the sites in this location were justified and sound. Their impact on the Highway network was acceptable, and sufficient new infrastructure and financial contributions towards existing are required in the site policies to support the new homes in this location, including education, medical provision and road improvements.

As part of this location a new Country Park is included, providing greater and improved access to the countryside for all.

12. Diana Angel – Housing in Maldon Road and Molrams Lane

I have recently received a notification from Great Baddow East Neighbourhood Association about the proposed 500 new houses to be built along Maldon Road and Molrams Lane.

As a local resident, I wish to voice my opinion that:-

1. There is already too much transport trying to use the A12, A414 and A130 in and out of Chelmsford through Great Baddow
2. Even when the Army and Navy junction is revised, there will still be problems accessing and leaving the town centre
3. The amenities in Great Baddow will have difficulty accommodating all these extra residents, doctors surgeries and local shops, especially the chemists.
4. The street parking will be increased
5. The safety of the children going to Sandon Secondary school may also be affected

I am very much against any further development around this area of Great Baddow

CCC Response:

The Inspector considered all these issues as part of the Local Plan Examination and concluded that the sites in this location have the policies to secure necessary highways and community infrastructure to mitigate the impact of the development and as such the proposals are justified and sound.

Further public consultation on masterplans for the sites are planned for later in the year ahead of more public consultation on future planning applications.

13. Chris Davidson - Housing in Maldon Road and Molrams Lane

With reference to the meeting to be held on 27th May 2020 relating to the proposed building of houses in Maldon road and Molrams Lane I have listed my concerns.

1. Schools. There will be a need for additional schools so when and where will they be built.
2. Doctor surgeries. Surgeries are at maximum capacity in Gt. Baddow so how does the council propose to address this shortfall.
3. Hospitals. Has Broomfield hospital the necessary capacity to accommodate this increase in possible patients.
4. Road Traffic congestion. What are the council plans to control the increase in Maldon road, Molrams lane and Gt. Baddow.

I would be grateful for your comments.

CCC Response:

Refer to response to Question 12.

14. Heather Cass – Development in Maldon Road, Great Baddow

With regard to the aforementioned proposed development, before permission is granted will the following be addressed to a satisfactory conclusion to the local residents :-

- 1) Where will the construction and residential traffic enter and exit the sites (Maldon Road is a very busy road and cannot take any more traffic it is only single lane). It also has to carry all of the traffic from Maldon, Danbury and surrounding areas to Chelmsford. Maldon is also in the process of a massive housing development, I am sure many of the residence will travel to Chelmsford. I doubt if the Park and Ride can facilitate all the extra cars. Molrams Lane also has to take all the Coaches, cars and school children to Sandon School.
- 2) To date no decision has been made on the Army and Navy flyover/roundabout or the bus lane, until such time when life returns to normal after Covid 19 do we really need more traffic on the Baddow Bypass and the Army and Navy junction in the future which this development will entail.
- 3) Doctors : The Gt Baddow Surgery is probably full to capacity as it is never easy to get an appointment (this was prior to Covid 19)
- 4) Education, have the local primary schools and secondary schools enough capacity to take in extra children.
- 5) Loss of more Countryside, I have lived off of the Maldon Road for the past 50 years, at one time there were playing fields in my back garden, I could look out of my bedroom window and see open countryside, now there are houses. At the moment I can take a walk down Baddow Hall Crescent onto the Maldon Road and see the countryside across to Chelmsford, in future that will be houses, you then walk into Molrams Lane, fields and countryside to your left at the moment, the future once again houses. Where are Englands green and pleasant lands.

Before granting planning permission for this development, please consider these points and remember Great Baddow is a village not an extension of Chelmsford and as such does not need a 250 house development off of the Maldon Road, and a further 250 on Molrams Lane.

CCC Response:

The adoption of the Local Plan does not grant planning permission, it establishes the principle for future development.

1. An appropriate mitigation strategy will be considered as part of the full Transport Assessment

which will be required as part of the planning application for the site. The Inspector considered the impact on the Highway network was acceptable as part of the Local Plan Examination and concluded that the sites in this location were justified and sound.

2. The City Council is working with Essex County Council who are responsible for the Army and Navy junction. The County Council has consulted on options for the Army and Navy and the City Council will continue to actively engage in this process to help shape the proposals.

3. The site is required to provide financial contributions to healthcare provision and CCC continue to work with the NHS/CCG to determine the precise additional service provision.

4. The site is required to provide financial contributions to provide additional school places. Essex County Council as Education Authority are content that the growth from these sites can be accommodated within existing schools, or by extensions or alterations to existing schools.

5. The sites are required to provide open space in accordance with the standards set out within the Local Plan. In addition, a new Country Park is also included at this location, providing greater and improved access to the countryside for all. The new housing within the Local Plan is meeting housing need across Chelmsford's administrative area.

15. Jennifer Price – Development in Maldon Road, Great Baddow

I would like to know when or if building will commence and at what stage is the planning. In addition I want to raise an objection to this whole development and so want to know how I can veto. Your help in this matter would be appreciated.

CCC Response:

The timeframe for development is set out in Appendix C Development Trajectories of the Local Plan which is updated annually. This development is currently projected to be built between 2021 and 2030. The site has been found sound by the Local Plan Inspector so the principle of the proposal is not up for debate anymore.

The Local Plan has been found sound by the Local Plan Inspector meaning the proposals are justified and sound. There will be opportunity to comment on the masterplan and future planning applications for the sites.

16. Roger Jones – Proposed Development on Manor Farm Shop

Please see below a list of my questions regarding the proposed development :

1 - Will a new Doctors be built to accommodate the new people.

2 - From experience i know that there are no school places within the local area, Hylands has space but is all the way out in Writtle how will children get there.

3 - Another 300 to 400 cars on Chelmsfords very busy roads

I do not object to progress and new developments but we must have the infrastructure in place before we commit to more housing / people within the area.

CCC Response:

Refer to response to Question 14.

17. Michelle Raymond – Proposed Development in Area of Manor Farm and Maldon Road

I am writing to voice my objection to the plans to build 500 houses in the area of Manor Farm and Maldon Road. The route into Chelmsford from this area is already heavily congested, the local secondary school is heavily over subscribed and during normal times it is very difficult to get to get an appointment at the doctor's surgery. What will be put in place to sort out these problems?

CCC Response:

Refer to response to Question 14.

18. Cheryl Mullender – Development in Great Baddow

In the Chelmsford Local Plan will there be a new doctor's surgery included? As Baddow Village Surgery is already full to capacity and can not take on in excess of 500 new patients!

Are there any plans to build a new Dentist? As Baddow Dental Practice would not have the capacity to take on another 500 or more patients!

In the Chelmsford Local Plan are there any plans to build a new Primary school? Both Baddow Hall school and Meadgate Primary school would not have the capacity to take another few hundred children!

CCC Response:

Refer to response to Question 14.

19. Philip Gee – Development in Great Baddow

As a resident of Great Baddow, for the majority of my life - I completely object to all the new houses being built behind manor farm shop.

The infrastructure to support the newly proposed estate simply would not work. The existing services, doctors, schools, nurseries, public transportation is woefully inadequate for the existing community as it is, with many already full!

The already heavily congested roads will be even busier (it's bad enough as it is)

As well as creating even more pollution within the area with all the added cars that will be expected.

I've also read up that the area is subject to flooding, surely that would further the problem elsewhere after they lay all their concrete?

Apart from this, the construction traffic on the already busy road will be atrocious for the tax payers in the community and who live near manor farm, attending Sandon school or simply passing through.

I hope you all heed the words of the people of this beautiful village who do not want it to become a overcrowded town.

CCC Response:

The Inspector considered all these issues as part of the Local Plan Examination and concluded that the sites in this location have the policies to ensure an acceptable environmental impact, secure necessary highways and community infrastructure to mitigate the impact of the development and as such the proposals are justified and sound.

[20. Tim Farrow – Development Area 5a Great Leighs](#)

In the original version of the plan it was recognised that there are a number of grade 2 listed building in the defined area. In the wording of the plan it was recorded that the intention of the council was to 'protect' these historic buildings. This wording has since been changed with the somewhat nebulous phrase 'the settings of which be enhanced where possible'. The term 'where possible' may suggest this may not happen if the developer does not wish it. This change has been applied to all of the properties other than that of Moulsham Hall' which is, of course, owned by the landowner/developer. When I enquired of the planning department why the change was made I was told that they had been advised by Historic England. It seems very unlikely to me that Historic England would offer this advice unless requested to by the planning department. My question is why; and what collusion has there has been between the landowner/developer and the planning department to warrant this downgrading. May I suggest that the original wording is re-instated and that the properties are treated on an honest and equal basis as originally intended.

CCC Response:

Modifications to the wording have followed advice directly from Historic England and the Inspector is satisfied with the proposed modifications. The Council cannot amend the Inspector's modifications.

21. Karen Sansom – Manor Farm Site Development

I live in Baden Powell Close opposite the farm shop and moved here to be on the outskirts of town, near green fields and away from the traffic and noise in the city centre.

I was unaware until today of the plans for 500 houses and business park in this area and it has come as a bit of a shock. We already have multiple sites for houses and several business parks already.

These developments will bring traffic noise and takeaway the lovely green areas that there are so few of around Chelmsford now. I use the park and ride at normal times and this is used to full capacity most days. Another 1000 cars on average trying to use that or get into town will be a nightmare especially since the fly over has been removed.

Any why have the liberal democrats changed their opposition to these proposals. All the residents who voted for you did not vote for this I am sure.

I sincerely hope this does not go ahead.

Thank you.-listen to the residents who live in the area which I assume you do not so it will not affect you.

CCC Response:

The Local plan has been found sound by the Inspector so the principle of the site allocation at East Chelmsford has been justified and tested independently. There will be opportunity to comment on the masterplan and future planning applications for the sites.

22. CERA Committee – Avon Road Bus Gate

On behalf of residents of Chignal Estate.

With regards to the bus gate on Avon Road, and further to MP Vicky Ford's written correspondence dated 16.01.2020, what new investigations have been carried out on the suitability of the A1060 following the recent upgrade works, as any surveys carried out prior to the upgrade are now out of date, nor relevant to current traffic conditions on the road?

CCC Response:

The traffic modelling that supported the Local Plan was considered robust by the Planning Inspector. A further Transport Assessment will need to be submitted with any future planning application.

23. David Pallash – Ecological Impact of Development

I would like to submit a few reflections and questions on the local plan 2013-2036 which is subject of an Extraordinary Meeting of the Council May 27, 2020.

I have been disheartened to hear that plans to destroy more countryside in the name of development and profit is progressing forward. As a resident of Baden Powell Close, directly opposite the proposed site, I naturally worry greatly about the impact the 250 new houses will have on local infrastructure and access. However, on this occasion, I write representing the voiceless - the wildlife and natural beauty that this is going to destroy.

I have been recording wildlife as a hobby and for local records for the last four years on the proposed site. I have observed 97 species of bird, 13 species of mammal, 2 species of reptile, and nearly 15 species of butterfly. <https://wildlifewander.blog/local-records/> This is a phenomenal amount of wildlife for such a small part of the countryside. It should be protected.

With the UK now one of the most depleted nature countries in the world (189th out of 218 countries) and many of our breeding farmland species in trouble (corn bunting, yellow wagtails, lapwings etc.), surely taking this land away at a time of crisis, when there are other brownfield sites available, is a huge error of judgement. https://www.rspb.org.uk/our-work/state-of-nature-report/?utm_source=adgoal_eu&utm_medium=affiliate&utm_campaign=rspb-uk-affiliate&mediacode=T15AFF0018
(<https://www.theguardian.com/environment/gallery/2019/jan/31/the-uks-nature-in-crisis-in-pictures>)

In summer months, the land in question is nesting grounds for at least 4 red listed bird species. These are yellow wagtail, linnet, yellowhammer, house sparrow and skylark. Throughout the year, the area sees at least 18 red listed birds call the area home.
(<https://www.rspb.org.uk/globalassets/downloads/documents/birds-and-wildlife/birds-of-conservation-concern-4--the-population-status-of-birds-in-the-united-kingdom-channel-islands-and-the-isle-of-man.pdf>)

There are also now records of water voles in the tributary canals on the site, the first in the area (Essex Wildlife Trust) - a species that has also neared extinction in recent years and needs all the help it can get. <https://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/home-news/water-voles-mole-rodent-habitat-loss-water-pollution-extinction-animal-cruelty-wind-in-the-willows-a8227961.html>

I understand that there are plans to create a country park on the surrounding area. Whilst I welcome any signal that land will be conserved, a country park usually favours what the public would prefer the countryside to be (sculptured, low biodiversity) versus what nature actually needs to thrive. This concerns me greatly and is clearly a thinly veiled attempt to hide a “negative” with what might be perceived as a “positive”.

Thank you for taking the time to read through this. I hope that some, if not all, of these reflections serve to open a few eyes and minds to what is actually at stake here.

My questions based on the above are as follows:

- Which independent ecology bodies (not environmental consultants) are involved and have been consulted during the planning?
- How would you like us to answer future generations that ask why their local wildlife and biodiversity has disappeared?
- How can you justify the destruction of land where important populations of red-listed wildlife breed and winter?
- What plans are in place to ensure minimum biodiversity loss to surrounding areas during building phase?
- What plans are in place to ensure biodiversity and wild habitat over aesthetics in country park development?

Thank you for your time. I look forward to hearing responses and reflections and strongly hope that these plans are reconsidered.

CCC Response:

The Council undertook a Local Wildlife Study prepared independent specialists Essex Ecology Services who are the commercial arm of the Essex Wildlife Trust and this formed part of the Local Plan evidence base. A Habitats Regulations Assessment was also undertaken which the Local Plan Inspector considered fulfilled the requirement to undertake an 'Appropriate Assessment'

In addition, further ecology surveys will be undertaken at masterplanning and Planning Application stages. Local Plan policies (including site policies where relevant) require the protection of species/sites or to appropriately mitigate any harm.

Detail of the protection/mitigation measures, including those for the country park will be considered and appropriately conditioned as part of the future Planning Applications for the sites.

Strategic Policy S4 and S9 set out the requirements for new development to provide a net gain in biodiversity.

24. Chelmsford Labour Party – Various Matters Relating to Local Plan

Below are a number of questions raised by Chelmsford Labour Party members, as well as members of the public regarding the proposed local plan put forward by Chelmsford Council.

1. Will there be any conditions to what sort of development is going ahead? The building of luxury properties will not help solve the housing crisis, will more truly affordable three and two bedroom houses be prioritised in Chelmsford?
2. What definition will the council be using for affordable housing?

3. What are the plans for ensuring suitable quantities of social housing will be built as part of the developments? Chelmsford drastically needs to tackle it's housing crisis and that includes a need for social housing.
4. How will it be ensured that the infrastructure needed for this massive development is put in place and that there is no back slide on the infrastructure that is desperately needed to support this development?
5. What steps will be taken by the council to ensure that there is sufficient public transport to meet the needs of the growing population?
6. Given that the police HQ site has been touted as a potential building opportunity and rejected because of the difficulties of achieving the infrastructure and environmental requirements, what will be done to ensure that these necessary requirements are met?
7. In order to fit in with the in environmental requirements of the Plan would the council consider that any new development's should have a electric car charging point installed for that road?
8. If you look at maps of big towns and small cities, Chelmsford has fewer green spots than most within the urban area. This plan proposes to build over four of the few green bits that we have left. These spaces are important lungs for communities and must not be further diminished, what will be done to protect the green spaces in our cities?
9. What evidence do the council have that the level of growth suggested from this building activity will be required in Chelmsford?
10. Most of this plan was drawn up before the COVID19 pandemic, will the council consider postponing the decision on the local plan till after the pandemic, to see if the plan is still fit for a post COVID landscape?

CCC Response:

The answers to these questions can be found within the Local Plan, which has been found sound by an Independent Inspector.

- 1) Yes. The mix of dwelling sizes and types is addressed in Policy DM1, which proposes a mix unclouding 28% 2-bedroom, and 46.3% 3-bedroom houses.
- 2) To secure affordable housing through the planning system the only definition of affordable housing that can used is that set out in Annex 2 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 3) The Local Plan sets out a requirement for development of 11 or more units to provide 35% affordable housing. The emerging Planning Obligations SPD sets out a 70/30 split between rented and shared ownership products. A number of recommendations an initiatives from the Council's Affordable Housing Working Group is seeking to increase the number of social rented affordable housing coming forward.
- 4) and 5) Provision of infrastructure, including public transport, is addressed in detail in the Local Plan, both strategically across the whole Chelmsford area and specifically for each allocated site. This will be planned in during the Masterplanning process, and will be secured through legal

agreements when planning permission is granted.

6) The Police HQ site was removed from the Local Plan due to it no longer being available for complete redevelopment, and not for the reasons stated. The main items of infrastructure needed would have been generated by the proposed development, so with its removal they are no longer needed, e.g. traffic, education.

7) There is a requirement for all new dwellings to provide convenient access to car charging points at a rate of 1 for each dwelling with off-road parking, and 1 for each 10 spaces where parking is not allocated.

8) The Inspector concluded that the site allocations were justified and sound. Open spaces and the Green Wedges identified on the Policies Map are protected by policies in the Local Plan.

9) The Council's evidence base includes an Objective Assessment of Housing Need. The Inspector concludes that the level of growth is based on sound evidence.

10) The Government see the development industry to be one of the key drivers of the economic recovery. The impacts of any changes to work patterns following Covid 19, as with any other changes which occur over time, will be considered as part of the review of the Local Plan.

25. Angela Stockwell – Housing Development in Great Baddow

How do you expect residents like myself to put up with extra traffic with the proposed development of up to 250 new houses on the manor farm site?

We are tired of the fumes from stationary traffic outside our homes along the Baddow road and a 5 minute traffic journey taking 40 minutes in rush hour.

Chelmsford has not increased the infrastructure to meet the housing growth and we are all really tired of sitting in traffic due to the sheer weight trying to move around the centre.

Why has nothing been done any earlier? The station at Beaulieu is still to be built and roads are at a standstill. Please can this additional housing be reduced or moved further up towards Colchester?

CCC Response:

Refer to response to Question 14.

26. Robert Page – Manor Farm Site, Maldon Road

In view of the likely changes in working patterns following the current Corona Virus situation, there is likely to be a substantial drop in demand for housing in the London commuter area as more people work remotely and can therefore choose to live anywhere in the country. What effect will this have on the council's plans? Shouldn't the Council put an embargo on all new developments for a few years until new employment and commuting patterns are established and future demand better understood?

Prior to the current situation the road system accessing Chelmsford from the east was clearly inadequate and there are already developments happening in Maldon and other locations that will exacerbate this situation. Additionally the local GP service is already overstretched.

Can the council describe what actions it will be taking to ensure these issues are resolved before any permission is granted for further developments to the east of Chelmsford?

CCC Response:

It is important to note that the need to build at least 805 new homes a year does not disappear if the Local Plan is not adopted. Putting the Local Plan on hold would mean Chelmsford would be open to speculative unplanned development in potentially less sustainable locations and reduce opportunities to secure new infrastructure.

The impact of any changes to work patterns following Covid 19, as with any other changes which occur over time, will be considered as part of the review of the Local Plan.

Also refer to response to Question 14.

27. Maria Luther – Manor Farm Site, Maldon Road

I would like the following points to be taken into consideration at the meeting on 27th May 2020 regarding the 'Local Plan' for housing development on the Manor Farm site along Maldon Road, Great Baddow.

- As a resident on Maldon Road myself and my family regularly enjoy the public pathways of this area along with many others in the community who use this picturesque area for dog walking, jogging and bike rides. It is home to an abundance of wildlife including pheasants, birds, rabbits and a multitude of insects.
- The new development would have a significant increased impact on the currently very busy traffic along Maldon Road making travelling/commuting more difficult for the local community.
- Residents along the Maldon Road enjoy the scenic aspect which would be destroyed by the new development.

CCC Response:

The Local Plan has been found sound by the Inspector so the principle of the East Chelmsford site has been justified and tested independently. There will be opportunity to comment on the masterplan and future planning applications for the sites.

28. Ian Hutchinson – Infrastructure Requirements

Full consideration of future housing plans, and any decisions re. future additional housing, should only follow improvements in infrastructure particularly road improvements; completion of a long-term improvement to the Army & Navy Roundabout; improvements to public transport and the Park and Ride schemes; more capacity for GP appointments and more places available in schools.

Also local shopping accessibility needs to be considered and developed.

CCC Response:

Refer to response to Question 14.

29. Heike and Keith Plaister – Development at Manor Farm, Great Baddow

While recognising that the country needs more housing, and that it is the responsibility of local authorities to facilitate this requirement, we would like to register our objection to the present plan for the development of Manor Farm, Gt Baddow, on the following grounds:

1. Living, as we do, in Maldon Rd, opposite the proposed site, and on a busy polluting street, there is a need to protect the area as a green "wedge" to provide for cleaner air and a healthy environment.
2. The busy Maldon Rd (which was part of the A414 before it was supposedly re-routed) is now still considered by many motorists to be part of the A road rather than the B1060. Access, therefore, on to this road from Molram's Lane, Baddow Hall Crescent, Baden Powell Close and from driveways from houses in Maldon Rd itself, is very difficult at the best of times, but particularly at rush-hours. The use of this road by further traffic from any new housing (not to mention the proposed new industrial site) would only intensify the problem.
3. Development of this site would mean added pressure on the traffic on the already over-loaded Army and Navy roundabout.
4. There seems to be no provision in the plan for necessary facilities, such as surgery, schooling, a pharmacy and essential retail outlets.

5. The site's development will harm the ecological balance in the area at a time when the green agenda should be uppermost in policy-making.

Two further points need to be made:

a) In view of the economic recession facing this country, what likelihood is there of finding developers when banks are highly unlikely to finance them with loans in a time of practically zero interest rates?

b) If the development is to go ahead, what percentage will be allocated for much needed social housing?

CCC Response:

1 to 5 Refer to response to Question 14.

In response to the final two points:

a) The sites all have developers promoting them and are considered deliverable.

b) Policy requirements in the Local Plan require 35% affordable housing on site of 11 or more homes.

30. Dave Vicary – Army and Navy Roundabout

There is no mention in the Committee report of the closure of the Army and Navy flyover. Therefore it would appear the Council is relying on the traffic modelling in place when the Local Plan was examined and found sound by the Inspector. The closure of the Army and Navy flyover resulted in a variety of noticeable different traffic patterns and much more traffic in many parts of the city centre and outlying areas such as Springfield and Broomfield.

There has been a major change in the City's road infrastructure and there is no firm proposal to remodel the junction. In the absence of revised traffic modelling and Sustainability Appraisal, to consider the Plan has been properly assessed for soundness because of the major impact that the closure of the flyover has had on the town and the current lack of any firm proposal to provide an alternative.

CCC Response:

The City Council is working with Essex County Council who are responsible for the Army and Navy junction. The County Council has consulted on options for the Army and Navy and the City Council will continue to actively engage in this process to help shape the proposals.

Major development proposals will need to undertake further Transport Assessments as part of any planning applications.

31. Geoff Pickford – Development at Manor Farm

Bearing in mind that this development borders a flood plain zone, which in turn impacts on the flooding of areas adjacent to the Blackwater and Chelmer, what independent Environmental and Ecological Studies have been commissioned to study what effect this proposed development will have on the environment?

I'm concerned that with this proposed development, maybe as much as 70% of the area will be covered with concrete, be it from foundations of homes, road and access ways, and parking areas, which will exacerbate the problem as the run off of water during heavy rain periods will need somewhere to go as it will not be absorbed into the ground and gravity dictates it will flow downhill to the blackwater and Chelmer basin.

CCC Response:

Refer to response to Question 23.

32. Geoff Pickford – Development at Manor Farm

During your Election campaign the LibDems condemned the actions of the Conservative majority council of agreeing development before ensuring that the necessary infrastructure: Schools, Roads, Healthcare, public affordable transportation, was in place BEFORE such developments were proceeded with. You indicated that this would not be the case if the Libdems became in charge of the administration.

These are two quotes taken directly from your own literature:

“New development should be close to transport links and be built with better local facilities and services”

“The previous Conservative administration choked Chelmsford. They put developers before local residents”

In view of this, can you confirm that you will honour your pre-election pledges and make sure that the infrastructure will be in place, before any adoption of this plan is agreed?

If not why are you reneging on the promises you made to the electorate?

CCC Response:

Refer to responses made by elected Members, a link to the recording is available on the Council's website.

33. Geoff Pickford – Development at Manor Farm

Any proposed development plans will be drawn up with the developers interests coming first.

I would suspect the developer will try to shoe-horn as many properties as legally possible onto the development. Careful vetting of any such plans should be seen with a view to the future, ensuring roads are wide enough to allow emergency vehicles easy access, sufficient off-road parking is available for at least 2-3 vehicles per household, and to factor in the intention (as I understand it) to ban any vehicles from bumping the pavement to park (because it's common practice on existing roads to allow access for emergency and other large vehicles).

Additionally, has any thought been given to the effect construction traffic will have on the roads and the quality of life of the community, citizens, council taxpayers and the electorate?

Essex Highways and Ringway Jacobs are ineffective in maintaining the existing road infrastructure, so the developer must be held liable to make good and provide a remedy for any damage to roads, accesses etc that their construction traffic may cause.

Will you ensure that, as you promised when elected to power, that you will put residents first when coming to make any decision on the Manor Farm Development?

CCC Response:

The Local Plan sets out the numbers of homes for each site and the internal space, open space and parking standards required to be met within a development.
Construction traffic and its routes and operations will be considered as part of the full Transport Assessment which will be required to be submitted as part of future planning applications for the sites.

34. Geoff Pickford – Development at Manor Farm

It seems the proposal to adopt the development of Manor Farm appears out of sync with the Liberal Democrats article headed:

“DON'T CHOKE CHELMSFORD”

To quote Stephen Robinson:

“Young people and families need genuinely affordable homes, but **many of these are in the wrong places, scattered around, and without the right infrastructure**. Local services are already under strain; roads are [at 96% capacity](#); and it will just get worse”

What exactly are the demographics of the Young People and Families? Are they local to the area, or just anyone who fancies living in Chelmsford?

What is definition of affordable homes? Below market value? If so, who funds the difference? Will they just be taken up by Housing Associations?

A developer is only obligated to provide so many “affordable” homes, a percentage of the total build, around 30%, will this be the case?

“Local services are already under strain; roads are [at 96% capacity](#); and it will just get worse”. This is the Leader of the Liberal Democrats’ own admission.

So, given 550 homes, at least one member of the household will be employed, and their only method will be to use a car to get to work, so that will put up to an additional 300 extra vehicles on the local roads during the “rush hour”, roads that already suffer from excessive congestion.

So in adopting this development, how is it justified given Stephen Robinson’s stated concern at putting an additional load of services and roads are unacceptable?

CCC Response:

Refer to response to Question 14.

The housing requirements within the Local Plan are based on the Objectively Assessed Housing Need Report which assesses the role of natural population change and migration and has been found by the Local Plan Inspector to be robust evidence.

Affordable housing secured through the planning system, is defined in Annex 2 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). This includes affordable rent, social rent, shared ownership and discounted market sales.

The Local Plan contains a policy that 35% affordable housing is required on sites of 11 or more homes.

35. Caroline Neale – Development in Maldon Road Area

Please take my email as my Statement of Objection to the development plans to the Maldon Road area of East Chelmsford area 3.

As a resident of Baddow Hall Crescent, I have major concerns over the building of approximately 500 new homes in the area.

This will put enormous strain on the already congested local road system. Maldon Road is already extremely busy, especially at peak times. Factoring in the addition of cars from 500 new homes is only going to increase travel times, congestion and pollution. It can currently take 2 or 3 minutes to pull out of Baddow Hall Crescent on the school run, particularly if someone in front is turning right towards the A12, this will surely increase with additional traffic flow coming from the proposed new road layout at Sanford Mill Lane. Build up off traffic on the Baddow Bypass during peak times often means that traffic queues along the Maldon Road as the slip road is congested. With the removal of the flyover at the Army and Navy roundabout, and no replacement decisions in place, traffic from this proposed housing is only going to add to the congestion misery for locals.

I am also concerned the pressure this will place on local schools and doctors surgeries. It's my understanding that the local junior and senior schools in the area are already at capacity. Where

will the children of the new development go to school? The nearest Doctors - Baddow Village Surgery - are no longer taking on new patients, even from the current catchment area, so what surgery will residents of the new development register at?

I am also concerned over the hugely devastating impact this will have on our local wildlife. Over the last couple of months of lockdown, hundreds of local residents have used the fields behind Maldon Road, out towards Chelmer Village and Sanford Mill, as a haven during this time of worry and uncertainty. Like me they would have enjoyed seeing a huge variety of wildlife, including Buzzard, Skylark, Kestrel, Little Egret, Heron, Pheasant, Water Vole, Fox and Rabbit, as well as the many different species of butterflies and insects. I note that there are plans to develop part of the area as a country park, but why do we need a man made park when nature has done a pretty good job in developing a naturally beautiful, diverse area.

CCC Response:

Refer to response to Question 14 and 23.

[36. Jane Young – Proposed Housing Development in Maldon Road](#)

My question to the council is if this development is approved then what are you going to do to improve the road infrastructure in and out of the city centre, in particular Baddow Road? This road is seriously congested now at peak times so I'm not sure how allowing even more people to use the road is going to help. Before anymore developments are approved you need to take a serious look at how to relieve the traffic problems you have at present.

I would also like to know if new GP surgery's, schools etc are going to be built and also how Broomfield Hospital is meant to cope with the ever increasing population?

Although Chelmsford has been given city status it is still a small town with a road infrastructure that can't really be improved on because of the building that has taken place around the city centre.

CCC Response:

Refer to response to Question 14.

37. CERA Committee – Warren Farm Development

Statement:

The main argument put forward for using the cut through on Avon Road as a bus route to the new Warren Farm development, was that a traffic survey carried out, deemed the A1060 unsuitable for additional bus traffic. However, as the A1060 has now received significant upgrade works, further investigations should now be carried out as to whether the upgraded road may now be suitable.

Furthermore, in relation to the siting of the bus gate itself, there are significant safety and practicality concerns over the proposed location of the bus gate, based on a number of factors. Some of these are listed as follows:

1) The Local Plan notes a green/amenity space on Cherwell Drive. This is no longer there as it was developed for housing, meaning the play area the bus gate is being built on is the only formal open play area for the Chignal Residents.

2) Essex Design Guide Section 6.67 states that footpath widths may be reduced below 2m only in exceptional circumstances and for short distances. The proposed bus gate layout has a reduced width for almost 30m, with the entrance at 1.2m wide. Avon Rd park is used extensively by Chignal Estate children and families. Any new route through to Warren Farm is likely to be used as access from the new development to local churches on Melbourne Ave, shops and Lawford Mead School. On top of this, Warren Farm residents are being offered free bicycles with house purchases. Assuming a low estimation that 25% of buyers avail of this, that is a minimum of 200 cyclists using the bus gate every day. As such, the proposed bus gate needs to provide for 5+ buses an hour, pedestrian through traffic, families children and prams and hundreds of cyclists; with a footpath width far narrower than minimum requirements.

Were a bus, as it entered the bus gate from Avon Rd, to encounter any cyclists or pedestrians on the bus gate it could be forced to stop across Avon Rd, potentially blocking the street.

3) The bus gate will require a new bridge construction whose sides will sit on adjacent properties' boundaries. It will also require; a pedestrian crossing mid-way along its length and a ramp for people to access the park and play area; a traffic light system on Avon Rd which, as shown on the current plans, would require significant trees to be felled.

4) The bus route being proposed to serve the Warren Estate through the bus gate, takes a long and convoluted route through Melbourne to Chelmsford City Centre. The existing buses that use the A1060 take a much quicker and direct route to Chelmsford Bus station. It is therefore reasonable to assume that Warren Farm residents are likely to use this route as opposed to the secondary route being proposed through Avon Road.

5) The Chignal Estate is an award-winning residential development. This new proposal essentially turns Trent Road into a trunk road running directly through the heart of the estate. Such a proposal would not be accepted on any new build development with such constraints as present in the vicinity of Avon Road playground.

There is a great deal of concern amongst the residents of the Chignal Estate area regarding the impact of the proposed bus gate on the area - the Chignal Estate Residents Association (CERA) petition voicing such concerns has currently around 800 signatures. Whilst there is regret over the proposed development of Warren Farm, there is also an understanding of the need for housing the Chelmsford area. However, so far, there has been a worrying lack of engagement with the CERA on the feasibility of the bus gate. With our queries, generally up to this point being mainly dismissed out of hand. We urge our local councillors and the planning committee to revisit the current proposal of the bus gate and reconsider alternative solutions that are less disruptive to the local community and environment.

Furthermore, we reiterate our recent requests for representatives of CERA, as one of the primary stakeholders in the new development and bus gate, to be given the opportunity to have a detailed discussion with the members of the council and Warren Farm developers to understand how these concerns will be addressed. We look forward to this at the earliest opportunity.

Question:

Considering the fact that potential buyers on the Warren Farm Development may be offered free bicycles when purchasing a house (as reported in Essex Live News on 31st January 20) and that the park at the bus gate is the only formal play area for the Chignal Estate, are council members happy that a bus gate, who's design falls well short of minimum Essex Highways design standards, can safely cater for buses, families and children using the park, pedestrians using the route as a cut through as well as potentially hundreds of cyclists?

Question:

Considering that no traffic surveys, road safety audits, technical appraisals, feasibility studies or formal investigations have been presented justifying the suitability of the bus gate on Avon Road, why is it being included in the Local Plan and why are Chignal Estate residents being told that the Warren Farm development hinges on this being constructed?

CCC Response:

The Local Plan has been considered sound by the Inspector which included the sustainable transport measures proposed to serve the West Chelmsford site.

The detail of the bus gate and other aspects of the site will and are being considered through the Masterplanning process and future detailed planning applications where further consultation is on-going.

38. Norma Yarham – Infrastructure and Ecological Concerns

I am writing my statement of disapproval to the 'change of mind' of the Liberal Democrats now that they are in power in Chelmsford. One of my reasons for voting for them was that they opposed the adoption of the above-mentioned plan. As a result of this betrayal I most certainly WILL NOT be voting for them in future.

The infrastructure of this area will not support a development of this nature and the traffic system most certainly won't. It can't cope with the current volume of traffic as it is!

The loss of flora and fauna will be devastating. We cannot, and must not, lose valuable areas of wildlife if we are to continue to live on this planet. Have we not learned from the consequences of the past few months?!!

CCC Response:

Refer to responses made by elected Members, a link to the recording is available on the Council's website

39. Great Baddow Parish Council – Development in Great Baddow

Great Baddow Parish Council understands that this meeting concerns consideration of the adoption of the Chelmsford Local Plan as approved by the Inspector. In its response to the public consultation held in 2017, after a public meeting held in April, the Parish Council raised several objections and concerns about the Plan relating to three proposed sites in and bordering Great Baddow. These included: -

- a) The green wedge along the river Chelmer
- b) Lack of provision of local amenities and facilities
- c) The exacerbation of parking problems in the village
- d) Increasing the already existing pressure on local schools and GP practices
- e) Traffic congestion at the new access roads and junctions and the Army and Navy roundabout. (The latter has now become a major problem with an acceptable solution yet to be considered)
- f) There should be a substantial proportion of affordable housing.

In view of the large number of concerns and objections raised, how will Chelmsford City Council ensure that the Parish Council and local residents will be involved in decisions in the next stage of development, should the Local Plan be adopted?

CCC Response:

The Inspector has considered all the representations made to the Local Plan, including that of Great Baddow Parish Council and concluded that the allocations in East Chelmsford are justified and sound.

Further consideration of these sites will be through the Masterplan procedure where all will have the opportunity to contribute to the future development of these sites, particularly the Parish Council as an important stakeholder in the formulation of the masterplan.

40. Pete Dixon – Building on Open Space and Recreational Land

The National Planning Policy Framework as it stood at the time of the consultation, stated in paragraph 74 that “existing open space, sport and recreational buildings and land should not be built on.” How did the council manage to persuade the inspector to ignore this undeniable fact when pushing through a plan that clearly deprives a large urban population of many of their few remaining open spaces? During the consultation, we were instructed to base our objections upon this guidance so if a new guidance has been used, the council must reopen the consultation as this moving of the goalposts is illegal and unethical.

CCC Response:

Agricultural land would not normally be considered public open space in the context of paragraph 74 of the NPPF. The development of a very small proportion of less productive agricultural land in Chelmsford will provide significant additional public open space with two new country parks, playing pitches, play areas and local open space.

With the removal of the John Shennan and Police HQ sites, these open spaces that were to be lost are now to be retained and protected. Significant areas of open space are to be retained as part of the former St Peter’s College site and financial contributions to improve/provide playing pitches off-site. This strategy has been formulated with the agreement of Sport England.

41. Jane Clark – Development in Great Baddow

As a resident of Great Baddow, on the Sandon side, I am greatly concerned about the proposed building of over 500 houses in this proximity. This will greatly impact on the infrastructure of the area which at present struggles to get into Chelmsford. A five minute journey currently takes over 20 minutes which also raises pollution to local properties but with these extra properties it will lead to an increase in vehicles, easily over 1000, thus exacerbating both pollution and travel times. This is greenfield which gives the area a more rural feel, it keeps the villages separate. How long will it be before there are no more villages? Before we are one continuous place with no variation, no green areas to go to. There will definitely be an impact on wildlife with the loss of so much vegetation. Local schools are full and so this could impact majorly on the opportunities for children to be educated locally, again adding to pollution and traffic. I moved to this area over 20 years ago

and have seen development in smaller areas but building over such a large area horrifies me with the loss of so much green land. Please rethink this and stop Chelmsford becoming a concrete City where pollution increases, Greenland diminishes and stress and depression prevail.

CCC Response:

Refer to response to Question 14.

42. Mr and Mrs Farage – Implications for Traffic of Great Baddow Development

Our 2 questions are regarding the Great Baddow/Sandon proposed development areas. Recently large amounts of money were spent justifying the proposed very unpopular Baddowgate scheme, to restrict travel through Baddow road, in addition to the cost of the Sandon Park and Ride, both focused on heavy traffic coming into Chelmsford at peak times. This clearly indicates that the Council had identified traffic as an issue on this side of Chelmsford. With the Army and Navy roundabout still not resolved, how do the council feel that adding 2 new large developments would not exacerbate the traffic issues on this side of Chelmsford? Local residents currently queue every day to get into Chelmsford at peak times and the Liberal councillors had already identified this as causing pollution concerns. This area cannot take more traffic.

The village surgery at Great Baddow has been unable to take any new patients, except babies born to existing patients families, if housing is developed in this area there will be insufficient services to meet their medical needs. Will any developments that stretch local services have new surgeries available before people move in? If not how far will these people have to travel?

CCC Response:

Refer to response to Question 14.

43. Mrs S Tredgett – Development in Great Baddow

I have lived in Great Baddow for nearly 20 years. When I came to this area, Chelmsford was a small market town and had the advantages of the surrounding green countryside and good transport links. These have already been steadily eroded by the numerous housing and business developments which have been built since I have lived here. There is increasing pressure on our existing, already inadequate, infrastructure.

Now it is proposed to build up to 500 new houses and a business park on unspoiled country land, which is part of the heritage of the area. A new housing estate is likely to be unsightly and take away more of the character and beauty of our local environment.

Moreover, at normal times, ie not during this pandemic, it is nigh on impossible to travel into Chelmsford by car due to traffic congestion. It is increasingly challenging to cross the Army and Navy roundabout from any direction. The bypass has huge queues at rush hour and it is faster to walk than attempt to drive down Baddow road. The train station is overwhelmed by passengers and there is no sign yet of a second station.

Attempts to go round Chelmsford via the A12 are often frustrated by the frequent accidents leading to numerous traffic jams.

Some people may be able to use the Park and Ride service at Sandon, but this will not cater for everyone.

I realise that people need new homes due to the housing shortage but, in my view, the proposed site will just add to the problems we already have in Chelmsford of overcrowding and inadequate resources to support such a large population.

For these reasons, I am opposed to the proposed development and would ask for my views to be taken into consideration as a local resident who will be directly affected if the plan is approved.

CCC Response:

Refer to response to Question 14.

44. Katie Hanover – Development in Great Baddow

I refer you to SOGC 18b, Chelmsford Local Plan Statement of Common Ground with Hopkins Homes - Strategic Growth Site 3a, November 2018, Appendix 3.

I currently live on Maldon Road, opposite the site you and Hopkins Homes are proposing as a potential development site for housing and for a country park. I refer in particular to Site 3a. This site on the plan is showing as being developed across what is currently a huge and very active flood plain. I have lived in this area all of my life and the area you have recommended for housing and a country park floods every year, without fail. It does not just flood a little but hugely, with extensive and very deep flooding in the Sandford Mill area. The river here rises by at least 8-10 feet in deep flood and the area is completely impassable.

I do not understand how you can propose to build houses on this area? How is this physically possible? Not only the construction proposals for properties are ludicrous but to then have the developer propose to build a 'country park' once the first developed property is occupied....this will probably mean that the country park will not be developed as they will realise they cannot develop a flood plain...which of course they will already know at the point of starting the development.

I attach for your reference a photograph of the recent flooding, taken from my house on Maldon road – this the exact area in which you propose to build houses and a country park! With the high levels of flooding over the winter of 2019/2020, as every year and an increase in these so called '100 year' events how do you plan to mitigate the flooding of the proposed houses and country park.



How has it become policy to blatantly build on floodplains?

It is stated in bold underline below that there are no constraints to developing the site and that it is suitable? Can you please explain what you plan to do with the river Chelmer that has been there for all of eternity?

The Chelmsford Pre-Submission Local Plan is supported by modelling which tests traffic (EB 026, EB 027, EB 029, EB 031, EB 032 and EB 033), flood and water cycle impacts (EB 106A-I and EB 107B). **These demonstrate that there are no over-riding issues and constraints to the development site.**

All parties agree that the East Chelmsford Strategic Growth Site allocations 3a, 3b, 3c and 3d are deliverable within the plan period, in a **suitable location for development and are viable.** There are no over-riding issues and constraints to bringing forward these development sites in accordance with the Chelmsford Local Plan.

This is laughable!

Properties in the new Beaulieu park development have frequently flooded over this winter with gardens standing with a foot deep of surface water! This is due to building on flood plains where the water table is naturally high and of course in times of flooding will be breached!

Apart from the above there is also a total lack of plans to address the infrastructure required to support such a development. The local schools are over subscribed, and have been forced to squeeze in extra classes to the detriment of the schools. The local doctors surgeries are over subscribed and no longer taking new patients. The park and ride is at maximum capacity with people queuing from 730am onwards. The roads are gridlocked and are even more so since the removal of the Army and Navy Flyover – this is not going to be replaced in any time for this development.

There are innumerable reasons NOT to build in this area, it seems that this is once again a development that cannot be sustained by the lack of infrastructure surrounding it. The City council needs to meet the infrastructure needs of the current residents before allowing further developments such as this to go ahead.

CCC Response:

Refer to response to Question 14

The area of Site 3a to be developed all lies within Flood Zone 1, which is the least susceptible to flooding. Surface water will need to be stored and managed on site through sustainable drainage systems.

The Local Plan is informed by a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment prepared in consultation with the Environment Agency. The Local Plan Inspector considered flood risk as part of the Examination of the Local Plan which has been found sound.

The proposed Country Park will be located in the area that is susceptible to flooding. However, the proposals for the Country Park will be low-key and naturalistic which provide better public access and manage this area for its biodiversity and wildlife.

45. Heidi Herlihy – Development in Great Baddow

In reference to the subject of the chelmsford local plans for housing development on the Manor Farm site along the Maldon road, I have many concerns that this new development will have on and around the area it sits, being:

1. the increase in traffic on an already busy main road,
2. The extra pressure on schools, doctors surgery's ,dentists etc.
- 3 Reducing the already limited amount of green areas for dog walkers to walk safely away from traffic.
4. An increase in pollution to the air.

I am opposed to this development. Please can you raise my concerns at the meeting.

CCC Response:

Refer to response to Question 14.

46. Mary Cordeiro, GBENA – Development in Great Baddow

Statement by GBENA

We wish to register our **objection** to the Local Plan 2013-2036.

We have sought opinions of Baddow residents on the plan as it pertains to Location 3, East Chelmsford, specifically 3a - Manor Farm and 3b - Land North of Maldon Road (employment site) which we see as a related development due to its proximity to 3a.

Residents are extremely disappointed to see that Liberal Democrats who, while in opposition, campaigned for *infrastructure before development*, now wish to adopt a plan which was prepared by the Conservatives. The Liberal Democrats have a [Don't Choke Chelmsford campaign](#), which is still featured on their web site.

The Liberal Democrat Leader of City Council promised that the local plan will deliver infrastructure and genuinely affordable housing. This plan does not deliver on either promise!

Comments below relate to Site 3a, with a few references to Site 3b.

- Infrastructure

“We need **new infrastructure - at the same time as the developments, not after**”

Source: Liberal Democrats [Don't Choke Chelmsford campaign](#)

In Site 3a we note that the plan does not require the building of schools at primary and secondary level, yet we know that all schools are over-subscribed in Baddow East. We note that there is provision for land to be set aside in Site 3b for a stand-alone early years and childcare nursery.

There is likewise no requirement for a medical centre, yet we know that Baddow Village Surgery on Longmead Avenue, the nearest GP surgery, has closed its books to new patients. Beacon Health Group is taking patients and has sites in Danbury and in Moulsham Lodge, but both are quite a distance away from the site.

There is no requirement for a recreation/community centre in Site 3a. There is merely a mention, in the Site Infrastructure Requirements, bullet 8, to ‘provide or make financial contributions to new or enhanced sport, leisure and recreation facilities’. However the last sentence of paragraph 7.114 reads, with reference to the proposed Country Park ‘Any further contributions to provide or make financial contributions towards new or enhanced sport, leisure or recreation facilities will be considered having regard to the provision of the new Country Park’.

Should we understand this to mean that, should the developer spend all the funds earmarked for leisure facilities on the Country Park, they are absolved from providing any kind of sport, recreation or leisure facility within the development at Site 3a? If this interpretation is correct, then we object most strongly.

In our view a community centre with multi-purpose rooms is an essential element of infrastructure.

We understand from a prominent local youth leader that the Channels development in the northwest of Chelmsford suffers from vandalism and other forms of anti-social behaviour due, in part, to the lack of a community centre from which a youth club and clubs for younger children could operate.

There is no requirement for Use Class A (shops, cafes etc.) in Site 3a, or in Site 3b.

We believe that the plan should list such infrastructure as essential.

- Transportation links

"Young people and families need genuinely affordable homes," says Leader of Chelmsford City Council Stephen Robinson, "but many of these are in the wrong places, scattered around, and without the right infrastructure. **Local services are already under strain; roads are at 96% capacity; and it will just get worse.**"

Source: Liberal Democrats [Don't Choke Chelmsford](#) campaign

Residents of Site 3a travelling to Chelmsford city centre, whether using Maldon Road or the Baddow by-pass, will pass through the Army and Navy. The redevelopment/reimagining of the Army and Navy roundabout is not yet at the consultation phase so a completed traffic management system for that area is still a long way off. Traffic moves freely at present due to the Covid lockdown, but typically there is gridlock. This development, both while under construction and afterwards, will only make the congestion worse.

We understand from the Bradwell agenda pack from Essex County Council that there are proposals to site a Park and Ride for Bradwell construction workers opposite the existing Sandon Park and Ride on Maldon Road. Further, we understand that there are proposals for a Bradwell-related lorry park on Maldon Road, located just on the east, Sandon side, of the A12.

The additional volume of traffic brought to the area by Bradwell-related activity will further exacerbate traffic problems.

Bus services in the area are infrequent and First Bus has been reducing services to/through Baddow. There needs to be a firm guarantee of bus services at times to suit commuters and school children.

- Housing, green space and sustainability

"Young people and families need **genuinely affordable homes**," says Leader of Chelmsford City Council Stephen Robinson, "but many of these are in the wrong places, scattered around, and without the right infrastructure. Local services are already under strain; roads are at 96% capacity; and it will just get worse." Source: Liberal Democrats [Don't Choke Chelmsford](#)

We believe that there should be genuinely affordable housing for local people. Affordability should be assessed with regard to the median wage in Chelmsford. There is no reference to the percentage of housing in the development that will be 'affordable housing'.

Despite statements about sustainable transport modes (paragraphs 7.118 and 7.122) the reality is that most residents will use a car most of the time and most households will have two vehicles. We believe that an adequate number of electric car charging points at each house, and in car parks, should be a requirement.

There should be adequate, and adequately-sized, off-road parking for each house, at each house, plus additional communal car parks. Clarion Gate, a development built in 2009-12, has poorly designed access roads. Residential properties there were designed to accommodate off-street parking for just a single vehicle at each property. Roads were not built to approved drawings and, we understand, some planning conditions on road design went undischarged.

All internal roads in the development should be of a width to permit emergency vehicles to pass easily.

There should be designated green space and children's play areas throughout the development.

Drug Use and Dealing has risen significantly in Chelmsford over the last few years, aided in no small way by the design and layout of housing developments providing numerous "rat runs". We understand the Police have a unit providing advice on making housing developments more policing "friendly" and consequently less likely to suffer from significant problems with drug dealing. Any development should be required to be constructed in accordance with police best practice advice.

- Country park

Residents of Baddow, Chelmsford and beyond already enjoy public footpaths and pedestrian/cycle access on minor roads from Maldon Road via Sandford Mill Lane to the Chelmer and Blackwater navigation and towpaths on either side, where they can walk or cycle for miles, and across the river to Brook End Road and Sandford Mill Road. The transformation of natural habitat into a more sculpted country park will have a negative impact on the abundant wildlife in the area while adding nothing extra for residents to enjoy.

The Country Park and Sandford Mill visitor centre will attract visitors from beyond Chelmsford thereby adding to traffic congestion in the area.

- Miscellaneous

Long-time residents have informed us that there are methane gas pipes running through Site 3a from beneath the Baden Powell Close development, which used to be a rubbish tip. There is no mention of how the pipes/gas will be managed.

As farm land, the area has been known to flood regularly. Run-off from the impervious surfaces of the development will require careful management to avoid flooding. Given the topology of the land, surface and foul drainage systems will be challenging.

Noise and nuisance during construction

Sites 3a and 3b will be under construction at the same time as Bradwell, so construction worker traffic to the Bradwell park and ride will be an additional nuisance to residents in the existing housing along Maldon Road and to the south of Maldon Road.

There should be measures to curtail construction and construction traffic to Sites 3a and 3b between the hours of 5pm and 9 am and all weekends and bank holidays.

We hope that our comments will be given proper consideration. We wish to add that we would be happy to sit down with the developer to discuss aspects of the design of the development at site 3a.

Question by GBENA

Residents are aware that schools in Baddow East and Sandon are currently over-subscribed. Why is there no provision for the construction of primary and secondary schools in Site 3a. ?

In the document, the site infrastructure requirements merely states ' Financial contributions towards...'

CCC Response:

Refer to response to Question 14, 39 and 44

In response to specific questions

The County Council as Education Authority undertakes school place planning and the Commissioning School Places document has informed the Local Plan. There is a requirement for financial contributions to increase primary and secondary school places in nearby schools to mitigate the impact of the development.

47. Sue Gander - Development in Great Baddow

I feel very strongly about the proposed development in Gt Baddow and I have to question Why we are still even thinking about it!

Why are we about to squeeze a multitude number of houses into an already over populated, over polluted area where all services are over stretched and are already struggling to serve the people who live in the area.

At present we are living through a Public Health Crisis and having to re-think how we live, how we socialise, how we conduct our daily lives and raise our children!

So if we have to build, be visionary and do it properly thinking about the needs of whole families and not just lining the pockets of greedy house builders!

Build houses big enough to accommodate their elderly folk in the family preventing overcrowded, over priced nursing homes. Stop children raised in flats with no gardens.

Build good recreation area's where people can exercise and give children fresh air to breath. Give families space to live!

The only way to do this is to purchase a decent area of land with all the Infer structure and build a small town.

CCC Response:

The Local plan has been found sound by the Inspector so the principle of the site allocation at East Chelmsford has been justified and tested independently.

48. Alex Scully - Adoption of Non-Strategic Policy relating to Growth Site 1q, Church Hall Site, Woodhall Road

I write to inform you of new information relating to a site known in the pre-adoption Local Plan as Growth Site 1q, Church Hall Site, Woodhall Road, and your prospective decision to adopt development of it as part of the new Local Plan, to be voted on 27 May 2020.

The draft Policy is:

GROWTH SITE 1q – CHURCH HALL SITE, WOODHALL ROAD

- *Around 19 new homes*
- *Main vehicle access will be from Woodhall Road*
- *Character and scale determined by adjacent residential development Development layout should respect neighbouring rear boundaries*
- *Drainage and flood risk management led by SuDs to address location in a Critical Drainage Area*
- *Phasing: 2022-2026.¹*

I write to inform you that it is not open to you to adopt this policy (1q) as to do so would be unlawful in public law terms because:

- i. You will be unable to fulfil your statutory duty relating to weighing the impact of the policy on protected species;
- ii. To do so would be to adopt a policy directly contrary to national and higher-level strategic policies within the Local Plan itself relating to open space, and therefore irrational.

Inability to perform statutory duty

The site consists of a large open space and a fenced and locked area that is the site of the old church hall, which has now been reclaimed by nature.

Possible presence of protected and endangered species at site 1q

An ecological report was recently obtained by prospective developers of the site, Barefoot & Gilles. This report is dated June 2019, and is **attached**. It has only recently come to my attention. I would direct the committee's attention to the following conclusions in the report:

Bats

All species of bat are subject to protection under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981. Certain species are listed in the EU Habitats Directive² Annex II as being species of community interest, as well as being considered species of national importance by the Secretary of State.³

The report lists a number of species of bat that may live on the site. It notes that the scrub area could provide foraging habitat for bats, and the hedgerow and boundary areas are good linear

¹ Chelmsford Draft Local Plan, Pre-Submission Document, January 2018, p. 115

² Directive 92/43/EC

³ S.40-41 Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 (NERC)

features for commuting bats.⁴ It does not discuss the presence of bats in the surrounding areas, and cannot comment on the presence of bats in the Church Hall site. It was also performed at the wrong time of year to assess hibernation roosts.⁵

Wild birds

The report notes the potential presence of a number of species requiring protection under EU Directive 79/409/EC (the '**Wild Birds Directive**'). The report notes the presence of domestically red-listed birds on the site: starlings⁶ and house sparrows.⁷ It also notes that the scrub and hedgerow had high suitability for nesting birds. It also notes that red-listed song thrushes⁸ are possibly present. These are all designated species of principle importance. It also notes the potential for amber-listed swifts, bullfinches and dunnocks.

It has not investigated the Church Hall site. It was also performed at the wrong time of year to assess winter behaviour.⁹

Reptiles

All native reptiles are species of principle importance. The report correctly recommends a seven-visit reptile survey to discount the presence of protected reptiles from the site.¹⁰

Notable invertebrates

The report notes the presence of deadwood on site, which is an important habitat for protected stag beetles.¹¹ Stag beetles are designated a species of community interest, per Annex II of the Habitats Directive, and are a species of national importance under the NERC.

The report does not comment on the steps taken (if any) to investigate whether stag beetles are present. It has also not accessed the part of the site which will be most conducive to rare invertebrate species.

Hedgehogs

As paragraph 3.10.1 notes, hedgehogs are a species of principal importance and protected by the NERC. Although the 'desk study' returned no records for hedgehogs near this site, it is common knowledge of the residents of Woodhall Road and the users of the site that hedgehogs are present, and there is a clear possibility that they make the Church Hall their home.

Badgers

Badgers and their setts are protected by the Protection of Badgers Act 1992. No assessment as to the presence of badgers appears to have been carried out. It was also performed at the wrong time of year to assess the presence of badgers.¹²

Bees

⁴ Paragraph 3.5.4, p.17

⁵ Natural England guidance is for a survey of this behaviour in November to mid-March

⁶ *Sternus vulgaris*, also included in Annex IIB of the Wild Birds Directive

⁷ Paragraph 3.6.2, p.19

⁸ *Turdus philomelos*, also included in Annex IIB of the Wild Birds Directive

⁹ Natural England guidance is for a survey of this behaviour in October to March

¹⁰ Paragraph 3.8.4, p.22

¹¹ Paragraph 3.9.2, p.23

¹² Natural England guidance is for a survey of this behaviour in February to April or October to November

A number of species of bee are protected under the NERC. The site has also been included in Buglife's 'B-Lines' project. Despite this, the report makes no mention of the presence of bees or whether habitat is conducive to bees.

Impact on surrounding area

The report does not take into account the impact of protect wildlife living nearby, which utilise the area to browse and feed.

Report's methodology

The report is the product of a 'desk study' (i.e. consulting records held on wildlife sightings in the area) and a single visit to part of the site on 7 June 2019.

The report notes that it '*may not provide a complete list of the plants and animals present, or which may utilise the site throughout the year*'. It also concedes:

*A large section of the south of the site was inaccessible due to a fence and a hedge around the entirety of the area. The habitats within this site were therefore not thoroughly surveyed, although some areas were visible from the other side of the boundary.*¹³

This inaccessible area refers to the fenced-off area of around 875m² which is the site of the old church hall. It is a type of habitat called 'open mosaic habitat on previously developed land', which is a protected habitat type under NERC and noted for its priority importance for invertebrates.¹⁴ Dozens of trees & shrubs have taken over the site completely, providing a sanctuary for many bird species. Local residents report seeing bats, hedgehogs and field mice. The report is unable to make any conclusions about this site, as it has not been inspected.

The report is therefore inadequate to form a view on the presence of protected species on site, and therefore the impact on them of the policy of developing the site, because:

- i. as it does not include a survey of a significant area of (and the most ecologically important) part of the site;
- ii. its conclusions are based on a cursory, single visit to the site and are at odds with local knowledge;
- iii. it seems to take no view on the presence of bees or badgers, and was performed at the wrong time of year for badgers;
- iv. it acknowledges further investigation into the presence of reptiles is required.

Unlawfulness of a decision to adopt Policy 1Q

Per s.40 Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006, you as a public body '*must, in exercising its functions, have regard, so far as is consistent with the proper exercise of those functions, to the purpose of conserving biodiversity.*'

¹³ Paragraph 3.2, p.9

¹⁴ UK Biodiversity Action Plan; Priority Habitat Descriptions. BRIG (ed. Ant Maddock) 2008. (Updated Dec 2011), pp. 49-56

Per Regulation 9(3) of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 ('CHSR'), you also 'must have regard to the requirements of the Directives so far as they may be affected' by your decision to adopt Policy 1q.

The 'Directives' referred to are the Habitats Directive and Wild Birds Directive. Article 12 of the Habitats Directive states that:

Member states shall take the requisite measures to establish a system of strict protection for the animal species listed [the protected species] in their natural range, prohibiting ... (b) deliberate disturbance of these species, particularly during the period of breeding, rearing, hibernation and migration ..."

In the UK, this system of strict protection is provided by various criminal offences, policed by Natural England.¹⁵ It is a criminal offence to disturb any of the species referred to above. As such, you must 'have regard to' whether Natural England would consider a criminal offence would be committed were site 1q to be developed in the way the policy suggests, and consider that Natural England would not license such an offence.¹⁶

Per Regulation 10 CHSR you must also take such steps in the exercise of your functions as you consider appropriate to contribute to 'the preservation, maintenance and re-establishment of a sufficient diversity and area of habitat for wild birds in the United Kingdom, including by means of the upkeep, management and creation of such habitat, as appropriate, having regard to the requirements of Article 2' of the Wild Birds Directive.¹⁷

The Wild Birds Directive, per Article 1, 'relates to the conservation of all species of naturally occurring birds in the wild state in the European territory of the Member States to which the Treaty applies. It covers the protection, management and control of these species and lays down rules for their exploitation. It shall apply to birds, their eggs, nests and habitats.'

Article 2 of the Wild Birds Directive reads:

Member States shall take the requisite measures to maintain the population of the species referred to in Article 1 at a level which corresponds in particular to ecological, scientific and cultural requirements, while taking into account of economic and recreational requirements, or to adapt the population of these species to that level.

Article 3 stipulates that these 'requisite measures' must 'preserve, maintain or re-establish a sufficient diversity and area of habitats for all the species referred to in Article 1'.

It is therefore imperative that your decision to adopt Policy 1q is in line with your statutory duties. However, due to the inadequacy of the ecological survey performed, you do not have an adequate picture of the presence or extent of various protected species on the Church Hall site. Although it is for you to weigh these effects and the impact on biodiversity, you do not have sufficient information to be able to do so.

¹⁵ Cf. Reg 42–45 CHSR

¹⁶ *R. (on the application of Morge) v Hampshire CC* [2011] UKSC 2 at [29]

¹⁷ Regulation 10(3) CHSR

It will therefore be impossible for you to ascertain or have regard to the likely effect of the policy to develop the site on the above species, habitat and/or biodiversity, or be able to have regard to the impact of the policy on the requirements of the Directives. As such, you will be unable to perform the balancing exercises required of you by statute, because you will have insufficient knowledge of material considerations.¹⁸

It is therefore my position that adopting the Policy 1q would be unlawful, as you will be in breach of statutory requirements pertaining to your decision.

Open Space

The Church Hall Site and area behind Woodhall Road is open space, which was left thus by the original designers of the estate. It is an open, lush grass area, used by a variety of people from the local community, including dogwalkers and families with young children. The estate is in one of the poorer areas of Chelmsford which is itself an affluent city, with many residents renting their homes from the local authority. Consequently, it is home to a disproportionate number of disadvantaged people, including the unemployed, elderly, those in receipt of welfare benefits, and the disabled. At either end of Woodhall Road, there are multi-storey flats with no gardens, whose occupants would be particularly badly affected by the loss of the Church Hall site. The nearest open space is St Andrews Park, which is around 0.5 miles away and already overused due to serving a dense urban area.

I therefore further consider that adopting Policy 1q would be contrary to both the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Strategic Policies within the Local Plan itself pertaining to open space.

Per the NPPF:¹⁹

96. Access to a network of high quality open spaces and opportunities for sport and physical activity is important for the health and well-being of communities. Planning policies should be based on robust and up-to-date assessments of the need for open space, sport and recreation facilities (including quantitative or qualitative deficits or surpluses) and opportunities for new provision. Information gained from the assessments should be used to determine what open space, sport and recreational provision is needed, which plans should then seek to accommodate.

97. Existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land, including playing fields, should not be built on unless:

- a) an assessment has been undertaken which has clearly shown the open space, buildings or land to be surplus to requirements; or*
- b) the loss resulting from the proposed development would be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity and quality in a suitable location; or*

¹⁸ Cf. *Bagshaw v Wyre BC* [2014] EWHC 508 (Admin)

¹⁹ As revised February 2019

c) the development is for alternative sports and recreational provision, the benefits of which clearly outweigh the loss of the current or former use.

98. Planning policies and decisions should protect and enhance public rights of way and access,

Per Strategic Policy S7 of the Local Plan (Protecting and Enhancing Community Assets):

The Council recognises the important role that community facilities have in existing communities including health, education, social, sports and leisure, parks and green spaces, arts and cultural facilities and are also an integral part of any proposals for new residential and employment development. New facilities will be accessible to the community, and will be secured by a range of funding measures including planning obligations, Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), and/or its successor, and other relevant funding streams. Existing community assets will also be protected from inappropriate changes of use or redevelopment.

It was also acknowledged in the previous Local Plan (adopted 20.7.11) that Woodhall Parade, Woodhall Road would 'serve new housing development' and would therefore require 'public realm and environmental improvements'.²⁰ Adopting policy 1q would therefore be to drastically limit amenities in an area the council has previously and knowingly put pressure on by previous developments.

Adopting a policy to in-fill the only area of sizable green space in the local area would deprive a local community of the only proximate green space in a situation where:

- i. It is far from clear the area has been assessed 'surplus to requirements', or if so why;
- ii. The Local Plan does not provide for equivalent or better provision of green space;
- iii. It would overload a local area already previously overloaded by previous planning and policy decisions;
- iv. Policy 1q would contradict national guidance and higher-level local, strategic policies.

As such, adopting Policy 1q would be irrational in public law terms.

Conclusion

We will therefore be grateful for confirmation that you will not consider adopting Policy 1q as part of the proposed Local Plan on 27 May 2020 or thereafter. For the avoidance of doubt, I/we make these observations to Policy 1q only, and take no present view on the remainder of the Local Plan.

If judicial review proceedings become necessary, this letter will be put before the court as evidence of my attempts to achieve a non-litigated solution.

This statement was submitted on the 26 May 2020 in relation to a current live planning application. However, much of the content relates to the decision to adopt of the Local Plan and this response only relates to Local Plan matter.

²⁰ North Chelmsford Area Action Plan, Adopted 20 July 2011, Para 2.59

The Council undertook a Local Wildlife Study prepared independent specialists Essex Ecology Services who are the commercial arm of the Essex Wildlife Trust and this formed part of the Local Plan evidence base. This identifies and assesses the key wildlife sites across Chelmsford which are shown on the Policies Map.

A Habitats Regulations Assessment has also been undertaken to support the Local Plan. The Local Plan Inspector confirmed that the requirement to undertake an Appropriate Assessment to confirm with the Regulations and the Habitats Directive has been met.

This level of evidence is entirely appropriate to inform a Local Plan and was considered by the Planning Inspector when finding the Local Plan sound.

Further policies within the Local Plan seek conserve and enhance habitats on non-designated wildlife sites and mitigate impacts. Development proposals need to assess any habitats and species, including any protected species and this is undertaken through Ecological Assessments that accompany individual planning applications.

Site 10 is allocated for residential development, but retains a local open space notation. An extensive Open Space Assessment inform the Local Plan. There are number of nearby existing open spaces in the immediate locality and the Open Space Assessment does not indicate any significant deficiencies in comparable types of open space within the area.

The Local Plan policy protecting open space does require any loss of designated open space caused by development to be mitigated. This could be the provision of alternative space and financial contributions to improve the quality of existing open spaces