

Chelmsford Local Development Framework
Development Plan Document Examination

Independent Inspector: Ian Broyd, MRICS Dip TP

Core Strategy & Development Control Policies

Thursday 27 September

**10.00am Session 6 - Transportation/Infrastructure/Delivery including
Planning Contributions/ "Chelmsford Tomorrow" Partnerships [mainly
Soundness Tests 4 - 9]**

AGENDA

Introductions - See Appendix 1

Issues

1. Whether the proposed new infrastructure is founded on a sound evidence base. Whether, in the absence of a commitment to public funding the NE by-pass could be built in time to support the new NE Neighbourhood. Whether the infrastructure proposals for the N of the borough could support an additional 2000 dwellings if the SofS's proposed changes are confirmed and supported following public consultation..
2. Whether Policy CP4 is consistent with statements from the Borough Council following the Preliminary Meeting of 16 May (see BD/CFD/075vii, paragraph 8,) relating to parts of the proposed new infrastructure not being pre-requisites to development in N Chelmsford. Whether that statement can be reconciled with the Borough Council acceptance that the new NE neighbourhood is dependent on new transportation infrastructure (paragraph 5.6 Topic Paper 5).
3. Given the risks inherent in delivering expensive and, arguably, technically demanding infrastructure and the delays that could be experienced whether an earlier release of the new neighbourhoods would be justified. Whether the reliance on costly new infrastructure is too risky and therefore inflexible. Whether the Core Strategy (Policy CP8) should refer to the importance of new infrastructure to achieve its objectives.
4. Whether an option that required less investment in new infrastructure would represent a more sustainable form of development, for instance, smaller, peripheral extensions. Entec 2004 Sustainability Appraisal. Whether the correction of existing deficiencies in existing communities justifies the scale of development and new infrastructure proposed. Whether planning contributions could be exacted from development remote from the northern neighbourhoods.
5. Whether the new railway station would be feasible, affordable and deliverable. Whether the new station is an essential pre-requisite for the 2 new neighbourhoods. Whether it should be mentioned in Policy CP8 and/or CP24; whether the developer contribution required to build a new railway station would represent a reasonable charge in addition to those required to establish the new neighbourhoods.

6. Whether any verifiable calculation has been made as to the scale of contributions that would be required (cost/dwelling) for essential road and rail infrastructure. Whether the new development could fund the cost of the infrastructure required. Whether any estimate of the cost of the proposed alteration to the Boreham Junction has been made and taken into account (Funding HA/Developer). Whether it can be relied upon (Nichols Report March 2007). Whether the Boreham junction of the A12 is capable of accommodating a safe and workable connection with the proposed new NE by-pass in transport terms.
7. Whether any developer has indicated they would be willing to finance the new infrastructure (road & rail). Whether any guarantees and conditions of any undertakings have been obtained from potential developers.
8. Whether a large neighbourhood development to the NW of the town should have been tested through a transport modelling exercise (Paramics-BD/CFD/046, p163) before dismissing this option; whether the Core Strategy gives enough attention to meeting the public transport needs of Melbourne.
9. Whether the proposed NW neighbourhood could function, in traffic terms, without the cross-valley link; whether traffic modelling has taken place to support that proposition. Whether the Cross Valley Link requires land that is not in the Control of the Borough Council.
10. Whether the concentration of investment in infrastructure to the NE would fail to achieve the RSS and Policy CP23 objective of supporting Chelmsford as a Regional Interchange Centre and fails to spread the benefits of substantial investment to the wider community.
11. Whether Policy CP4 (Securing Infrastructure) conflicts with national policy; whether it should make reference to Circular 5/05; whether Policy CP18 is redundant in the light of the objectives of Policy CP4.
12. Whether the Boreham Airfield (Great Holts) site would be better placed to provide the new road/rail infrastructure and better able to be integrated into the local/strategic road/rail network than the Core Strategy's preferred option.

Any other matters (not already covered, or not to be covered in greater detail in later sessions).

Appendix 1

Introductions

Chelmsford Borough Council (CBC) -

Mr Alan Swash Boreham Conservation Society

Mr Eric Cooper Highways Agency

Mr Michael Gallimore The Prudential Assurance Company Limited (PRUPIM)

Mr Mark Hendy Higgins/PelhamHomes Ltd

Mr Martin Carpenter Bovis Homes Ltd

Mr Andrew Martin - Countryside Properties

Mr Andrew Cook ECC

Ms Patricia Ford

Ms Gabrielle Rowan Persimmon Homes (Essex) Ltd and Taylor Wimpey Developments,

Mr M. Howarth Little Waltham Parish Council (via phone)

Graham Warriner, Turley Associates, Standard Life & Chelmsford Meadows Ltd Partnership

Mr Paul Munson

To Observe:

Mr Andy Stevens Knight Developments Ltd

Mr Neil Osborn Kier Residential Ltd

Mr Lee Melin Barratt Eastern Counties/Ashwell Developments

Mr Robin Shepherd CgMs Ltd

Andrew Forrest, Bellway Homes

Relevant background papers

Documents to be referred to are likely to be wide ranging - see the Borough Council's Reference Document List

Further Written Representations:

D.W.S. Bodyworks, Andrew Martin Associates, WR/S6/15

Gary Duncan, Countryside Properties, WR/S4 & S6/23

Sir Jeffery Bowman, Mark Button Alan Swash, Boreham Conservation Society,
WR/S2/S3/S6/S7/22

