

Boreham Neighbourhood Plan Referendum

Summary of Representations, Regulation 16 Consultation

The following table provides a summary of the representations received during the Regulation 16 consultation, which ran from 21 January to 4 March 2026. Full comments have been submitted to the Independent Examiner.

You can view the full comments on our consultation portal:

<https://consult.chelmsford.gov.uk/kse/>

Organisations

Consultee	Summary of comments
Chelmsford City Council	The Neighbourhood Plan Group's hard work is commended. The group identified key themes through community consultation and has thoroughly examined each of them, leading to a range of policies to influence future development and areas for protection in the parish.
Forestry Commission England	<p>The Forestry Commission would like to encourage communities to review the trees and woodlands in their neighbourhood and consider whether they are sufficiently diverse in age and species to prove resilient in the face of tree pests and diseases or climate change.</p> <p>The Forestry Commission has prepared joint Standing Advice with Natural England on ancient woodland and veteran trees. This advice is a material consideration for planning decisions across England and can also be a useful starting point for policy considerations.</p>
Historic England	Refers to previous comments submitted at Regulation 14 stage which included that, if there is a local list of non-designated heritage assets, these could also be included in the appendices. It was also recommended to include a glossary in addition to the list of abbreviations.
National Highways	The challenges of the area in accommodating a key Strategic Road Network junction (junction 19 of the A12), the new Beaulieu Park railway station and future development are recognised. The Neighbourhood Plan (NP) suggests ways in which to encourage sustainable travel. This approach is endorsed.
National Grid Electricity Transmission	One or more of our assets are within the NP area. Details have been provided on an attached plan.
Chelmer Housing Partnership (CHP)	<p><u>General</u> Overall, the NP appears to have been generally positively prepared in its acknowledgement of potential development that could be delivered in the parish, and its overall alignment with the Local Plan. In this respect, CHP is broadly supportive of the NP and its objectives. Concerns expressed relating to a lack of compliance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) as one of the five basic conditions, ensuring growth is not hampered, ensuring the NP aligns with the latest Local Plan and the latest housing needs.</p> <p><u>Policy 1</u> This policy appears to accord with national and local policies in the assessment of impact on heritage assets. It is therefore supported.</p>

Consultee	Summary of comments
	<p><u>Policy 2</u> This policy requires the retention of all existing mature trees, hedgerows and habitats which are important for their historic, visual or biodiversity value. This approach is supported in principle. Recommends that the policy allows some flexibility to acknowledge individual site constraints. Part 2 should be more flexible.</p> <p><u>Policy 4</u> Supports the general approach to the policy but recommends that the settlement boundary aligns with the emerging Local Plan to ensure longevity of the policy.</p> <p><u>Policy 5</u> Recommends that the policy is amended to become more flexible with regard to retention of existing trees and green spaces to make effective use of land and recognise what can be achieved through new or replacement planting.</p> <p><u>Policy 6</u> Supports this policy and its recognition that new housing development proposals shall contribute to a balanced mix of housing types, including housing for older people.</p> <p><u>Policy 7</u> Recommends that the first sentence is updated to require all major development to make proportionate contributions towards local infrastructure, services and facilities, in accordance with the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations, and then where relevant include the measures listed.</p> <p><u>Policy 10</u> Clarification needed on what is meant by 'endeavour to improve'. Generic requirements should not be applied to all major sites. Recommends that the policy is amended to allow infrastructure improvements to be informed by site-specific transport assessment work, and in accordance with CIL Regulation tests.</p>
Natural England	Natural England does not have any specific comments. Advice should be sought from topic specific experts to determine whether a Strategic Environmental Assessment is necessary.
Essex County Council	<p><u>General</u> Welcomes that many comments made at Regulation 14 stage have been incorporated into the Regulation 16 Plan. Remaining comments seek to ensure the NP supports ECC's statutory responsibilities and remains accurate and up to date. Recommends various wording changes e.g. the use of "should" or "must" instead of "shall" and correction of typos.</p> <p>Essex Parking Standards should be referred to as Essex Parking Guidance prepared by the Essex Planning Officers Association (EPOA).</p> <p><u>Section 2.2</u> The NP should include context on minerals and waste matters. This</p>

Consultee	Summary of comments
	<p>includes the roles of the Minerals and Waste Local Plans and their status and the need for Mineral Resource Assessments. The NP area includes land within a Mineral Safeguarding Area and Mineral and Waste Consultation Areas. These areas are subject to a mineral safeguarding policy (see Policy S8 of the Minerals Local Plan).</p> <p><u>Section 4.2.2</u> Recommends that ‘multifunctional green infrastructure’ is included within Objective 4.</p> <p><u>Policy 2</u> Recommends a number of amendments such as deletion of footnote 24, changing ‘new buildings or structures’ to ‘all development proposals’ in part 1 and amending part 2e to reflect the position of rainwater harvesting in the drainage hierarchy.</p> <p><u>Policy 5</u> Recommends that concerns regarding sufficient off-street parking, school pick-up parking and obstructive/excessive parking are progressed via the Local Highways Panel. Supports reference to Essex Parking Standards in Part 2c but this should be applied to all development. Amendments proposed to part 2f for consistency with Objective 4 and to clarify the wider benefits of green infrastructure.</p> <p><u>Policy 6</u> Welcomes reference to new development being required to provide older people’s housing in part 1c but ‘specialist’ should be used rather than ‘sheltered’.</p> <p><u>Section 5.4</u> Recommends that the second paragraph is updated to reflect the current position with regard to preschool provision in Boreham. Requests a reference to Boreham Primary School being near capacity with limited scope to expand.</p> <p><u>Policy 7</u> Recommends that part 1 is updated to require all major development to make contributions towards local infrastructure, services and facilities where appropriate. Some amendments also proposed to part 1a and 1c to refer to all appropriate options and all types of education provision respectively.</p> <p><u>Justification to Policy 7</u> Recommends that the policy is amended to include a more up-to-date position with regard to the provision of early years and childcare in neighbouring Hatfield Peverel and Terling.</p> <p><u>Section 5.5</u></p>

Consultee	Summary of comments
	<p>Recommends deletion of the word 'superfast' for consistency with the latest technology.</p> <p><u>Policy 8</u></p> <p>Recommends that the policy is updated to refer to the latest technology (gigabit speed broadband and 5G mobile). In addition, recommends that a new part is added to the policy making reference to cabling being linked to at least two open access network providers</p> <p><u>Justification to Policy 8</u></p> <p>Recommends that paragraph 2 is deleted and replaced with up-to-date text providing longevity with regard to the Digital Strategy for Essex and its rolling Action Plans.</p> <p><u>Section 5.6</u></p> <p>Recommends that the text is updated as the Beaulieu Park railway station is now operational.</p> <p><u>Policy 9</u></p> <p>Welcomes reference to ECC Developers' Guide to Infrastructure Contributions but the footnote should be deleted to ensure longevity. Development should 'have regard to' and not be 'in accordance with' this guide.</p> <p>Recommends that the first sentence of part 3 is replaced and says: New development must be designed to prioritise and maximise opportunities for active and sustainable transport and movement. Part 3b should refer to 'walking and cycling routes' rather than facilities.</p> <p><u>Policy 10</u></p> <p>Recommends that all development proposals not just those with 10 dwellings and above should be assessed in relation to their impact on the highway network. Requires that part 1 is amended so that all development proposals should be required to improve connectivity across Main Road. Requires that the second and third sentences of part 2 of the policy is removed and an additional sentence added clarifying how the necessary mitigation will be delivered.</p> <p><u>Table 6.1 Action Plan</u></p> <p>Recommends that Action 1 is amended to make reference to the Essex Local Nature Recovery Strategy.</p>
Essex Police	<p><u>Section 4</u></p> <p>Requests consideration of incorporating the concept of 'safety' when referencing development proposals within the Vision Statement. The negative impact that crime (and the perception of crime) and Anti-Social Behaviour can have on communities should be considered from the outset within future design proposals, as this will support sustainability agendas.</p>

Consultee	Summary of comments
	<p><u>Sections 4.24, 4.25, 4.27 and 5.32</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regarding Objective 13 - Housing should not just be of high-quality but also safe, inclusive and sustainable, in line with the NPPF. Recommends that a Secured by Design accreditation is achieved for all future development in Boreham. This also relates to section 5.32. • Regarding Objective 15 - Welcomes the opportunity to work in partnership with the Council, Department for Education, additional Education bodies and Design Teams to ensure future educational facilities are inclusive and safe for future users. • Regarding Objectives 16, 20 and 21, recommends that there is early engagement with the Design Out Crime Officer (DOCO) when designing new sustainable travel routes and safe and inclusive public realm spaces. <p><u>Section 5.2</u> Secured by Design standards can be incorporated when designing homes to meet various ecological requirements such as lighting and housing design. Recommends early consultation with the DOCO.</p> <p><u>Policy 9, Section 5.6.2 and Policy 10</u> Liaison with the DOCO is essential when creating routes for sustainable travel to ensure safety is considered for future users. The Essex Police Roads Policing Team should be consulted if there are alterations to road infrastructure, proposals to connect to neighbouring communities and where development has major implications on the transport network. This will ensure the emergency service can gain access to the development and the whole of Boreham.</p>
Aquila Developments Ltd	<p><u>Policy 4</u> Recommends that part 2 is deleted as the requirement for development to demonstrate need in relation to the village is not appropriate or reasonable as part of the NP area has a close relationship to Chelmsford Urban Area.</p> <p><u>Policy 7</u> The policy does not reflect the legal requirements applicable to planning obligations as it suggests a blanket approach for all major developments.</p>
This Land	<p><u>Policy 4</u> The NP is capable of meeting the basic conditions (in the Town and Country Planning Act 1990) providing the Coalescence Safeguarding Zone and Policy 4, part 4, a-d are deleted. The evidence base is not robust or proportionate.</p>
LVJ Maldon Ltd	<p><u>General</u> Supports the aims of the NP overall but as drafted it does not fully meet the basic conditions of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as it does not contribute to the achievement of sustainable development as it places unnecessary restrictions on future development. Request that the NP is amended to align with and support the Local Plan including the allocation of Strategic Growth Site Policy 9a.</p>

Consultee	Summary of comments
	<p><u>Policy 2</u> Policy needs to be more flexible to enable development to come forward. This can be achieved by requiring that the retention of mature trees and hedgerows should be prioritised “where appropriate.</p> <p><u>Policy 3</u> Including protected views in the NP would unnecessarily constrict development. Client’s land is constrained by strong landscape boundaries. Impact on the wider landscape would be picked up within a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment.</p> <p><u>Policy 5</u> Policy needs to be more flexible to allow for more modern development and the difference between residential and commercial development.</p> <p><u>Policy 7</u> Policy needs to make clear that the contributions listed may not be relevant to all types of major development, e.g. education and health care contribution are not relevant to employment proposals.</p> <p><u>Policy 9</u> To make the policy wording clear and unambiguous, recommends that part 3 of the policy is updated to clarify that all transport requirements to be provided by major development proposals should be informed by detailed transport work. Financial contributions only to be required in accordance with the CIL Regulations.</p> <p><u>Policy 10</u> Recommends that the wording is updated to confirm that the requirements will be informed by detailed transport work to ensure that any improvements are proportionate.</p>
Danbury Parish Council	Danbury Parish Council congratulates Boreham on preparing the Neighbourhood Plan and strongly supports its contents.
Tarmac	<p><u>General</u> There is no recognition within the NP of the draft policies and allocations made in the emerging Chelmsford Local Plan which might lead to conflicts. The draft Local Plan anticipates that the NP will shape this site allocation, which it does not.</p> <p><u>Policy 4</u> It is not reasonable for all major development outside the settlement boundary to be accompanied by relevant infrastructure and services as infrastructure mitigation may be considered through the planning process. The policy also conflicts with Policy DM4 of the Local Plan which supports development within Waltham Road Employment Area. Recommends that the existing industrial estate is shown as an existing employment area outside the settlement boundary, exempt from the requirement of Policy 4.</p>

Consultee	Summary of comments
	<p><u>Policy 5</u> Part a of this policy places an unreasonable and unjustified requirement on certain development proposals, for example, where they have no relevance to the street scene or are within an industrial estate. Part 2 also needs to be updated to refer to residential development only.</p> <p><u>Policy 7</u> Recommends that major development is defined as that in Annex 2 of the NPPF. Recommends that the wording is amended to ensure that obligations are specific and relevant to the development type in line with national policy requirements.</p> <p><u>Policy 10</u> The policy requires significant revision to ensure that growth of the limited businesses in the area is not restricted. Recommends that some words used are defined in part 1 of the policy to make the text clearer. Recommends that the policy recognises that mitigation works should be required as requested by the Local Highway Authority. Finally, recommends significant revision of part 2 so as not to stifle growth on the industrial estate.</p>
Urban Provincial	<p><u>Policy 4</u> The NP is supported overall. Weight should be given to the draft Local Plan given its advanced stage of consultation. Recommends that the NP is amended to reflect the proposed site allocations for the village. This can best be undertaken through the Settlement Boundary Review policy.</p>
Chelmsford Garden Community Council	<p><u>Policy 4</u> Recommends that the boundaries of the parishes of Boreham and Chelmsford Garden Community are reconsidered. All of the land within the parish of Boreham to the west of the A12 should be brought into the parish of Chelmsford Garden Community as it has a far greater connection to this parish and is outside the curtilage of the village of Boreham.</p> <p><u>Section 5.6.2</u> Whilst understanding the need to calm traffic along Main Road, with any traffic calming measures, careful consideration should be given to the impact upon neighbouring areas so as not to transfer the problem to another community.</p>

Members of the public

Consultee	Summary of comments
Margaret Adams	<p><u>Section 4.2</u> Support in particular for Objectives 1, 4, 8, 9, 13, 14, 15, 17, 21, 22 and 23.</p>
David Barton	<p>Supports the use of traditional architecture design codes for all new construction with a ban on demolition of all buildings constructed prior to 1950. Umbrella representation attached for additional Placemaking/Planning and Greenery Proposals.</p>

Consultee	Summary of comments
Nigel Brown	<p><u>General</u> The NP is a well-structured, comprehensive document which will be effective in informing local planning decisions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It clearly identifies the importance of maintaining the separation of Boreham from the urban area of Chelmsford, vital to maintaining its separate village identity. • It has considered the need for allocating land specifically for development and not made any recommendations beyond those already agreed as part of the Chelmsford Local Plan. This aligns with the view of residents and is appropriate for Boreham's local needs and wider development. • It provides a useful summary of the historic and natural environment and emphasises their importance in maintaining the essential character of Boreham. • It identifies a range of issues around Main Road with through traffic effectively separating a substantial part of the village and wider parish from the main village, and potential solutions. <p>Support in particular for Sections 3 and 4.</p>
William Brown	<p><u>Section 3</u> Supports the aims, the references to the historic areas around Boreham, the rapidly developing area around the Chelmer and Blackwater Navigation for leisure purposes and acknowledging the new homes in Orchard Way.</p> <p><u>Sections 4-6</u> The vision and objectives are broadly welcome - keeping the gap between Springfield (Chelmsford) and Boreham. It shows a strong desire to keep Boreham a village, its natural setting would be enhanced. The housing mix reflects the needs of the community. A big omission by Beaulieu Park railway station is the lack of pedestrian/cycle bridge to connect to Boreham without going via Junction 19 of the A12. Commends the efforts and supports the NP.</p>
John Cannon	Supports Boreham Conservation Society's opinions for the NP.
William Carrington	<p>Section 5.2.2 Would prefer Boreham to remain a village. Any further development would have an impact on Boreham School and the Doctor's Surgery.</p>
Karen Fardell	Support expressed for the NP.
Vivienne Flack	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports the NP which will be helpful in making local planning decisions. It will ensure that any changes made will maintain Boreham as a separate rural area from the urban area of Chelmsford which is essential in ensuring a village identity. • It has considered the need to allocate land for development but has not made any suggestions outside those made in the Chelmsford Local Plan. This fits in with the opinions expressed by local residents and Boreham's local needs. • It emphasises the importance of the local historic and natural environment in maintaining the character of Boreham as a village. • It emphasises the issues around Main Road. The high volume of through traffic means that a large part of the village is cut off from the central part of the village and potential solutions.

Consultee	Summary of comments
Simon Hurrell	Supports the NP. It represents what is best for the village and the residents. It highlights the strain expansion would put on the local services and infrastructure and the need for wildlife corridors, nature and biodiversity. Boreham has a failing bus service and lack of cycle provision.
Ann Martin; Charles Martin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Boreham has already given up a large area of the parish to facilitate the creation of Chelmsford Garden Community. • The development at Orchard Way has already provided some 150 new dwellings for Boreham, completed in the early 2020s. Any increase in allocation is opposed both in the Local Plan and the NP. • Concerns regarding the issues surrounding Main Road and the through traffic effectively severing a substantial part of the village from the main village have been addressed, offering possible solutions. • Maintaining the separation of Boreham from the urban area of Chelmsford and keeping its village surroundings is important to and has been effectively addressed. • Strong support for the NP. It is well thought-out and easy to understand.
Ryan Pearcy	<p><u>Section 5.3.1</u></p> <p>Agree with the purpose of the coalescence zone but the zone (Figure 5.9) only covers the west and south. It is unclear why it covers such a large area. With the inability to expand north this is limiting all further developments to the east, taking future housing further away from current infrastructure such as shops, school, community centre and health centre.</p>
Heidi Robinson	Fully support the NP. It deserves now to be implemented to the fullest extent and as a result the identity of Boreham will be more fully secured, as a clearly identifiable village and community.
Alan and Jennifer Swash	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong support for the NP. The policies and objectives are clear and succinct giving clear direction to the future of Boreham. It is a well-considered document representing the views of the local community. • Support the key principle of maintaining the clear separation, both physically and visually of Boreham from the urban expansion of Chelmsford. • Support the principle of not identifying specific sites for future development, and the criteria by which future projects will be judged. • The NP covers local concerns on the high level of through traffic using local roads, in particular Main Road, Plantation Road and Waltham Road and the need to control this going forward.
Andrew White; Nicky White	Grave concerns expressed regarding the expansion of Waltham Road Industrial Estate relating to an increase in traffic levels, an HGV impact. Other concerns relate to impact on wildlife using the field, noise levels and bright lighting, noise, dirt and pollution. The lack of mains utilities in the form of gas and sewage is also an issue.