Chelmsford Local Plan Review 2022 – 2041

Examination

Inspectors – Mr H Baugh-Jones BA(Hons) DipLA MA CMLI

Mrs R Morgan BSc(Hons) MCD MRTPI

Programme Officer – Mrs Annette Feeney

Annette.FEENEY@chelmsford.gov.uk

HEARING SESSION AGENDA

Tuesday 17 November 2026 10.00 am and 2.00 pm

MATTER 6

Inspectors' openings and introductions

Approach to masterplans

1.1 Given that they have not been subject to formal examination, should site specific policies require development to *accord* with approved masterplans?

Growth Area 1 – Central and Urban Chelmsford

Location 1 – Central and Urban Chelmsford

1.2 Strategic Growth Site Policy 1a - Chelmer Waterside

- What evidence supports the estimated delivery of housing on the Chelmer Waterside Sites (CW1a and CW1c-d) as set out in the Housing Site Schedule April 2026 (LDS012)?
- Proposed modification to fifth bullet point in Policy SGS1a (in Council's hearing statement)

1.3 Strategic Growth Site Policy 1w – Meadows Shopping Centre and Meadows Surface Car Park

- In light of paragraphs 68 & 69 of the Council's hearing statement, is the requirement to demonstrate capacity in existing car parks still needed in Policy SGS 1w?
- Proposed modifications to Policy SGS 1w (in Council's hearing statement):
  - Capacity and delivery timescale changes
  - Additional sentence requiring development to accord with a masterplan
  - Amendments to requirements for replacement bridges

1.4 Strategic Growth Site Policy 1b – Former St Peter's College

- Proposed modifications to reflect changed circumstances at Policy SGS 1b (in Council's hearing statement).
- Should the site boundary be amended to exclude the two schools which are now operational?

1.5 Other proposed modifications to site policies in Location 1:

- SGS Policy 1cc - Proposed changes to capacity, delivery timescales and policy wording specifying type of housing required
- SGS Policy 1f – additional bullet point referring to utility easements
- SGS Policy 1y – additional requirement for an archaeological assessment
- SGS Policy 1dd – additional bullet point referring to utility easements
- Proposed changes to delivery timescales - SGS Policies 1d, 1e, 1f and 1y

1.6 Any other comments on Location 1 sites?

Location 2 – West Chelmsford

1.7 Strategic Growth Site Policy 2 – Proposed changes to delivery timescales

Location 3 – Central and Urban Chelmsford

1.8 SGS Policies 3a–3d and GS Policies 3a–3d: East of Chelmsford

- Should policies SGS3a and SPA5 be amended to clarify access requirements to the proposed country park and Sandford Mill?
- proposed amendments regarding mitigation of potential recreational disturbance on SSSIs
- proposed changes to delivery timescales

Location 4 – Galleywood

1.9 GS Policy 4 – proposed deletion of policy and amendments to paragraph 7.11, Figure 16, Policy Map 16 and Appendix 4 following completion of site

1.10 Any other comments on sites in Locations 2-4?

Location 18 – North West Chelmsford

1.11 SGS Policy 18a – North of Hollow Lane

- What are the reasons for selecting SGS 18a, and what alternatives were considered?
- Can development of the scale proposed be accommodated without unacceptable harm to landscape character, heritage assets and biodiversity?

- Does the transport evidence demonstrate that development of Site 18a can take place without unacceptable effects on the strategic and local highway networks?
- Other infrastructure requirements, including health and education
- Proposed changes to delivery timescales
- Any other comments on SGS Policy 18a?

Location 19 – Land West of Patching Hall Lane

1.12 SGS Policy 19

- What are the reasons for selecting SGS 19 and what alternatives were considered?
- Can development of the scale proposed be accommodated without unacceptable harm to landscape character, heritage assets and biodiversity?
- Does the transport evidence demonstrate that development of Site 19 can take place without unacceptable effects on the strategic and local highway networks?
- Other infrastructure requirements, including health and education
- Would the allocation require a new boundary to be created across a field, and if so, would the remaining agricultural land remain viable?
- Any other comments on SGS Policy 19?

Afternoon Session 2.00 pm

Growth Areas 2 and 3 (excluding sites 16a and 16b)

Inspectors' openings and introductions

Growth Area 2 – North Chelmsford

Location 6 – North East Chelmsford (Chelmsford Garden Community)

1.13 Strategic Growth Site Policy 6

- Progress with delivery of Chelmsford Garden Community
- Are the proposed delivery timescales realistic, taking account of infrastructure requirements and timings?
- Proposed modifications to SGS Policy 6 – listed in Council's hearing statement
- Any other comments on SGS Policy 6?

Location 7 – Great Leighs

1.14 SGS Policies 7a – 7c

- Are the proposed delivery timescales realistic, taking account of infrastructure requirements and timings?
- Proposed modifications to SGS Policies 7a – 7c, (in Council's hearing statement)

Location 9 – Boreham

1.15 SGS Policy 9a – Waltham Road Employment Area

- How was the site selected, and what alternatives were considered?
- How were the transportation and highways impacts assessed, what would be the impacts of development, and how could the effects be mitigated?
- What would be the impact of development on the rural landscape, biodiversity and residential amenity? What mitigation would be needed?
- Proposed modifications (in Council's hearing statement)
- Any other comments on SGS Policy 9a?

1.16 Growth Site Policies 9b and 9c

- How were the sites selected?
- Proposed modifications (in Council's hearing statement)
- Any other comments on GS Policies 9b and 9c?

Location 14 – Ford End

1.17 Growth Site Policy 14b

- How was the site selected, and what alternatives were considered?
- Is the scale of development appropriate, taking account of the existing settlement size? What would be the proportional increase in the size of the settlement?
- What would be the impact on rural landscape character, and how could this be mitigated?
- Would development limit the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land?
- Proposed modifications (in Council's hearing statement)
- Any other comments on GS Policy 14b?

1.18 Any other comments on Growth Area 2 sites?

Growth Area 3 (excluding sites 16a and 16b)

Location 10 – North of South Woodham Ferres

1.19 Strategic Growth Site Policy 10

- What progress is being made with site delivery, including the s106 agreement?

- Proposed modification to delivery timescales
- Any other comments on SGS Policy 10?

Location 11 – Bicknacre

1.20 Growth Site Policy 11b and Strategic Growth Site Policy 11c

- What were the reasons for selecting the sites, and what alternatives were considered?
- Proposed modifications to GS Policy 11b:
  - revisions to ensure no impact on safeguarded defence assets (MOD ref 228, 230)
  - proposed modification to delivery timescale (MOD ref 229)
  - requirement to work with stakeholders to assess recreational pressure (MOD ref 231)
- Proposed modifications to SGS Policy 11c:
  - include reference to utility easements (MOD ref 231, 235)
  - requirement to work with stakeholders to assess recreational pressure (MOD ref 234)
- Any other comments on GS Policy 11b and SGS Policy 11c?

Location 17 – East Hanningfield

1.21 Growth Site Policies 17a, 17b, & 17e, and Strategic Growth Site Policies 17c & 17d

- What were the reasons for selecting the sites, and what alternatives were considered?
- Cumulatively, does the quantum of development proposed in East Hanningfield represent a proportionate increase in the size of the settlement?
- Would development here accord with the Spatial Principles in Strategic Policy S1, in particular point a) - locate development at well-connected and sustainable locations?
- How would the sites, in particular SGS 17c and SGS17d, relate to the existing built form?
- SGS17c is identified as being of high overall landscape sensitivity, and the other sites of moderate value. How would the landscape and visual impacts be mitigated, and are any modifications needed?
- In terms of infrastructure requirements, how have the cumulative impacts of Location 17 sites been assessed?
- Are the anticipated delivery timescales realistic, having regard to capacity limitations at South Woodham Water Recycling Centre?
- Proposed modification to SGS Policy 17d - include reference to utility easements (MOD ref 249, 250)
- Any other comments on Location 17 sites?

Location 20 – Rettendon Place

1.22 Strategic Growth Site Policy 20

- What were the reasons for selecting the site, and what alternatives were considered?
- Does the quantum of development proposed represent a proportionate increase in the size of the settlement?
- Would development here accord with the Spatial Principles in Strategic Policy S1, in particular point a) Locate development at well-connected and sustainable locations?
- Are the anticipated delivery timescales realistic, having regard to capacity limitations at South Woodham Water Recycling Centre?
- Proposed modification to clarify the maximum floorspace for a convenience retail unit (in Council's hearing statement)
- Proposed modification to include reference to utility easements (MOD ref 252, 253)
- Any other comments on SGS Policy 20?

Location 12 – St Giles, Bicknacre

1.23 Growth Site Policy 12

- Proposed modification to delivery timescales
- Any other comments on GS Policy 12?

Location 13 – Danbury

1.24 Strategic Growth Site Policy 13

- Proposed modifications:
  - revisions to site capacity and delivery timescales (MOD ref 240)
  - revisions to ensure no impact on safeguarded defence assets (MOD ref 241, 242)
- Any other comments on SGS Policy 13?

Location 21 – Woodham Ferres

1.25 Growth Site Policies 21a and 21b

- What were the reasons for selecting the sites, and what alternatives were considered?
- Are the anticipated delivery timescales realistic, having regard to capacity limitations at South Woodham Water Recycling Centre?
- Proposed modification to GS Policy 21a to include reference to utility easements (MOD ref 254, 255)

- Any other comments on GS Policies 21a and 21b?