

# **North Chelmsford Area Action Plan**

**Preferred Options**

**Consultation Feedback Report**

**July 2009**



# **North Chelmsford Area Action Plan (NCAAP)**

## **Preferred Options Consultation Feedback Report**

### **Introduction**

This report sets out the main issues that have arisen from representations made to the Preferred Options consultation to the North Chelmsford Area Action Plan and accompanying Sustainability Appraisal.

The principles, policies and preferred options for the NCAAP area were tested among stakeholders and the community during an eleven week consultation period from 11 December 2008 to 27 February 2009. The responses received will be used to prepare a draft Submission version of NCAAP scheduled to be published September/October 2009.

The Preferred Option consultation was a second stage consultation. The initial Issues and Options stage of consultation took place in August 2007. Both of these consultations have been undertaken in accordance with Regulation 25 of The Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2008 (as amended).

### **Context**

The adopted spatial strategy within the Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD provides the context for the NCAAP. The NCAAP will be the statutory Development Plan for North Chelmsford and will provide a planning framework to shape and allocate land for new development and identify areas of constraint, opportunity and areas requiring protection.

### **Consultation**

The consultation period was extended from nine to eleven weeks due to the high level of interest in certain aspects of the NCAAP. The Council exceeded the statutory requirements for consultation on the documents giving full opportunity to the wider community, stakeholders and organisations to contribute to the documents. Methods used during the consultation comply with the Council's Adopted Statement of Community Involvement. A number of methods were used and included:

- A summary leaflet was delivered to nearly 23,000 homes in the 37 square mile plan area;
- Copies of the consultation material were placed in 15 local libraries;
- Copies of the documents were sent to all statutory consultees;
- 2,000 notification letters were sent to range of bodies, organisations and individuals;
- Four permanent exhibitions and eleven staffed exhibitions held in Springfield, Broomfield, Boreham, North Melbourne, Little Waltham and CBC's offices, visited by around 300 people;
- A public notice and five press releases;
- Updates in Borough Life;
- Presentations by Members and officers to Parish council and conservation societies;

- Regularly updated website pages;
- ‘Piggy-backing’ on existing local consultation events, such as the Broomfield Village Design Statement exhibition and AGM.

## Consultation Responses

A total of 970 representations received within the eleven week consultation, of which 36 were received after the closing date. Following a final assessment of the representations numbers, which has resulted in some minor changes than that previously published, the tables below show the breakdown of responses:

**Table 1 – Breakdown of Number of Representations by Respondents**

Member of the Public	Parish/Town Councils	Other Stakeholders	Developers and Landowners	Total
904	17	21	28	970

**Table 2 – Breakdown of Number of Representation by Method of Response**

On-line Form	E-mail Form	Paper Form	E-mail	Letter	Total
415	64	84	112	295	970

The paper form comprised a questionnaire which had a total of 38 questions and allowed the opportunity for additional comments.

A number of respondents also sent letters with their paper forms. Some landowners and developers also submitted plans and detailed reports. Some of the responses were received as a result of concerted campaigns, with over 200 copies of a letter objecting to development North of Copperfield Road (Site Allocation 5), around 70 copies of a letter relating to development around New Hall School, and about 100 individual letters relating to other topics. A number of responses were received from people living outside the Borough.

## Committee Consideration

Development Policy Committee considered an initial report of consultation responses giving aggregated figures of responses to individual questions. The Committee asked officers to proceed with drawing out some of the substance of the issues raised and to develop an amended version of the Plan in response.

## Main Issues arising from Responses

The main issues that arose from the consultation responses are set out below, not in any particular order:

- The protection of important heritage assets such as the Grade I listed New Hall and Boreham House and their settings in the landscape.
- The location, role and function of proposed employment allocations in NE Chelmsford.
- The deliverability of proposed highway and transportation infrastructure to support new development in North Chelmsford.
- The potential route of the rapid bus transit proposals (ChART).
- The proposed dispersed approach for new development in NW Chelmsford rather than a centralised option.
- The impact of new development with regards to the character of landscape, traffic generation, effect on local services and facilities and existing residents' amenity especially at the site North of Copperfield Road (Site Allocation 5)
- The location of proposed new schools and local centres in NE Chelmsford.
- The proposed location of the Gypsy and Traveller site.
- The ability of the proposed strategy to deliver at least 4,000 new homes.

The appendices to this report provide more detail on the main issues within representations and are broken down as following:

**Appendix 1 –** Stakeholders and Developers/Landowners Preferred Options Representation Summaries

**Appendix 2 -** Public Responses - Summarised Main Issues

**Appendix 3 -** List of Respondents

## APPENDIX I

### STAKEHOLDERS AND DEVELOPERS/LANDOWNERS PREFERRED OPTIONS REPRESENTATION SUMMARIES

---

#### PARISH COUNCILS

##### **Boreham Parish Council [REG25/PO/NCAAP/LDF0003916/341]**

- Essential that proposed developments do not impact on New Hall and Boreham House
- Bulls Lodge Quarry should become a country park on completion of extraction
- Strongly opposed to employment use east of Boreham Interchange – affect on Boreham House, intrudes into countryside, increased traffic congestion at Boreham Interchange, conflicts with policy of employment areas in mixed-use areas; A12 will form barrier to pedestrian access, site should be west of A12 to enable access to ChART; unacceptable to introduce this at such a late stage.
- Concern at proposed expansion of business at Drakes Lane – poor access, traffic will use existing routes, more traffic will access through the village and country roads.

##### **Broomfield Parish Council [REG25/PO/NCAAP/LDF0003917/658]**

- More community facilities needed to serve development – sports, youth and drama
- Would welcome provision of police office
- Rebuilding of Broomfield Primary School supported – may need to limit amount of development to lower estimates to ensure enough school capacity
- Small family homes and warden controlled houses the most needed – executive homes the least needed
- Housing need for Hospital employees has been met
- Open space – meadows to south of Church Green should be designated open space, and included in Conservation Area
- Also need to consider listed buildings in Broomfield – Priors, Scravels, Broomfield Place
- Difficult to provide cycle route along Main Road/Broomfield Road. Suggest cycle paths should be created to east and west of village, link to Peters field Link. Cycle path should not be lit and surfacing should be in keeping (not hard surfacing).
- Disagrees with Park and Ride location – prefers Sheepcotes Roundabout, closer to Chelmsford, greater potential for bus links to Hospital and railway station
- Roundabouts on A130 Essex Regiment Way should be minimised to draw traffic away from B1008
- Supports dispersed approach for NW Chelmsford
- Suggests Days Garage site for local centre
- Suggest local centre should be added north of New Hall
- Concern about additional traffic on School Lane, need for junction improvements also
- Gypsy and Travellers site too far from NE Chelmsford services, suggests alternatives
- Opposed to a possible western access to Hospital – limited value in traffic reduction, visually intrusive – suggest cycle and foot access to west, and second road access on northern edge
- Broomfield Parish Plan outlines background and details of many of these comments

### **Chignal Parish Council [REG25/PO/NCAAP/LDF0003918/876]**

- Main concern is the increase in potential traffic levels using Chignal Road.
- Proposed road would cut through open fields; extra traffic will create even more congestion in Chignal Road both for vehicles trying to enter it from minor roads and at the traffic- light junction with Roxwell Road.
- Proposed development to the east of Regiment Way is considered to be in totally wrong place. Essex Regiment Way should be the correct route and should be improved but not replaced as proposed.
- Development between Hollow Lane and Copperfield should be mostly single storey to ensure they are not visible from the Parish of Chignal. Proposals for 'public open spaces' indicate that it is proposed to develop the other side of Hollow Lane at some date in the future.
- Realignment of Hollow Lane where it meets the main route is understandable but it is not in the Parish's interests to extend the development beyond Blue House - preferred that the existing junction with improvements be retained.
- Widening Hollow Lane in part is unacceptable because of people using road as a cut through. Suggest alternative route to Patching Hall Lane which would enable the loop of Hollow Lane to be left as it is.

### **Danbury Parish Council [REG25/PO/NCAAP/LDF0003919/140]**

- Supports NCAAP proposals to meet additional housing requirements for the Borough to 2021 by means of developments in North Chelmsford
- Views of Danbury Ridge best protected by not developing east of Boreham Interchange, and designating a green wedge between Danbury and Boreham
- Infrastructure should be provided in time to support new housing developments
- No information is given as to where the extracted minerals from line of NE Bypass will be processed/washed. Seeks confirmation that this will not come to St Clere's Pit in Danbury.

### **Galleywood Parish Council [REG25/PO/NCAAP/LDF0010030/877]**

Commenting on specific proposals not appropriate. However, planning approach will lead to more satisfactory development and better neighbourhoods than piecemeal development.

### **Great Waltham Parish Council [REG25/PO/NCAAP/LDF0003925/912]**

- Unconvinced about need for so many homes but supports general concept for NE and NW
- VDS supports small scale 'non executive' homes in area covered by VDS.
- Supports affordable homes, suggests redevelopment of Airey Homes sites (Barrack Lane and Mashbury Road). Working with CBC, CHP and RCCE.
- Promotes use of land between Cherry Garden Road and Duffries Close for affordable housing for local people (shown as open space)
- Suggests feasibility study for redevelopment of Airey homes at Mashbury Road as affordable homes for local people.
- Supports limited development of redundant farm buildings for residential use.
- Broomfield Hospital – care should be taken in new development to avoid light pollution and to maximise sustainable transport especially cycling including on-site through routes.

- Provision of bypass is essential to the plan. Also seeks a north-west bypass with links to reinstated cross valley link to A414 or A12 to relieve traffic on Broomfield Road and nearby lanes.
- Strategic walking and cycling routes supported. Proposed route between Great Waltham, Broads Green and Partridge Green especially welcome; submits a report prepared by RCCE to support proposals. Route at Chelmsford Road to Ash Tree Corner welcome but constrained by road width and high levels of vehicle usage.
- Park and Ride fully supported; early implementation urged.
- NCAAP should specifically refer to creation of a Community Focal Point by extending the village hall, facilitated by an LAA with other service providers – work underway with partners to achieve this.
- Gypsy and Traveller site should be split between 6/7 residential pitches and 3/4 transit pitches. Location is supported.
- Part of open space between Cherry Garden Road and Duffries Close is garages which could be developed – designation should be shown more accurately (grass area should remain POS).
- Support green wedges, strategic gaps.
- *Other issues relate to the area of the Parish outside the NCAAP*

#### **Great and Little Leighs Parish Council [REG25/PO/NCAAP/LDF0003924/795]**

Agree with principle but not in total agreement with locations.

#### **Little Baddow Parish Council [REG25/PO/NCAAP/LDF0010018/785]**

- Concerns about the impact of development on Boreham interchange. Benefits of bypass will be offset by new traffic for railway station, park and ride, bus links, in addition to increases in traffic for Stansted Airport.
- Development of land to the east of Boreham Interchange breaches principle that development is contained by the A12 and means it has no eastern boundary. Concerns about the erosion of the open aspect, encirclement of Boreham House, joining of Chelmsford and Boreham.

#### **Little Waltham Parish Council [REG25/PO/NCAAP/LDF0004078/76]**

- Seeks definition and impact of 'leisure arc'
- Pleased to note deletion of Cross Valley Link
- North-south cycleway in Chelmer river valley should avoid hard surfacing and artificial lighting
- Park and Ride – supports provision but concerns about traffic congestion; site should be used for gravel extraction before construction to lower the site
- Objects to development north of Hospital – visually intrusive, poor road access, closes countryside gap, detached from Chelmsford
- Motor-cycle trialling (current activity) opposite MEG is incompatible with Green Wedge policy – area should be designated for nature conservation
- Essex Regiment Way industrial area should not be extended northwards, leisure uses to the south should not be used to justify expansion northwards
- Parish already has two Gypsy and Traveller sites, another one is undesirable
- Boundary of Drake Lane Industrial Estate should be tightly drawn and no extensions allowed

- Proposed affordable housing site is best option, however local people should have first priority and houses should remain available for local affordable need in perpetuity
- South west corner of allotments in Main Road should be included as open space

**Sandon Parish Council [REG25/PO/NCAAP/LDF0003935/209]**

The proposal is the only sustainable option available to CBC.

**Springfield Parish Council [REG25/PO/NCAAP/LDF0010131/794]**

- Possibly not adequate provision of ‘extra care’ dwellings; plan should also make provision for sheltered housing.
- What is net job growth for NE Chelmsford? Will job numbers match population levels?
- Encourage use of empty business premises and provide start-up units.
- Review locations of shops to ensure they are centrally situated adjacent to other facilities.
- Support bypass proposal.
- Better integration of cycle routes needed; improved bus links to Broomfield Hospital and Sainsbury’s.
- Gypsy and Traveller provision should be split between 2/3 sites, closer to school and health facilities.
- Support New Bowers Way designation as local centre.
- Concern that implementation of houses and supporting infrastructure is compatible.

**Writtle Parish Council [REG25/PO/NCAAP/LDF0003942/319]**

- Micawber Way/Newland Spring development does not relate in any way to the rest of the plans. Away from new places of employment in the new industrial areas, further adding to the issues of congestion.
- Any large development must include infrastructure including traffic management, public transport, flood precautions, general public and utility services, education facilities, medical facilities, youth facilities

**South Hanningfield Parish Council [REG25/PO/NCAAP/LDF0003936/882]**

**Stock Parish Council [REG25/PO/NCAAP/LDF0003939/869]**

**Great Baddow Parish Council [REG25/PO/NCAAP/LDF0003923/860]**

**West Hanningfield Parish Council [REG25/PO/NCAAP/LDF0003940/80]**

Record that they have no comment to make.

**Black Notley Parish Council [REG25/PO/NCAAP/LDF0007773/842]**

Any major development should not go ahead without the necessary infrastructure in place.

## **OTHER STAKEHOLDERS**

### **Essex County Council [REG25/PO/NCAAP/LDF0010818/846]**

*Land east of Boreham Interchange – concerns regarding:*

Proximity and impact on Boreham Interchange

Impact on setting of New Hall, Boreham House, Chelmer and Blackwater Ridge SLA

Visual edge of Chelmsford/views from Danbury ridge

*Mineral extraction*

No objection to rescheduling mineral extraction at Bulls Lodge/Park Farm to an earlier date, but this should be a pre-requisite to development to ensure extraction is not impeded by phasing of housing development.

*Location of secondary school, NE Chelmsford*

Welcomes the need but cannot at this stage comment on specific locations. A study will take 6 months to take account of all criteria.

*Site Allocation 7 – Broomfield Place*

Welcomes relocation and expansion of Broomfield Primary School to enable upgrade of school and provide shared community uses. Developers will be expected to fund feasibility study by ECC. Suggests separate access for emergency and grounds maintenance vehicles for pupil safety.

*General comments*

- Welcomes opportunity to work with CBC on provision of services (elderly care, schools, co-location, routes etc)
- Support for a number of structuring principles including ChART, Park & Ride, alternative travel

### **Essex County Council Historic Environment Branch [REG25/PO/NCAAP/LDF0010809/838]**

NCAAP contains little reference to historic environment around Broomfield and impact of development:

- Archaeological finds from Neolithic to post medieval have been identified
- Deposits of national significance have been found south of Broomfield Saxon burial
- Cropmarks of trackways and a ring ditch survive east of Broomfield Hospital, plus Late Bronze Age settlement has been excavated.
- Historic environment should be considered at masterplanning stage, considering the historic environment as a whole and not just remaining built assets.
- Careful consideration should be given to the impact of development on the historic environment of Boreham House.

## **Highways Agency [REG25/PO/NCAAP/LDF0004135/845]**

- NE Bypass – no objection in principle
- ChART – strongly supported
- Bus, cycling and walking networks – welcomed
- Rail station – principle welcomed; beneficial to A12 although it could attract additional trips depending on cost and frequency of trains, further modelling will help to determine amount of parking needed
- Park & Ride – supported, but more modelling of impact on A12 would be welcome
- Housing locations – PO to disperse 800 homes in NW Chelmsford welcomed, modelling work needed on impact of NE Chelmsford on A12
- Further modelling needed to assess impact on A12 of Site 9, 10, 13, Springfield Business Park
- Site allocation 12 (Land East of New Hall) – not sustainable, needs public transport
- Demand management measure and travel plans are required, and will be an essential element of establishing modal shift

## **East of England Regional Assembly (EERA) [REG25/PO/NCAAP/LDF0010694/824]**

NCAAP is in general conformity with the East of England Plan.

General support expressed with some points to note:

- Greenfield development should be phased with brownfield development elsewhere
- Does the NCAAP need to include some provision for Travelling Showpeople?
- Developer and private contributions should continue to be sought to deliver Bypass

## **East of England Development Agency (EEDA) [REG25/PO/NCAAP/LDF0003559/754]**

- Themes and objectives are well considered.
- Suggests an up to date employment land review is carried out to ensure proposed meets current needs and is deliverable. Business locations need to be well-planned, easily accessed by sustainable transport – will provision within the neighbourhoods do this?
- NCAAP does not make specific reference to energy provision – EEDA promotes principle of sustainable communities including renewable energy.

Taking these issues into account will provide the context needed to maintain the prosperity of East of England, enhance regional competitiveness and support business growth.

NCAAP should take account of Sub-regional Policies of RES for Chelmsford area:

- Sustainable transport between key centres, and to international airports
- Basic business infrastructure – power and water supply and treatment
- Raise employment rates through raising skills particularly in deprived wards
- Support sub-regional roles of KCDC
- High quality sustainable urban environment
- Overcome affordable and key worker housing shortages, broaden the housing offer
- Mix of employment land and premises, support requirements of key sectors
- Business innovation and performance enhancement through business network

## **Environment Agency [REG25/PO/NCAAP/LDF0008875/769]**

Plan is robust and environmentally sustainable.

Support for:

- The need for all development to be exemplar
- Policy EPE2
- Identification of strategic sewer route and increased capacity of works
- Inclusion of green spaces – important for drainage and run off, improves water quality and ecological corridors
- Boundaries and planning principles for Green Wedge
- Identification of hedgerows, ponds, spaces and significant features
- Relevant parts of Section 7

Points to note:

- Chelmer River Valley landscape character area is in Flood Zones 2 and 3, this should be listed as a further constraint
- Large scale new developments must incorporate drainage strategies; and be accompanied by FRA for surface water drainage
- Should aim for Level 3 or higher of the Code for Sustainable Homes
- SuDS requirement should be set out as a requirement from the outset, can require larger areas of land which may affect planned densities
- Footpath or cycleway works close to River Chelmer will need EA permission

## **English Heritage [REG25/PO/NCAAP/LDF9000894/755]**

- Minimum figure for NW Chelmsford should not be included where there are constraints on capacity (around New Hall)
- Employment proposals have potential adverse impact on New Hall (NH) and Boreham House (BH)
- NCAAP underplays the importance of the significant Grade I buildings at NH
- Landscape corridors in Diagram 7 should be modified to reflect setting of NH and BH
- Diagrammatic nature of some illustrations does not enable assessment of impact on NH and BH
- Railway station siting should be reassessed in relationship to NH and important views
- Employment proposal East of Boreham House does not analyse setting of BH
- Housing locations not based on an understanding of setting of NH
- Lack of setting detail in SA
- A coherent analysis of NH and BH settings is needed, followed by analysis of the relationship between NH and BH and proposed development

**Government Office for the East of England (GO-East)  
[REG25/PO/NCAAP/LDF0011281/765]**

Commends the NCAAP, and how it lays out CBC's preferences, alternative approaches and reasons for rejection, and implementation framework.

**Mid-Essex Primary Care Trust [REG25/PO/NCAAP/LDF0010907/835]**

- NCAAP contains insufficient provision for the funding and delivery of healthcare facilities.
- New health facilities incorporating two new health centres are required which should be developer funded through S106 as follows:
  - NE Chelmsford – new 4 GP practice (1000 sq m) with associated services
  - NW Chelmsford – expanded or new 2 GP practice (350 sq m) in existing or new centre
  - OR 1000 sq m floor space health centre equidistant between NE and NW
- These would need to be provided in 2012/13
- Further consideration/modelling needs to be given to air quality impacts of new developments.
- Water use/abstraction measures need to be developed to meet CSH level 3.
- A number of detailed suggestions on working to include more references to health care facilities, health and wellbeing.

**National Grid [REG25/PO/NCAAP/LDF0011741/836]**

- Electricity and gas lines shown in Diagram 4 are likely to be responsibility of local distribution companies EDF Energy Networks and National Grid Gas Distribution. NCAAP should be amended to reflect this. National Grid high voltage lines run to the west of Chelmsford through Chignall Smealy and Chignall St James.
- Provides website addresses for information on local electricity and gas transmission assets and contacts for local gas distribution.
- Welcomes the opportunity to be involved in preparation, alteration and review of DPDs.

**Anglian Water [REG25/PO/NCAAP/LDF0011758/837]**

- Sewage treatment capacity at Chelmsford Sewage Treatment Works is limited and will be address in the period 2010-2015  
New strategic sewer and pumping station needed to serve site allocations 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16
- No issues with site allocation 15
- Site allocation 5 – limited capacity at downstream pumping station, upgrade or storage solution needed
- Site allocations 6, 7, 8 – capacity is available in downstream existing Broomfield sewer for 400 dwellings
- Surface water should preferably be dealt with through SUDs.

### **Natural England [REG25/PO/NCAAP/LDF0008688/839]**

- Emphasis on environmental responsibility and sustainability is welcomed
- Welcome references to green infrastructure, some working could be strengthened in this regard
- Grade I listed buildings, parks and gardens and other strong landscape features – the current boundaries are drawn too tightly and do not allow sufficient views and separation, particularly at the rear of New Hall
- Costs of burial of overhead power lines could impact on financial viability of development proposals
- ChART proposal should not sever New Hall avenue; impact of station buildings and transport hub should be minimised
- Wildlife site (Pratts Farm Lane, Ch83) should be protected/retained
- Development delivery should take a sequential approach in the current economic climate
- Access to green wedge should be balanced against biodiversity issues

### **Essex Chambers of Commerce [REG25/PO/NCAAP/LDF0011081/840]**

- Centralised development may enhance new business opportunities, but dispersed approach may support existing businesses
- Concern at increased pressure and congestion of roads, particularly Pump Lane/White Hart Lane
- Bypass and adequate links, Park and Ride and adequate parking within developments are key to the proposals
- Suggest site by the Generals is reconsidered – good communication links, ideal for business or science park
- Rail station – ensure parking requirements are met, commuters will use it instead of Chelmsford Town, also could be used as parking/shuttle bus to town centre, opportunities for migration of commuters and easing of traffic congestion on town centre should not be overlooked

### **CPRE [REG25/PO/NCAAP/LDF0000240/841]**

- Support for cycle and footpath from Petersfield Link to Great Waltham
- Route should be quiet and traffic free, to the west of Main Road, good quality and smooth surface, lighting should take consideration of local needs
- Priority for first phase should be Broomfield Hospital to School Lane via Chelmer Valley High School
- Support for link from Woodhouse Lane to Great Waltham
- Suggests two links from Goulton Road – to Heathfield Road; and an east-west route parallel to School Lane crossing Patching Hall Lane
- Leisure route in Green Wedge supported
- Another option is for Broomfield Road and Main Road to have cycle lanes along the entire length, may need to use discretionary cycle lanes on narrow parts

### **Simon Burns MP [REG25/PO/NCAAP/LDF0011346/741]**

- ChART route through Beaulieu Park – would divide the park, deter people from using park, cause damage to natural habitats. Detrimental and lasting effects to the aesthetics and environment.
- Location of rail station is too close to New Hall, supports provision in principle but the location should be nearer to Boreham.

### **Little Waltham Sports and Social Club [REG25/PO/NCAAP/LDF0011158/753]**

- Broomfield Library is very limited and does not open often enough
- Not enough high tech jobs are indicated
- Not enough buses serving Little Waltham
- Gravel workings at Essex Regiment Way should have been closed on expiry of last licence
- NW Chelmsford development will put pressure on B1008
- Disagrees with provision of Gypsy and Traveller Site

### **The Chelmsford Society [REG25/PO/NCAAP/LDF0011401/678]**

Disagrees with development of land around Broomfield Place, at Hospital Approach/Woodhouse Lane, and east of Main Road. Proposals will elongate the village, unity will suffer, would lose its separateness. Suggest all development should be north of New Hall School to a line lateral with Hospital Approach.

### **The Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings [REG25/PO/NCAAP/LDF0011345/743]**

Concern about development around New Hall – would be detrimental to the setting and jeopardise appreciation and understanding of the historic building. Happy to be involved in future discussions about NH.

### **The Theatres Trust [REG25/PO/NCAAP/LDF9001211/844]**

- Page 16 mentions only sports/leisure facilities – suggest criteria is broadened to encompass culture
- New community facilities should be multi-purpose to include a range of facilities, including arts and entertainment events. Changing facilities could be shared with sports facilities. Spaces for performing arts can be accommodated within education of other community buildings.

### **MENCAP [REG25/PO/NCAAP/LDF0006955/775]**

Adequate consideration should be given to housing needs of people with disabilities. These include affordable social housing, care homes, residences supported by social service for independent living. Considerations include the type of housing and location and access to facilities.

## **The Church of England [REG25/PO/NCAAP/LDF0011760/843]**

- Must ensure 'community' is built into new plans. In particular All Saints Church in Kings Road could be improved as a centre
- Are there 'sacred spaces' for the community, youth groups, and ecumenical groups separate from actual churches?
- Happy to be involved in discussion on people's future welfare needs

## **DEVELOPERS/LANDOWNERS - NORTH EAST CHELMSFORD**

### **Countryside Zest (agent Andrew Martin Associates) [REG25/PO/NCAAP/LDF001 I 709/657]**

Extensive representations have been submitted regarding Land at NE Chelmsford including a retail statement and research report in respect of proposed business park development.

The representation promotes the delivery of a new neighbourhood to the NE of Chelmsford and sets out concerns in relation to a number of key issues:

- Consistency of NCAAP with national policy and the conformity with the adopted Core Strategy.
- The mistranslations of the Inspector's directions on the Core Strategy into the Preferred Options NCAAP document.
- The mistranslations between regional policy and the Preferred Options NCAAP document.
- The overall soundness of NCAAP based upon the revised tests in PPS12

The substantive concerns are identified as:

- The contents of the NCAAP in view of the uncertainty regarding the funding and timeline for the North East By-pass.
- The consideration of reasonable alternatives and appropriate contingencies.
- The necessary commitments required from both Chelmsford Borough Council and Essex County Council to affect a deliverable strategy.

Key Specific objections include:

- The NCAAP fails to meet the objectives set out in MG1, MG5, MG4, EPE1, BCI, QLI, QL2, QL3, QL4, ECPI and ECP2.
- Objection to the proposed employment strategy within NCAAP and promotion of a single 50,000 sq m. business park, north east of Boreham Interchange.
- Strong objection to identification of proposed Gypsy and Traveller site in NCAAP.
- Objection to the limiting of retail floorspace and location of proposed local centres and the inclusion of significant employment space within local centres.
- Objections regarding the specific safeguarded land surrounding New Hall and the interpretation of its setting.
- NE-Bypass should not solely be described as a structuring principle.
- Objection raised with regard to the omission of a contingency for non-delivery of NE By-pass.
- Railway Station evidence base appears lacking in terms of delivery, governance, timelines and joint working.
- Concerns over access from west via Belsteads Farm junction.
- Proposed Secondary School should be located east of Essex Regiment Way/North of White Hart Lane.

**Toveglen (agent Andrew Martin Associates) [REG25/PO/NCAAP/LDF10797/615]**

Do not believe that 64,000m<sup>2</sup> of commercial new floorspace can be achieved with the sites identified in the AAP. Concerned there are insufficient sites for B2 and B8 uses, currently only Site 14 is proposed for this.

Therefore propose that Drakes Lane should be extended to the west on part of the site already lawfully used for storage and parking; and land further to the west (2.15 hectares).

- Opportunities to expand existing and provide for new businesses
- Land is unfarmed and overgrown
- Previously developed land (WWII)
- Consolidation of existing prosperous employment site
- Location and mature screen planting lend location to 'non-conforming' uses from other sites better used for housing etc

**Alan Saywell (Agent Andrew Martin Associates)  
[REG25/PO/NCAAP/LDF0011687/656]**

Area for Gypsy and Traveller site is not suitable.

- Encroachment on open countryside, site is exposed and visible'
- Disturbance of protected species (Great Crested Newts)
- Access not guaranteed from NE Chelmsford development, and inappropriate from Essex Regiment Way
- Lack of evidence of alternatives considered and reasons for rejection
- Lack of evidence of consultation with Gypsy and Traveller community
- Site has too many pitches, does not meet Gypsy and Traveller needs/desires – Approach 1 preferred
- No realistic likelihood of site being made available by landowner

**Granville Developments (Agent Andrew Martin Associates)  
[REG25/PO/NCAAP/LDF0008834/616]**

In respect of land east of Boreham Interchange.

Disagrees with choice of location for employment sites. Suggests land closer to Boreham Interchange (30% former brownfield land) instead of NCAAP proposal.

NCAAP proposal:

- Greenfield location in middle of agricultural land, random location
- No evidence base or intended employment use to support allocation
- Harmful impact on setting of Boreham House and character of Chelmer river valley
- No highway access, distant from proposed railway station and existing services, access road would need lighting

Respondent's proposal:

- Missed opportunity
- Proposes office-led business park, similar to respondent's scheme at Feering

- Good location in relation to new railway station, and nearby hotel/pub facilities
- No harm caused to setting of Boreham House, other nearby new development has been acceptable in this regard
- Land between site and edge of Boreham development would be given to parish or CBC to protect against future loss of gap between settlements

### **New Hall School (Agent LDA Design) [REG25/PO/NCAAP/LDF0011691/661]**

Detailed report outlines concerns. These include:

- Regard for the importance of New Hall as an educational facility
- Surrounding the school with development
- Destruction of rural setting and way of life
- Effect on historic environment
- Effects on the school as a business, its ethos and values
- Weakness in transport infrastructure delivery, in relation to housing delivery - phasing
- Location of railway station
- Close proximity of proposed secondary school, interaction of pupils
- Effect of employment led development around station on school setting

Some areas of development are accepted, but deletions and appropriate mitigation measures and suggested.

Further representations detailed the school's own anticipated growth and suggested measures to mitigate heritage impact.

In addition a 'petition' of 133 individual letters and 106 signatures of pupils attending New Hall Preparatory School were received.

### **Mid Essex Gravel Ltd (Agent Savills)**

*Relating to Drakes Farm, Cranham Road. [REG25/PO/NCAAP/LDF0002202/611]*

Full support for proposals to make Drakes Lane site an Employment Policy Area.

Propose extending this to up to 7.5 hectares of employment development with associated landscaping, and new access from Cranham Road. High quality buildings, lighting, landscaping, sustainability and transport links are envisaged.

*Relating to Strategic Framework Masterplan relating to MEG sites in Plan area.*

### **[REG25/PO/NCAAP/LDF0002202/662]**

- Scope for utilising land adjacent to Essex Regiment Way including land to the south of Belsteads Farm Lane for employment and leisure uses.
- Proposed visitor centre at Essex Regiment Way
- Movement of golf course to the north to allow for landscaping of Park and Ride site, some residential development, enhanced facilities for golf club
- Propose using land south of Belsteads Farm Lane for some high quality employment, in addition to/instead of NCAAP's suggested leisure uses

**Peter Marriage, W & H Marriage & Sons [REG25/PO/NCAAP/LDF0011099/722]**

Requests that Drakes Lane Employment Policy Area is expanded to accommodate relocation of W & H Marriage & Sons. Company's success and changing markets mean that present site (New Street) is restricting ability to compete. Requirements for a site are:

- 5ha plus landscaping
- Good power supply
- Good road network links
- Proximity to suppliers and labour force

Drakes Lane would meet these needs.

**The Ford Motor Company [REG25/PO/NCAAP/LDF0010923/855]**

Promotes development of Boreham Airfield as an alternative to NCAAP proposals.

**CEMEX [REG25/PO/NCAAP/LDF0001149/833]**

Promotes development at Boreham Airfield as an alternative to NCAAP proposals.

**Mr & Mrs D Jones [REG25/PO/NCAAP/LDF9000119/951]**

Object to proposal for neighbourhood centre at Old Lodge Farm (in their ownership).

## **DEVELOPERS/LANDOWNERS - NORTH WEST CHELMSFORD**

### **Bellway Homes and Herts Property Investments (Agent David Lock Associates) [REG25/PO/NCAAP/LDF0010924/663]**

Dispersed approach for NW Chelmsford does not meet implied centralised approach of CS Inspector's comments at examination, earlier options for NCAAP, Government policy. Not the most appropriate approach in terms of spatial planning and sustainable development. The dispersed approach would mean:

- New developments would be too small to support new community facilities and could not physically accommodate the level development proposed.
- Difficult to deliver 'leading edge' examples of sustainable development; could not collectively maximise opportunities.
- Not compliant with Core Strategy not a single new neighbourhood.
- New developments unable to develop a sense of character
- No firm proposals for accessible local facilities and services
- Fragmented transport provision
- Few opportunities for employment
- Unlikely to support utility infrastructure improvements
- Increases car based travel

Promotes a centralised, comprehensive mixed-use urban extension to west/north west of Broomfield; 'leading edge development' (part of Site C on NCAAP Diagram 21).

- 800 dwellings
- Neighbourhood centre
- New primary school
- Internal walking and cycling links, less car travel
- Alternative hospital access
- Relocated playing fields for KEGS
- Business and medical employment area (NCAAP Site 8, Hospital Approach)
- Energy centre
- Simple ownership means early delivery, flexibility of phasing.

### **Chelmer Housing Partnership Ltd [REG25/PO/NCAAP/LDF0010908/613] Christian Growth Centre [REG25/PO/NCAAP/LDF0001031/903]**

Propose development of land at Chignall Road, between Avon Road and Brick Barns Lane for 90-150 new dwellings (2.5 hectares).

- Private and social housing
- Low lying – no visual intrusion
- Land is unused, rough scrub, uncared for
- Would create defensible boundary
- No flood risk (source EA)
- Early delivery
- Consistent with NCAAP objectives
- Smaller homes to free up larger CHP properties in North Melbourne area

- Shared ownership possibilities
- Brings investment to the area
- Good access to local facilities
- Indirectly lifts usage and quality of schools, shops, community facilities, faith community
- Scope for improving local shops in partnership with CBC and local community

**Persimmon Homes (Essex) Ltd (Agent Pegasus Planning Group)  
[REG25/PO/NCAAP/LDF0008557/614]**

NCAAP is not flexible enough to respond to changing circumstances beyond 2021; sets maximum rather than minimum targets in conflict with EEP; dispersed development in NW Chelmsford is not a comprehensive approach.

- Cohesive neighbourhood more effective than dispersed approach
- Integration into new neighbourhoods of dispersed sites difficult to achieve
- Cumulative benefits of infrastructure and community improvements would not be met
- Site 7 does not appear large enough to accommodate proposals
- Site 8 is too remote from town centre, would add to congestion

Proposes development incorporating Site 5 and Site 6, including land in between the two sites and around Priors Farm (part of site A on NCAAP Diagram 21).

- Early delivery
- Improved public transport, open space, play areas – of particular benefit to St Andrews and Patching Hall
- Range of housing in character areas
- Possibility of locating new primary school on site (replacing Broomfield School)
- Traffic benefits on Patching Hall Lane, Hollow Lane, School Lane
- Main site access on Chignall Road
- Closure of Patching Hall Lane at northern end except emergency, public transport, pedestrians, cycles
- Hollow Lane joins residential access road instead of Chignall Road

**Taylor Wimpey Developments Ltd (Agent Pegasus Planning Group)  
[REG25/PO/NCAAP/LDF0011712/817]**

Chelmsford has been identified as a Key Centre for Development and Change (KCDC)

- Dispersed approach for NW Chelmsford does not meet implied centralised approach of CS
- Cohesive neighbourhood not delivered through dispersed approach
- Objects to ceiling of 800 homes for NW Chelmsford
- Objects to Site Allocation 8, no relationship to KCDC
- NCAAP is not flexible enough to respond to changing circumstances beyond 2021 and fails to acknowledge future growth
- NW Chelmsford growth should be at edge of Chelmsford, not Broomfield
- Objects to extension of Chelmsford Urban Area to incorporate Broomfield

## **The Brown Family (Agent Brian Lingard) [REG25/PO/NCAAP/LDF0001647/664]**

Proposes development at Woodhouse Land, Broomfield (north of Woodhouse Lane).

On 0.75 hectares of overall 6 hectare site:

- Employment opportunities building to form open-ended square between new buildings and front of hospital
- Community services, e.g. shop, branch library, primary care, café, childcare, health club
- Supplementary hospital services, e.g. diagnostic and treatment facilities
- Basement car parking

Remainder of land:

- 184 dwellings ranging from 1 and 2 bedroomed flats, 2 and 3 bedroomed linked houses, elderly person's flats, 3 and 4 bedroomed detached houses, townhouses
- Parking
- Footpath and cycle track
- North Court Road diverted into site
- Suggests alternative dwelling mix to that proposed in NCAAP, particularly in relation to affordable housing (less than 35%)

## **Mid Essex Gravel Ltd (Agent Savills)**

*Relating to Champions Farm, Saxon Way, Broomfield. [REG25/PO/NCAAP/LDF0002202/612]*

Residential development is proposed on the Days Garage site and on agricultural land behind it (6.765 hectares).

- 80-100 new homes
- Good access to local facilities, public transport and cycle network
- Development would provide enhancement of Main Road frontage
- An attractive edge to Saxon Way
- Landscape strategy for integration with countryside
- Focal building on corner of Main Road and Saxon Way

*Relating to executive housing development proposal for site at Little Waltham.*

**[REG25/PO/NCAAP/LDF0002202/796]**

Suggest sites should be identified for low density executive housing to aid attraction of senior executives to the local economy.

Propose 10 dwellings to the hectare – site is 3.25 hectare, to accommodate 5-6 executive homes. Adds to mix of housing types, high quality individual design and landscaping.

## **Miscoe Enterprises (Agent Andrew Martin Associates)**

**[REG25/PO/NCAAP/LDF0001083/317]**

In respect of land at Brooklands, Broomfield.

Green wedge boundary should be redrawn to exclude part of the land at Brooklands. This would enable housing development to the north and south of the main house. Parts of the land

within the Green Wedge allocation are in private ownership, and therefore are not suitable for nature conservation/recreation as stated in the allocation. Excluding the representation site would have no impact on the function or visual quality of the green wedge.

- The potential of land at Brooklands for small scale housing development is not recognised in the NCAAP.
- Well located for community facilities and public transport, and can be delivered early.
- The defined settlement boundary should be extended to include this site.

**Granville Developments (Agent Andrew Martin Associates)**  
**[REG25/PO/NCAAP/LDF0008820/318]**

In respect of land at Three Gables, Broomfield.

- Green wedge boundary should be redrawn to exclude land at The Gables. It currently reads as part of the urban area.
- Two options are proposed, 14 units or higher density 25 units.
- Supports Broomfield Place proposal, but considers Three Gables should be added.
- Benefits from the same food services and facilities.
- No impact on the appearance or function of the Green Wedge.
- The defined settlement boundary should be extended to include this site.

**Countryside Properties (Agent Andrew Martin Associates)**

*Proposes development at Stacey's Farm, School Lane, Broomfield.*

**[REG25/PO/NCAAP/LDF0011700/617]**

Dispersed approach for NW Chelmsford does not meet implied centralised approach of CS Inspector's comments at examination, earlier options for NCAAP, Government policy.

- New developments would be too small to support new community facilities
- Lacks critical mass
- Impact of development on Broomfield Place, Priors, Hollow Lane
- Two southern sites remote from Broomfield Hospital, and public transport

Proposed 'centralised' approach includes Stacey's Farm in addition to West of Broomfield Place (scaled back version of PO) and North of Hospital Approach (similar to PO) to create an 800 home neighbourhood, providing:

- Dedicated bus and cycle way between Stacey's Farm and north Broomfield to relieve Main Road traffic
- Access from School Lane
- Community hub
- Retail and community facilities
- Expanded primary school
- Proximity to Broomfield hospital and Chelmer Valley High School
- Promotes sustainable travel

*Proposes use of land at Williams Road for access in relation to other proposals.*

**[REG25/PO/NCAAP/LDF0004161/798]**

- Possibility of access using land immediately west of Williams Road to link to potential development land to the west (detail in other reps)
- Contribution to an accessible neighbourhood
- Not in Conservation Area or protected landscape

**Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd (Agent Indigo Planning)**

**[REG25/PO/NCAAP/LDF0008845/728]**

Considers that Sainsbury's store at Colchester Road should be designated as a Neighbourhood Centre – community role already being increased by approval of plans for a doctors' surgery there.

**Mrs J Fairweather (Agent R W Land & Planning)**

**[REG25/PO/NCAAP/LDF0011713/848]**

Supports Allocation 8 North of Hospital Approach, Broomfield;  
Promotes inclusion of land to the south of Runnymede Cottage in the allocation (1.5 acres with 0.9 for development and 0.6 as open space). This is adjacent to the north edge of Site Allocation 8, fronting Main Road.

- Potential for 14 homes
- Private land, unused / scrub
- Development would have little impact on distant views
- Rear boundary of site in line with adjacent gardens
- Established hedgerows and mature trees form boundaries
- Within containment boundary suggested in NCAAP Diagram 7
- Opportunity to improve Woodhouse Lane/Main Road junction
- Early delivery possible

Objects to Allocation 5, North of Copperfield Road:

- Large scale backland development that will be hard to integrate with existing development
- Encroachment into the countryside
- Encourages car use

**J Day, Days of Chelmsford [REG25/PO/NCAAP/LDF0011098/749]**

Supports inclusion of 74 Main Road within Defined Settlement Boundary. Refers to Savills' previous work on her behalf and their design brief encompassing the site.

**Bovis Homes [REG25/PO/NCAAP/LDF0011350/747]**

- NCAAP is not flexible enough to respond to changing circumstances beyond 2021 - timescale is too short. A substantial volume of additional land should be identified.
- Proposes land east of White Mead (5 acres) for development, on periphery of built-up area. Broomfield Defined Settlement Boundary should be extended to include land east of White Mead and north of Glebe Crescent.
- Bovis has scaled back earlier proposals, discussed with CBC last year, and understood there were reasonable prospects of this land being included in NCAAP.
- Cross Valley Link – land should be safeguarded in the longer term to allow future flexibility. Designation of Green Wedge would not permit any enabling development, meaning any provision would have to come from public funds. NCAAP should show previously identified routes, amend western boundary of Green Wedge, look favourably on development proposals that could deliver Cross Valley Link.

**JWF Hughes, Mid Essex Gravel and MJ Peters  
[REG25/PO/NCAAP/LDF0008899/910]**

Promotes residential development east of Vellacotts/Campions Farm on land proposed for Green Wedge designation.

## APPENDIX 2 – PUBLIC RESPONSES - SUMMARISED MAIN ISSUES

This Appendix lists the main issues raised by members of the public responding to the North Chelmsford Area Action Plan consultation. These are presented as summaries of actual comments received.

These have been grouped into topics as follows:

<b>TOPIC</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
Development North East	27
Development North West	28
Employment strategy and sites	30
Financing, phasing and delivery	32
Green infrastructure	33
Gypsies and Travellers	35
Housing general	36
Landscape and heritage	37
Local neighbourhood centres and retail	38
Masterplanning, place making and design	41
Minerals and restoration	42
New Hall	43
Schools location and specification	44
Settlement boundaries	45
Themes and objectives	47
Sustainable Transport, Rail Station and Road Networks	48
Utilities infrastructure	55
Other Matters	56

## **Main issues - Development Site Allocations North East**

### **Suggested alternative locations:**

- More sensible development would be to create a viable, sustainable new community at Boreham aerodrome - gives scale for employment opportunities, station usage and can plan-in excellent access from the outset – this a lost opportunity
- Would prefer centralised development around Broomfield Hospital
- All of the new development should be in NE Chelmsford in one location
- St Peters College is closing – why not build houses there rather than in green belt?
- Residential housing to the south of Broomfield should be allocated to extra land being made available north of New Hall School, to a boundary in line with the latitude of Hospital Approach
- Build another 2,000 new homes on the vacant land (except for car boot sales) to the south of Boreham House – protecting its exceptional front aspect and long lake setting – and bounded to the west by the A12 and to the south by the Navigational Canal

### **General:**

- The proposed new housing is in too big a block in each and every area
- Would prefer smaller and more managed development throughout the whole of the Chelmsford area
- Ideal for development - major services for roads already exist, hospital nearby and schools sufficient for extra population
- Scale of protected land B seems unnecessary – Area A could also be extended slightly north and/or east towards the NE Bypass without significant environmental impact
- Proposed new houses in Newland Spring will be detached from the existing residential areas
- Proposed development at Lawn lane – concern about loss of existing uses
- Land is urgently needed by the Local Showman of Essex
- Insufficient SME accommodation
- New football stadium at this location would allow Chelmsford City supporters to use rail services – reduce congestion, linking with employment land would allow shared car parking
- Encourage possible provision of a Scout Hut in the NCAAP proposals for the First North Springfield Scout Group
- Station location will bring noise, light pollution and thousands of vehicles in close contact with currently overcrowded town environs
- Area does not demand more executive 4+ bedroom homes as the plan states

## **Main issues – Development Site Allocations North West**

### **Specific areas:**

#### **Broomfield:**

- Previous proposals suggested development around Broomfield Hospital – this is a departure from that
- Concern at loss of distinction and space between Broomfield village and Chelmsford, disregard for benefits of village life
- Houses should be close to employment sites – not possible in Broomfield
- Residential housing to the south of Broomfield should be allocated to extra land being made available north of New Hall School, to a boundary in line with the latitude of Hospital Approach
- There should be NO development north of Hospital Approach. This road should be maintained as a natural barrier to further development between Broomfield and Little Waltham
- If it is not possible to build all new houses in the NE development, the next best option is to build these houses in the areas of Broomfield Place and land to the west, and Broomfield Primary School and North of Hospital Approach and South of Woodhouse Lane
- Further consideration could be given to land west of Longshots Close previously identified in the NCAAP 2007 Issues and Options document at Options 2 and 3
- Any development here should include a central ‘green’ to add to Broomfield’s existing 5 greens
- Proposals would elongate the shape of Broomfield village - geographical integrity and unity of the village would suffer as a result
- There is scope for small developments such as north of hospital approach and on the Day's garage site if it is eventually closed, but the hundreds more houses will completely change the character of the village.
- A small addition should be made to the settlement area behind Days Garage to allow extra houses and green recreational space at the Saxon burial site
- What access will new estate to be built on site of Broomfield Primary School have?

#### **Newlands Spring:**

- Development north of Oliver Road will increase urban sprawl into countryside
- Conservation and heritage north of Copperfield Road – Hollow Lane is a country lane with listed buildings; agricultural land and paths will be lost, wildlife habitat destroyed
- North Springfield area is not near enough to existing facilities and therefore has to be self-sufficient
- Housing at North of Copperfield Road is the least defensible of those suggested in NW Chelmsford – intrudes into valuable landscape
- The aesthetics and feel of the estate would be changed adversely with the addition of new housing

- If development was tightly constrained around the built up area along Chignal Road, to the west and south west of the proposed allocation, a suitable extension to the current residential area could be provided. This would be well integrated with the existing built form of the neighbourhood and not visually intrusive.
- North of Copperfield Rd Site 5 - should be employment priority area

**General comments:**

- Generally don't think the roads/infrastructure will support the volume of additional traffic
- Politicians previously stated only 300 homes would be built in NW Chelmsford
- North west has limited community facilities
- Airfield at Boreham would have less impact on all communities and it is nearer the planned new railway line and A130
- No reference made to opportunity to build a new football stadium in North Chelmsford
- Additional sites need to be identified, including land at Baddow Meads to allow the housing needs of the whole community to be met
- NE Chelmsford has far greater capacity to accept additional housing and associated infrastructure
- Housing should be built in areas where there are sufficient transport links and facilities i.e.) The East of Chelmsford , Boreham A12
- Great Waltham could sustain a far greater proportion of the 'expansion' requirements than has been proposed
- With suitable flood plain provisions, Little Waltham could support more development than has been proposed by in-filling between the existing village and the existing Waltham bypass
- The housing would be better deployed near to the proposed development of the new Chelmsford train station where the facilities and new infrastructure would be new and specifically designed for such needs
- More local allotments required
- Site 15 - Site should maintain health function as well as housing
- Reduce number of houses to less than 1,000, and move the houses to the rear of New Hall so that they cannot be seen to ruin the context of New Hall and at least 200 metres from the boundaries
- Build 2000 new homes along shallow strip to the east side of the A130 (Essex Regiment Way) with the disused quarry at Barnstead's Farm Lane at its centre – would eliminate intrusion into the heritage surroundings of New Hall and Old Lodge Farm, with access from the roundabouts at Belstead, Pratts and Wheelers Farm lanes
- Consideration should be given to further housing to the rear of the Lawford Mead estate which would not encroach on valuable landscape – good road access, additional access from Roxwell Road, infrastructure in place

## **Main issues – Employment Strategy and Sites (inc Broomfield Hospital)**

### **Need:**

- Do the plans supply enough employment?
- Is the future forecast for need too optimistic?
- There already lots of empty business premises, vacant premises and sites should be used first
- Need to take account of the economic climate
- Sustainable, long term solutions are needed
- Many workers out-commute
- Doesn't address training

### **Type of employment - Respondents suggested a need for:**

- Manufacturing businesses, B2 and B8
- Skills based employment, not just service based
- Higher paid technical jobs
- Home-working opportunities
- Careers, not just jobs
- Small business units
- A range of jobs and salaries that match housing types

### **Location:**

- Does not provide new jobs at Newlands Spring or Broomfield – should be considered
- Industry needed close to new railway, with associated railway siding
- Both support and opposition for the possibility of employment development East of the new bypass
- Boreham Airfield would provide good location for a business park
- Lawnside Farm on Chelmer Valley Road as a gateway development
- Essex Regiment Way site should be returned to agriculture, or not allowed to expand
- Proposals affect the setting of New Hall and Boreham House
- Employment should be close to efficient public transport systems, and close to new housing areas, commuting distance should be reduced as much as possible

- Drakes Lane boundary should be tightly drawn with no extensions
- Site north of Copperfield Road could be used for employment to help local deprivation, also to provide training
- Concentrate new development south of B1117 behind Royal Mail, B&Q etc
- Link employment development to a new football stadium so that parking can be shared

**General concerns:**

- Affect on landscape
- High rise buildings should be limited
- Bypass should be built before other development
- Impact on traffic, particularly at Boreham Interchange, Broomfield Road

### **Main issues – Financing, Phasing and Delivery**

- Large number of comments express a view of the importance of building infrastructure before houses, particularly the bypass, as well as schools, railway station, other transport networks, healthcare, improvements to Boreham Interchange.
- Many people have picked up on the possibility that funding might not become available for the bypass.
- What guarantees are there that facilities will be delivered – Beaulieu Park had planned facilities that have not materialised, railway station has been promised for many years.
- Current infrastructure is already overloaded including roads, schools, doctors, cycleways, sewage.
- In some areas (e.g. Newlands Spring) the opportunities for expanding the existing facilities are very limited.
- Concerns about the ability of Broomfield Hospital to accommodate needs of new residents, other healthcare facilities needed (doctors, dentists).
- Clarity is sought over how community facilities and infrastructure improvements will be financed, and how the funding will be secured, and costs of different elements.
- Concerns that new building will lead to flooding.
- Plans will create years of building work which will be disruptive for existing residents.
- Rigorous delivery programme management will be needed.
- Safeguard sought that if infrastructure is not provided, development would be slowed or halted.
- Management is not included – management of community centres, landscape and heritage, open space.
- Does the plan take account of the potential lack of available building contractors due to the Olympics?

## **Main issues – Green Infrastructure**

### **General:**

- Public open spaces should be accessible and not need people to drive to it.
- Open space should be within the development areas, so there is good access.
- Contradiction of building on current open spaces, farmland should be protected.
- Who takes responsibility for management and maintenance of open space?
- There should be much greater provision for allotments.
- Concern that the gap between Chelmsford and Broomfield is being reduced by new development, and that the two will start to merge.
- Open spaces are important for drainage of pathways, controlling surface water runoff rates, improving water quality and as ecological corridors.
- Should include cycle paths.
- Are the size of biodiversity corridors sufficient?
- Protecting land now limits future flexibility.
- Concern at the reduction in gap between Chelmsford and Broomfield.
- Formal open space also needed – playing pitches, sports courts, sports fields etc.
- What is the definition of the leisure arc?

### **Site specific:**

- South of New Hall – space should be protected from ChART, should not be turned into public open space but should be left as it is, proposed parkland is too close to school grounds,
- Should keep a continuous green corridor between New Hall and Old Lodge Farm to White Hart Lane.
- Open space around Beaulieu Park should be protected, residents were told this would remain permanent open space when purchasing their homes
- Existing parks at Patching Hall Lane and Melbourne are bleak – new spaces need to be better than these.
- Land north of Newlands Spring should also be a green wedge.
- Broomfield church and lower pastures should be preserved.
- Area between North Springfield and Channels as should be protected as open space.
- All land at Ash Tree Stud Farm, Little Waltham should be incorporated into green wedge and protected from development. Development in North Melbourne/Newlands Spring should be contained by the current open countryside.

- Wooded area within green wedge opposite Mid Essex Gravel should be designated for nature conservation.
- Green wedge should include site allocations 2, 3 and 4.
- The Upper Chelmer Valley Green Wedge site allocation is too broad – hinders potential of suitable development sites within this area.
- Angel Green, Broomfield Place and surrounds should become a conservation area.
- Should designate a 'green wedge' between Danbury and Boreham to protect views of Danbury Ridge.
- Pot Ash, Broom Pightle & Night Pasture should be mentioned.
- Developments off Essex Avenue and Hollow Lane encroach on Green Wedge.
- Prominent ridge lines of the plateau of the Pleshey Farmland Plateau should be protected.
- Ideal future use of gravel workings is to create a future country park, also could protect Boreham from expansion.

## **Main issues – Gypsies and Travellers**

### **General comments**

- There was a lot of general opposition to the provision of sites for Gypsies and Travellers.
- Many people simply stated they did not want a site close to them.
- Others were concerned about potential social problems including crime, effect on house prices.
- How will it be managed and how will unauthorised expansion be prevented?
- Desire expressed for land to be allocated in NE Chelmsford to the Showmen of Essex.
- Would the site be fully used?
- Travellers should be encouraged to apply for permanent housing to integrate into society better.
- How would the site be funded?
- Any site must be properly contained and landscaped.
- Have the Gypsy and Traveller community been consulted?

### **Location**

- Location would harm the character of the area and have an unacceptable visual impact.
- A less visible location should be chosen, this is the first thing people will see at the edge of Chelmsford, it would detract from the openness.
- Too close to the Park and Ride site.
- Too close to green wedge, negative impact on environment of river valley.
- Concerns about access and impact of turning traffic, particularly larger vehicles.
- Suggest a site further along Essex Regiment way close to one of the existing roundabouts, due to potential traffic issues.
- Third site in Little Waltham is unwelcome – schools and doctors cannot cope with the extra pressure.  
Would access be available from the NE Chelmsford development?
- Safety concerns as the site is adjacent to a gas sub-station.

### **Main issues – Housing General**

- There were many comments from respondents saying that new housing is not needed and is unwelcome.
- Questions as to whether forecasts need to be amended in light of current economic conditions.
- Plan should also address needs and forecast in the next period after the current plan
- Need to balance needs of new communities with those of existing residents.
- The land is perfectly good arable land and should not be spoilt by more housing – use brownfield sites first
- Proposed development does not achieve NCAAP aim of creating a community hub round Broomfield
- Allocation made now should be centred on one general location
- Development should be centralised rather than dispersed to encourage supporting infrastructure
- A separate development further north with A12 and rail access would better meet the needs of those who would live there.
- Development between Boreham and Hatfield Peverel would be far more strategic and could utilise a current railway station outside of Chelmsford
- Do not agree that the locations for growth that have been selected are capable of being integrated into existing neighbourhoods
- Smaller, more numerous developments would be less damaging to the landscape
- More housing should be provided in the short term – proposals will take a long time to implement
- Plan should reflect needs post 2021 in line with recent announcements for anticipated growth
- Are aspirations for 30% bungalows and 35% affordable realistic?
- Will the level of affordable housing meet needs?
- Affordable housing should be situated as close to town as possible – minimises transport costs
- Need for more smaller houses as part of the mix, 1 and 2 bedroomed
- More provision should be made for care dwellings and sheltered houses
- More low cost housing needed for key workers
- Housing growth should be limited to match availability of work in the local area
- More homes should be built on land not used for farming
- Excessive increase in housing densities should be avoided

### **Main issues – Landscape and Heritage**

General concerns expressed about the effect on wildlife and its habitats, natural beauty, the wider environment, biodiversity and nature conservation, landscape, woodland, heritage, rural character, future noise or light pollution

#### **Landscape:**

- Chelmer Valley floor in Broomfield should be protected at all costs
- Concern about light pollution into Chelmer river valley
- Should be no hard-surfaced tracks or paths along the Chelmer Valley close to the river
- Rural landscape and greenfield sites in North West Chelmsford should be Sites of Special Scientific Interest
- Maintaining characteristics of plateau landscape not considered, field boundary and hedgerow patterns would not be conserved, especially around the proposed site for the station
- Plan should note protected species on land east of Beaulieu Park
- Is Generals Lane to be a protected lane?
- Pratts Farm Lane is a protected lane and should not be included in any development
- Rural character of Belsteads Farm Lane should be protected
- Hollow Lane used more for recreational purposes than other lanes – needs protection
- All medieval sunken lanes should be protected
- No reference in document to Broomfield church, Broomfield Hall and Church Green and relationship to open countryside
- Concern over close proximity of protected woodland to public open space
- Potential loss of access to pathways and links into countryside
- Development could intrude and affect views to and from ridges and plateau landscapes
- Area between Newland Grove and Little Waltham Meadows (both Essex Wildlife Trust sites) plagued by motorcycles and off road vehicles – destroys landscape, noise pollution. Whole area should be used for nature conservation and wildlife
- Woodland on Blasford Hill should be protected

#### **Heritage:**

- Some Listed Buildings not shown – Chobbing's Farmhouse, Barn at Chobbing's Farm, Granary at Chobbing's Farm, Barn at Scrael's House, Staceys, Bulls Lodge Cottages, Generals Farm
- Proposals affect the setting of Boreham house and grounds, New Hall, Bulls Lodge, Priors
- Heritage settings for Old Lodge Farm and Bulls Lodge Farm should be separately identified

- Careful consideration of the historic environment in the master planning stages will be necessary
- Structuring Principle 2 deals only with built heritage but not wider historic environment issues
- Setting of significant buildings in Broomfield including Broomfield Place would be severely affected
- Need to consider Roman remains in Newlands Spring and Chignal, Iron age fort at Springfield Lyons, Saxon site at Broomfield, and other important archaeological remains

## **Main issues – Local/Neighbourhood Centres and Retail**

### **General:**

- Concern that proposals put extra strain on Broomfield Hospital, dental practices, doctors, fire service, police, parking, shops, schools
- Use of any of the proposed facilities depends on good access
- Community facilities should be multi-purpose in nature providing indoor space for leisure, arts, community and entertainment events, they could be combined with changing facilities on a sports field, for economy of scale and efficiency of management
- Facilities should be centrally located, with good access for pedestrians, cyclists and car drivers
- Facilities for churches or other places for religious worship should be included in the community facilities, though sharing might not be suitable for some groups
- Damaging impact of neighbourhood centre near Old Lodge Farm – listed buildings
- Specific facilities would be welcomed – Scout accommodation, football stadium, outdoor sports courts and indoor sports halls
- Should be greater exploration of the possibility of linking the education with early years and adult training opportunities.

### **Newlands Spring:**

- Existing centre would not be large enough. New facilities should include playground and sports provision, improved library, enlarged school, improved community hall

### **Broomfield:**

- Would welcome new primary school with community facilities and/or an extended community centre, facilities for sports, youth and arts clubs, police office
- Days garage could be used as local centre with relocated food store
- If local centre was north of Broomfield Place it would be more central for users
- Sports hall is already planned for current Broomfield school site, include this in the NCAAP

### **Retail/Shopping:**

- Shopping centres should be close to or central within the new developments, and near to other community facilities
- 'Express' type shop will not be big enough to serve the amount of housing proposed - a larger shop would be required
- Existing shopping precincts, supermarkets and retail parks are sufficient for projected needs
- Already vacant shops in the town centre
- Should encourage smaller specialist shops that would lead to the generation of a unique identity to the community

- Any new shopping needs good car parking
- Concern about vandalism and anti-social behaviour in the local centres after working and shop opening hours
- Woodhall Parade may not be able to provide enough shops for development north of Essex Avenue, redevelop former church site for retail

**Health care:**

- Specialist services should be at Broomfield - eye, diabetes and heart clinics
- Already plenty of health facilities – will be able to meet projected needs
- When the current upgrade to Broomfield Hospital is complete it will have approximately 200 less beds
- Additional pressure will have a further negative impact on performance of Broomfield Hospital
- Existing healthcare facilities should be improved rather than building new facilities
- Additional, localised, secondary care facilities should be included
- Broomfield – needs a GP surgery in a central position

**Libraries:**

- Chelmsford Library and the mobile library cover the whole Chelmsford area adequately
- Are libraries needed with the internet, will demand decline in the future?
- Broomfield library should be improved, larger, longer opening hours, better access and parking
- North Springfield has waited 30 years for a library
- Newlands Spring library could be relocated elsewhere, and the existing building used to expand the school

## **Main issues – Masterplanning, Place Making, Design**

### **Masterplanning:**

- More sports facilities encouraged for varied recreation – indoor and outdoor, especially for children, post-school activities, home ground for local youth football club, possible new City Football Club stadium which could also provide other community uses
- Facilities needed for other youth activities – youth clubs, Scouts/Guides
- Golf clubs and Falcon bowls club need to be retained
- Could achieve aims with an eco-town on Boreham Airfield
- Relocate Council's recycling and waste centres from between the A138 and B1137 out of town, redevelop the land to provide park and ride facility
- Have all the suitable brownfield sites been explored?
- If the existing lorry park is to be redeveloped, alternative provision should be provided.

### **Design:**

- Development should allow for small front gardens
- New houses should not be too close together
- Buildings should be well insulated and carbon neutral, and consider sustainable building, energy consumption, grey water collection from drainage, solar heating, insulation
- Good design can be prohibitively expensive – funding difficulties could lead to compromise
- More consideration should be given to climate change and other environmental aspects
- Private and public sector building styles and materials should preserve the identity of rural and semi rural North Chelmsford – no modern landmark styles, general height guideline should be reduced to 2 storeys.
- Rendered or timbered exteriors, clay tiled and thatched roofs may not be appropriate for Newlands Spring
- Village Design Statements and Parish plans should be taken into account
- Design guidelines for hospital buildings should contain a building height restriction to avoid detrimental visual intrusion
- Design guidelines should apply to employment development as well as housing
- Is there an architectural style for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century or will we get a hotch-potch of 400 years of Essex vernacular like Beaulieu Park?
- Plan should distinguish between the differing standards of, and facilities needed within, accommodation for the frail compared with the able bodied
- Design guidance will only ensure quality if it is followed strictly – how will this be ensured?

### **Main issues – Minerals and Restoration**

- To reduce the visibility of the proposed P&R consideration should be given to the extraction of gravel from the site before the hard surface is put down.
- Entire mineral site should become a country park when redundant as intended in original permission – will protect Boreham from eastward expansion of Chelmsford.  
A sailing lake should be provided at former quarry works.
- Unlimited mineral extraction will have an effect on the water table in the area.
- What reason is there for Boreham Airfield being allocated for housing and/or industrial use instead of agriculture or recreational lake?
- Reassurance sought that minerals extracted along the line of NE bypass will not be processed at St Clere's Pit, Danbury.
- Whole of Area C should be set aside for visitor attraction

### **Main issues – New Hall**

- New Hall School will be badly affected: too many buildings crammed in to insufficient space; too much burden on existing infrastructures
- Development is too close to Beaulieu Park and New Hall School
- Location of employment and residential development within close proximity of New Hall will severely affect setting
- Possible pollution around New Hall School from extra business/industry
- Proposals could affect attractiveness New Hall's future as a business
- Open space proposals (regarding the public park to the south of New Hall) will have a serious affect on New Hall as regards security
- Proposed 'deep buffer' should cover whole of Hew Hall driveway
- Views from the rail line (people on trains) should not be forgotten
- Compensatory measures for Hew Hall should be quantified, actions and costs
- Object to proposed bus route across New Hall driveway
- Transport system around New Hall should improve traffic flow around the area and not make it worse
- Need a path between Beaulieu Park and New Hall School
- Proposed site for new secondary school could disrupt New Hall pupils – site should be moved further away
- Location of railway should be moved further east so as not to adversely impact upon New Hall School
- New Hall is used as a school - why so anxious to preserve it from nearby development? Of course it's a spectacular site but it's a school at the end of the day, not a Stately Home.
- Increasing the supply of housing and the level of employment around New Hall should be encouraged, not restricted

### **Main issues – Schools Location and Specification**

- Two schools does not seem enough
- The need for these new schools in Chelmsford is unquestioned, however their location next to New Hall not supported, potential conflict between pupils, impact on heritage setting, potential security issues
- Is there enough space for a secondary school with playing pitches and fields?
- Schools should have a dual use for the school and for the community, suggest community sports facilities
- New schools will have no reputation, no history, no former results
- Planned housing for Broomfield should not outstrip the proposed new primary school provision
- Location of Broomfield school should be reviewed, suggest it should be further east to protect open space south of Broomfield Place
- Closure of one local Chelmsford school, Rainsford, has just been announced due to oversupply of school places. Most local secondary schools have spaces and the demography of the region is that the number of secondary aged pupils is going to decline significantly over the coming years
- Existing schools should be improved before new ones are built
- Plans for Newlands Spring and Broomfield schools should be more detailed
- There is no nursery facility at Newlands Spring as stated, just a part time pre-school facility

## **Main issues – Settlement Boundaries**

### **Site specific – Broomfield Special Policy Area:**

- Hospital likely to contract rather than expand
- Hospital is grossly overdeveloped – needs far stricter regulation in relation to development size and style
- Limits growth and restricts future healthcare/services private or public
- Broomfield Hospital site should continue to be developed – it's already undergoing development, not widely populated, convenient for staff to have a development there
- Reduced healthcare prospects – people will go to Romford, Basildon, Colchester etc.

### **Site Specific – Great Waltham Defined Settlement Boundary:**

- Proposals are damaging to landscape and rural character of Great Waltham
- Need to protect existing allotments
- Defined Settlement Boundaries in Howe Street and Ford End should be extended
- Great Waltham could sustain a far greater proportion of the 'expansion' requirements than has been proposed

### **Site Specific – Little Waltham Defined Settlement Boundary:**

- Little Waltham does not have good range of facilities as it needs more shops
- Site 3 should have been included
- Proposed development off Church Hill should be restricted to allow for future extension of burial ground at rear of St Martins Church
- With suitable flood plain provisions, Little Waltham could support more development than has been proposed by in-filling between the existing village and the existing Waltham bypass
- The limited plans seem to indicate a lot more than 10 houses are planned due to land allocation

### **Site specific – Broomfield Defined Settlement Boundary:**

- Do not agree with extension of Woodhouse Lane
- Request DSB be extended to take in an area of approximately five acres of east of White Mead and north of Glebe Crescent - provides land for residential use which could facilitate provision of recreational and open space facilities
- Proposed changes effectively make Broomfield a part of Chelmsford
- A small addition should be made to the settlement area behind Days Garage to allow extra houses and green recreational space at the Saxon burial site

- Broomfield Place should be removed from the area and no development should be allowed in the grounds of the listed building except for limited community recreational uses that do not damage the setting of the building

**Site Specific – Chelmsford urban Area:**

- Roselawn Farm should not become part of Chelmsford Urban Area
- Defined settlement should be extended to include land to the north to Montpelier Farm
- Broomfield Parish is also a village and as such should be outside the Chelmsford urban area in its entirety

**General comments:**

- What are the criteria for establishing rural/urban boundaries?
- DC32 - "Rural Housing Need" would apply and would be sufficient to over-ride right-to-buy legislation
- No more development in villages – plenty of Brownfield sites will be available when businesses fail due to the economic crisis
- Suggesting the boundaries should be changed to create a more defensible boundary is moving the goal post to suit the game and does not make clear planning sense

### **Main issues – Themes/Objectives**

- There are 22 strategic objectives quoted but they are not prioritised or weighted in importance to the community
- No objections as such to new housing, but at least 50% should be affordable
- Houses and industrial areas could stay empty because of the current economic climate
- Development is planned on the basis of a railway station that is unlikely to ever appear
- MGI - what is the justification for the number of houses proposed, and what compensation is included for the current economic downturn and reduction in demand
- EPEI - development will have an impact on the setting of New Hall, Bulls Lodge, Old Lodge and Boreham House
- QLI - downgrading White Hart Lane too be encouraged, but is entirely dependent on building of the Bypass
- ECP5 - the railway station should be called 'New Hall Station'
- BCI - disagree with providing a gypsy traveller site
- BCI – what requirement is there for high standards of design, height restriction or limitations on parking places, or on densities?

## **Mains issues – Sustainable Transport, Rail Station and Road Networks**

### **Park & Ride:**

#### General:

- Buses will only add to congestion in an already busy area
- P&R will only encourage more cars
- Suggest two P&Rs, one for existing Springfield and one for people commuting in from Braintree direction
- Will only attract non-residents and commuters
- Running hours should be extended to 6am-10pm, or for 24 hours to accommodate Hospital staff
- If it must be built it should be in an excavated hollow which could be made by gravel extraction – to reduce visual impact
- P&R in Danbury currently works well – I would only agree with this if the P&R replaced the current bus service in the area and the tickets were cheaper

#### Location:

- Proposed site is very close to existing housing
- P&R site will cover a large Greenfield site near to the green wedge and cause disruption, noise and pollution close to it
- The existing footpath can easily cross the car park which may provide a useful and unobtrusive parking facility for walkers
- Access should be from slip roads, not from the roundabout or protected lane
- Route should incorporate access to the new train station
- P&R could be based at the new railway station
- If located at Pratts Farm careful visual shielding is essential. Light pollution in the Green Wedge Chelmer Valley is also a major issue to be addressed. Pratts Farm Lane is a Protected Lane, landscape value will be affected.
- Only 3 Park & Rides are needed for Chelmsford at Sandon, Essex Regiment Way and Widford. Boreham would be too near to Sandon and attract the same users
- Proposed P&R at Boreham intrudes on the gap between Springfield and Boreham

#### Alternative sites suggested:

- P&R site should be west of interchange, A 12 & new bypass – will mean developed landscape on the Chelmsford side is bounded by these roads and a clear landscape of development west of and open countryside east of these roads would be maintained
- If moved a couple of hundred yards would not spoil view from Broomfield across river valley
- In a less congested area like Witham or Great Leighs

- At the point where A130 currently turns from westbound to northbound - more accessible for people coming from the east into Chelmsford from the direction of Colchester and North Springfield
- Next to the new bypass road
- Sheepcotes roundabout is more appropriate
- More beneficial at the junction of the A120 and the A130, with link to Hospital
- Further South on bypass
- Belsteads Farm or Nabbots Farm/White Hart Lane roundabouts
- Relocate Council's recycling and waste centres from A138/BI137 to out of town, and redevelop the land to provide park and ride facility

#### **Site allocations NE Chelmsford:**

##### White Hart Lane:

- Loss of valuable open space to Rapid Transit Route
- Need new vehicular access routes – White Hart Lane already congested
- White Hart Lane between Sainsburys and former Rubbish tip roundabout should become 7.5 tonne when Relief Road opens
- Timing of Toucan crossing on White Hart Lane should be changed to favour pedestrians when Relief Road opens
- Roundabout should be constructed to allow access to Oak Lodge Tye

##### Station environs:

- Location of railway should be moved further east so as not to adversely impact upon New Hall School
- Station should be moved nearer the A12
- New station is not required
- Has allowance been made for enough parking?
- The station access should be from Generals Lane, utilising and improving the previous yard access that was used by the railway
- Promised station has not happened in 30 years, why will it happen now?

##### Other sites:

- Increased congestion
- Impact on A12 and highway network of new development
- Impact on traffic in Generals Lane – no plans for widening
- Sites would need bus provision and other services
- Business park site should be west of A12 to enable it to be on the ChART route

- Boreham Interchange MUST be rebuilt before any development of the land can take place
- A12 will form a barrier to pedestrian access from the proposed railway station to the site east of Boreham Interchange

#### **Site Allocations NW Chelmsford:**

##### North of Copperfield Road:

- Increased congestion via Chignal Road/Copperfield Road – increased danger for pedestrians and road users
- Little scope to improve public transport provision
- Access should be onto Chignal Road not Hollow Lane
- Widening Hollow Lane will spoil it as a rural lane, hedges are an important natural habitat
- Proposed re-sited junction at Hollow Lane will be at the top of a slope with limited visibility
- Roxwell junction could be improved by removing the traffic lights and adding a mini roundabout
- Concerns of subsidence to steep banks on the Chignal Road turning from Copperfield to Blue House due to increased traffic
- Impact of extra traffic on Broomfield Road and access to Hospital
- Concerns about effects on carbon monoxide and air quality in school area

##### Essex Avenue/Patching Hall Lane:

- Up to 130 additional houses will generate further traffic using Patching Hall Lane, School Lane, Broomfield Road and Chignal Road, all heavily congested with schools close by
- Woodhall Rd is already almost impossible to negotiate
- The proposed site should not be accessed from Patching Hall Lane – suggest Woodhall Lane or Essex Avenue
- Essex Avenue cycle path needs moving so that it follows a more direct line and does not go behind gardens

##### Broomfield Place/Broomfield School:

- Increased traffic on Main Road/School Lane
- Impact on traffic going to Hospital
- Broomfield transportation links cannot support more traffic, village nature will be lost
- Essential that new access is constructed from the B1008 using a roundabout facility to the right turn into School Lane for Chelmsford bound traffic

#### Hospital Approach/Woodhouse Lane

- Further consideration needed of removal of western access to Hospital
- Concern that development here could ultimately be used as justification for the construction of the cross-valley link
- Woodhouse Lane is too narrow to support access to these homes - it should be a protected lane
- There should be no development north of Hospital Approach. This road should be maintained as a natural barrier to further development between Broomfield and Little Waltham.
- A long way from other community facilities and not supported well by public transport

#### **Site Allocations – employment sites:**

Employment allocations should be located where efficient, frequent bus services can be provided to link the whole Chelmsford urban catchment

No plans to include a junction on the new bypass to access Drakes Lane site

Access to any sites via Broomfield Road totally unsuitable. Out of town sites east from A12 Boreham Interchange might be more suitable

Sites closer to A12 would be the most logical approach

#### **Road access to NE Chelmsford:**

- General concerns about increased traffic congestion, pollution, infrastructure capacity, impact on town centre, loss of Cross Valley Link, cycling provision.
- Concerns about affects on traffic capacity on White Hart Lane, and at Boreham Interchange
- Proposals will not reduce traffic flows in Broomfield
- Is enough land available for adequate highway access?
- The passage of a major road near New Hall will be damaging to the environment and the wildlife, and a route further to the north-east should be considered
- Building of bypass and infrastructure must be completed before the housing
- Challenge should be to enhance road access to NW Chelmsford as well
- Concern about access off Belsteads roundabout and impact on current leisure activities off this route especially access to footpaths
- The road should be a bypass - there should be limited access to avoid cut-throughs and "rat-running"

#### **Bus Based Rapid Transport (ChART):**

- Roads already in existence should be used for a rapid transport route, not a new road constructed through Public Open Space for this purpose
- More suitable plan would see bus route running the other side of the railway track and taking in the supermarket

- Is this required in the area? There are already a number of buses that serve the area
- Area is used for play, walking and recreation – this could cause a danger users
- Open space should be protected, when developed residents were told it was ‘permanent public open space’
- Too close to properties, would result in noise and light pollution
- If built, running hours and charging policy needs to be in line with customer needs
- How would other vehicles be restricted from using it including quad bikes and mini motorbikes?
- Bus priority along Chelmer Valley Road would impede existing vehicles unless the road width is extended to provide dedicated lanes

### **Bus, walking and cycling networks:**

#### **Bus:**

- Cheaper to drive into Chelmsford and park than to take a family on the bus
- The bus routes should use the proposed bypass, with its early implementation, for economy of scale of construction cost
- Bus and cycle routes should be given priority installation rather than added later as an afterthought
- Not enough buses to Little Waltham village, walking too restricted
- Bus routes are needed to link Old and New Springfield, Chelmer Village, Chancellor Park and Beaulieu Park with Broomfield Hospital; and Old Springfield/New Bowers Way with the Sainsbury's store at White Hart Lane

#### **Walking:**

- Can be very difficult to cross over Copperfield Road at peak times due to the level of traffic; and at times dangerous
- Footpath along River Chelmer from Mill Lane to Croxton's Mill is welcomed - but should not be hard surfaced
- New cycling links should provide priority for pedestrians

#### **Cycling:**

- A number of new or improved cycle routes suggested – between Chelmsford and Broomfield Hospital; from Newland Spring into town; Back Lane and Little Waltham; from Petersfield Link to Great Waltham, via Chelmer Valley High School, Broomfield Hospital, and via Broad's Green; around Beaulieu Park; Beaulieu Park to town centre; Old Springfield to North Springfield, Cuton Hall Lane and Chelmer Village, Goulton Road, School Lane
- Cycling along Copperfield Road and Chignal Road is dangerous due to the level and speed of traffic; Hollow Lane is a winding lane with very poor visibility
- Proposed North-South cycleway in the Chelmer Valley should follow existing routes on the Eastern and Western perimeters of Green Wedge - avoiding new hardened surfaces or artificial lighting being provided for cyclists in valley floor near the river

- Main road Broomfield is not a suitable route for cycles - too busy and dangerous
- Easy access and adequate provision needs to be made for commuting cyclists to the new rail station
- Cycle route safety should be paramount as well as ease of access

**Location/function of new railway station:**

- Alternative locations suggested: Boreham; Essex Regiment Way; further east than currently indicated; beyond A130 bypass
- Preferred location is in an already congested area
- Insufficient account has been taken of a need for goods railway siding/depot
- Will adequate parking be provided?
- Will there be additional train services and more seats?
- Need to plan for allowing trains to overtake
- Why not just upgrade Hatfield Peverel railway station?
- The setting of New Hall should be preserved, further assessment of impact needed
- Possibility of linking station development to a new football stadium should be investigated
- Concern about noise and light pollution
- Concern that lorries will park overnight in station car parks

**General points:**

- Land should be safeguarded for a Cross Valley Link in case it becomes viable in the future
- Broomfield Hospital would benefit hugely from a Cross Valley Link
- Other options for accessing the hospital need to be considered to reduce traffic flow through Broomfield
- Traffic safety measures on Blasford Hill and the road past the Hospital Approach roundabout should be considered – suggest 30mph limit, pedestrian/cycle crossings
- Parking policy for businesses needs to be addressed, more parking needed
- Channels Golf Course - suggest different access via new roundabout at Travellers site entrance to slow down speeding traffic and provide easy access for Channels and Falcon Bowling Club
- Proposed bypass has no junctions for local traffic
- Effective noise screening would be required for bypass
- Road through Chignal Smealey has no pedestrian walkway and 40 mph speed limit is never enforced. Concern that use as a cut through between North Melbourne and Great Waltham will make this worse

- Only way to secure excellent transport links would to be to convert Chelmer Valley Road to dual carriageway
- Concern about access for emergency vehicles into new developments
- Need for good signage e.g. named lanes & distance

### **Main issues – Utilities Infrastructure**

- What are the costs for burial of overhead power lines across NE Chelmsford?
- Removal of electricity pylons is essential to allow development on the site
- High and intermediate pressure gas pipes are mentioned as a constraint for NE but not NW Chelmsford
- Limited sewer capacity in NW Chelmsford should be noted as a constraint
- Water and sewage could be a problem around Broomfield Place, and drainage north of Hospital Approach
- Before any development takes place new drainage systems for foul and surface water need to be constructed
- When will new sewers be developed?
- Development 'North of Copperfield Road' will cause the natural soak away abilities of the open land to be replaced by building plots that cannot drain away, causing water to run away down to Newlands Spring
- Shortage of water supply and negative effects of excess water shedding from pavements, roofs etc are understated
- Potential deterioration in water pressure from extra demand, lack of sufficient dependable electricity supply to support development - area already has regular short power cuts
- Is combined heat & power planned?
- Chelmer River Valley area should be designated as a flood risk

## Main issues – Other Matters

- There is little about health care structure in the whole document
- Existing Chelmsford should not be deprived of the quality of life and local environment that is well established
- Concerns expressed about pressure on services and infrastructure
- Plans are radically different from those proposed in 2007 for a small community around Broomfield
- Plan disregards the benefits that village life can give those escaping city life
- Missed opportunities to create sporting facilities to make use of topography e.g. mountain bike trails
- Concern about current economic downturn
- Plan does not show where the roads and bus routes are going to be – car parks, bus stops etc
- Summary of the Council's open space standards might usefully be incorporated
- Chelmsford Borough Council's approach is correct in that it gives people a say in our new plans and proposals
- The NCAAP Preferred Options document is clear and easy to understand
- Given the constraints that the Borough has to work to then these proposals present an excellent solution
- Lots of information to take in at once – should be broken down into smaller sections – although does provide overview of main changes
- Document is long and complex
- Should be able to save online responses part way through
- Difficult to both refer to the document and fill in the form online
- All developer owned land should have been highlighted
- Borough Council should resist attempts by Central Government to impose targets/extra funding
- History constrains development. Why not make a seriously bold decision of a new eco-town?