

## Appendix 2 - Summary of consultation responses

Consultation Comment	Consideration	Action(s)
<p>Loss of allotment land and development-related impacts on allotments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of active allotment land a key objection – not all of the allotment land is active however</li> <li>• Primarily this relates to the land to be used for housing</li> <li>• There was a less severe reaction to the land to be used for gas pressure reduction compound and Early Years facilities – some have even welcomed the location of the Early Years facility specifically because of its relationship to the allotments – in any event these facilities are needed and cannot be removed from the allotment land without wider and severe adverse consequences for development</li> <li>• 4-storey apartment block as shown in consultation draft will impact remaining allotments and mean changes are necessary to the existing vehicle access</li> <li>• Housing growth increases demand/need for allotment provision</li> <li>• Existing allotments have a long waiting list</li> <li>• Flooding and drainage considerations</li> <li>• Allotments are important for community, physical and mental health/wellbeing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Remove housing development from the allotments</li> <li>• Keep Early Years facility in same location (limited to single storey)</li> <li>• Keep gas pressure reduction compound in same location</li> <li>• Through developer obligations, fund an increase in active allotment plots, improved on-site facilities and better drainage – make sure this is indicated in the Framework</li> <li>• Re-wild remaining land south of the access line (excluding new allotment plots and GPRS) to enhance biodiversity</li> </ul>
<p>Loss of Sea Cadets/ Chelmsford Canoe Club and considerations around those existing river-users</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of existing river users a key objection</li> <li>• Canoeists have a desire to use the stretch of water above the weir as it has the best conditions year round</li> <li>• Detaching Canoe Club/storage from stretch of water above the weir will frustrate activity and may create some adverse issues for the club/its members</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Framework to include a feasibility study to look at re-providing Canoe Club on same section of the water with Sea Cadets relocating downstream</li> <li>• Although the existing Canoe Club site would need to be consolidated if to remain in same location, club functions</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sea Cadets vacated riverfront site 3 years ago, but strongly desire a return to a riverfront site</li> <li>• More clarity about potential siting of Sea Cadets and Canoe Club as part of the Framework</li> <li>• Phasing and sequencing to ensure new facilities are available before old ones removed</li> <li>• These functions are already an active part of the community and contribute to active river use</li> <li>• Security and safeguarding considerations</li> <li>• Conflicts with pedestrians/cyclists to be avoided as much as possible</li> <li>• Parking and access considerations</li> <li>• Storage and site function considerations</li> <li>• Nature of access to the water</li> <li>• Space for sporting and social events</li> </ul>	<p>can be sited above boat storage allowing for a more efficient use of land</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Smaller Canoe Club site would reduce length of exclusive access to the water, but gates allowing access to public riverfront would allow for times of increased activity</li> <li>• Storage should be arranged to avoid boats being carried across foot/cycle paths (so far as possible)</li> <li>• Phasing to reference continuation of existing water-user functions</li> </ul>
Increasing the function of water	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More clarity on moorings</li> <li>• More ways to access the water</li> <li>• Preserve natural banks</li> <li>• Considerations relating to increased use of waterways</li> <li>• Springfield Basin requires an additional water feeder supply from the River Chelmer across CW1a to support increased navigation</li> <li>• Opportunity to include more water in proposals</li> <li>• More water would improve flood compensation and decrease risk of flooding</li> <li>• Low bridges further upstream</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use Framework to more clearly show areas where access to the water will be provided and show examples of the differing types of interface with water</li> <li>• Reduce amount of moorings shown near to the Canoe Club, but show where moorings would be more appropriate</li> <li>• Specify majority of moorings will be for recreational use</li> <li>• Add reference to feeder pipe for Springfield Basin</li> </ul>
New lock	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overwhelming support for the lock</li> <li>• Manoeuvrability for boats at either end</li> <li>• Ability to carry canoes, etc. around weir</li> <li>• Be clear that existing boat rollers are not remaining</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Framework should state a commitment for development to provide funding towards the lock</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opportunity to include a canoe flume</li> <li>• Opportunity to incorporate hydro-electric power generation</li> <li>• Opportunity to include reference to fish pass</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Show an outline strategy for small vessel portage around the lock that does not rely on boat rollers</li> <li>• Detailed matters are not for this Framework to address – a detailed design for the lock is to be produced in due course</li> </ul>
Facilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of primary school</li> <li>• Lack of community centre</li> <li>• Lack of primary healthcare facility</li> <li>• Lack of children’s play facilities</li> <li>• Lack of functional parkland</li> <li>• Lack of sports facilities</li> <li>• Lack of community gardens</li> <li>• Lack of cultural events space</li> <li>• Lack of outside gym</li> <li>• Parking for commercial facilities and Essex Record Office</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Facilities referenced within the Framework are a response to the Local Plan policy requirements – additional suggestions are not in line with adopted policy and have not been sought by relevant authorities/bodies</li> <li>• Framework to show potential location of children’s play facilities</li> <li>• Framework to show potential location of outside gym equipment</li> <li>• Framework to show potential location of outside performance space</li> <li>• Framework to show increased/improved allotment provision</li> <li>• Commercial facilities and ERO can rely on local public parking</li> </ul>
Footways and cycleways	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should include a foot/cycle path to south side of River Chelmer heading east</li> <li>• CW1c and CW1e do not have as good cycle connectivity as existing</li> <li>• Drainage considerations</li> <li>• Safety considerations</li> <li>• Wider route improvements outside of Chelmer Waterside</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Framework to include a foot/cycle route to south of River Chelmer continuing east to new Country Park</li> <li>• Framework to reference drainage and safety expectations and a requirement for all routes to achieve 4m width</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 20mph limit to estate roads</li> <li>• On-road parking reduces safety of cyclists and makes cycling less attractive</li> <li>• Pedestrian crossings beyond Chelmer Waterside</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limit to off-road cycle route opportunities north of the canal due to a lack of connectivity and constraints beyond Chelmer Waterside</li> <li>• Framework to reference low estate road speeds and reduced on-street parking although detailed planning will address both</li> <li>• The Local Highway Authority will raise any improvements outside of Chelmer Waterside as part of detailed planning stages</li> </ul>
Design and Environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Net Biodiversity Gain</li> <li>• Target more robust standards of sustainable construction</li> <li>• Design in natural development cooling – street planting/water</li> <li>• Car charging</li> <li>• Design Code</li> <li>• Public space attributes and functions</li> <li>• SUDS considerations</li> <li>• Relationship of development to High Bridge Road</li> <li>• Secure By Design (layout and building design) and public safety beyond SBD – Smarter Cities, CCTV coverage, amount of lighting</li> <li>• Importance of green river corridors to heritage</li> <li>• Re-use of the Bailey bridge – how/where will this be re-used</li> <li>• Fire Safety – construction standards</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Framework to reference examples of sustainable construction. Controls can only go as far as the adopted Making Places SPD, although central government may introduce new requirements in time</li> <li>• Framework to reference Net Biodiversity Gain</li> <li>• Framework to reference more greening to streets for cooling</li> <li>• Car charging is a detailed planning consideration</li> <li>• A Design Code is unlikely to be used on this nature of scheme as it would limit design flexibility and innovation</li> <li>• Framework to illustrate examples of public open space approach</li> <li>• SUDS are a detailed planning consideration</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Framework to ensure development adequately remote from High Bridge Road</li><li>• SBD a detailed planning consideration</li><li>• Framework to reference heritage of rivers</li><li>• Any re-use of the Bailey bridge will occur outside of Chelmer Waterside</li><li>• Fire Safety considerations a detailed planning consideration and further considered under Building Regulations</li></ul>
--	--	--