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

11 November 2026 2.00 pm

MATTER 4

Issue 1 – Whether the planned infrastructure aligns with the planned housing and economic growth

A12 widening cancellation and strategic growth

1.1 Does the Beaulieu Access Package provide an adequate replacement for the relevant elements of the cancelled A12 scheme?

1.2 Is there sufficient evidence at this stage that the additional growth proposed by the Plan can be accommodated at A12 Junctions 18 and 19 and on the A12 mainline?

1.3 What further mitigation measures, if any, are necessary, and are they sufficiently identified and deliverable?

Chelmsford North East Bypass

1.4 Is the Council correct that Sections 1b and 2 are not required to support any of the housing growth proposed in this Plan?

1.5 Is Section 1a sufficient for the growth assumed in the transport evidence?

Junctions 18 and 19 and cumulative growth

1.6 What role does the Beaulieu Access Package play in accommodating growth beyond Chelmsford Garden Community?

1.7 What additional works would be necessary to accommodate Site 16a?

1.8 Have the cumulative effects of Sites 16a and 16b at Junction 18, the A414 and the A12 been adequately assessed?

1.9 Can any outstanding matters properly be resolved through masterplanning and planning applications, or are they necessary to demonstrate deliverability at the plan-making stage?

Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) (INF012)

1.10 Are all critical infrastructure requirements adequately identified?

1.11 Is there sufficient information about their cost, funding, phasing and responsible delivery body?

1.12 How will changes to infrastructure requirements be monitored and incorporated during the Plan period?

1.13 Where site-specific infrastructure remains to be determined, is there sufficient certainty at this stage to establish that the development is deliverable?

Infrastructure costs, viability and funding

1.14 Do the costs in the IDP align with the assumptions in the viability evidence?

1.15 Where costs remain indicative or to be confirmed, is there sufficient allowance to demonstrate viability?

1.16 Is there sufficient clarity about which infrastructure will be funded through CIL, section 106/278 obligations, direct provision or external funding?

1.17 Are there any sites where the cumulative infrastructure burden could materially affect delivery?

Strategic Policy S9

1.18 Does the policy adequately link the phasing and occupation of development to the delivery of necessary infrastructure?

1.19 Is it sufficiently clear what happens if critical infrastructure is delayed, altered or not delivered?

1.20 Are any further main modifications necessary for effectiveness?

Strategic Policy S16 and sustainable transport

1.21 Are the requirements for different scales of development sufficiently clear?

1.22 How will the sustainable-transport objectives be translated into site-specific requirements?

1.23 Is reliance upon subsequent masterplanning and Transport Assessments appropriate?

1.24 Are the proposed modifications sufficient to make the policy effective?

Infrastructure delivery mechanisms

1.25 What are the respective roles of CIL, section 106/278 obligations, direct provision and external funding?

1.26 Where infrastructure is critical to the delivery of an allocation, is reliance upon future funding decisions justified?

1.27 How will infrastructure needed to address cumulative impacts across more than one development be secured?

Development and infrastructure phasing

1.28 Are explicit infrastructure or occupation triggers required for any strategic allocations?

1.29 Should the Plan specify the consequences where critical infrastructure is delayed or does not come forward?

1.30 Are any main modifications necessary for soundness?

12 November 2026 9.30 am

Issue 2 – Transport

Transport evidence and modelling

1.31 Are the assumptions underpinning the strategic transport modelling sufficiently robust?

1.32 Does the modelling adequately identify the effects of the Plan on the strategic highway network, including the A12, Junctions 18 and 19 and the A414?

1.34 Does it adequately identify effects on the local highway network and any displacement of traffic onto local routes?

1.35 Does the evidence provide sufficient certainty at the plan-making stage about the transport impacts of the strategic allocations, or are any significant matters being deferred to masterplanning and planning applications?

A12 and Site 16a

1.36 Are the modelling assumptions concerning the distribution of Site 16a traffic between Junctions 18 and 19 sufficiently robust?

1.37 What are the implications of the identified limitations in modelling A12 mainline congestion and merge/diverge behaviour?

1.38 Is further assessment required before the Plan can properly conclude that the impacts of Site 16a on the strategic road network can be satisfactorily mitigated?

Sustainable transport and modal shift

1.39 Are the assumptions concerning reduced car use and increased use of public transport, walking and cycling adequately evidenced and achievable?

1.40 Are the measures necessary to achieve the assumed modal shift sufficiently identified and capable of delivery?

1.41 How will delivery of development be related to the provision of the sustainable transport measures upon which the transport strategy relies?

Mitigation and phasing

1.42 Which mitigation measures are essential to accommodate planned growth and which remain subject to further investigation?

1.43 Is there sufficient certainty about the timing and delivery of those measures?

1.44 Should development or occupation be expressly linked to the delivery of any critical transport infrastructure or mitigation?

Beaulieu Access Package and Chelmsford Garden Community

1.45 Are the proposed infrastructure and occupation triggers sufficient to ensure that development does not outpace transport capacity?

1.46 Is any further policy mechanism or modification required to secure the necessary relationship between development and infrastructure delivery?

Strategic Zonal Focuses

1.47 Is there a sufficiently clear relationship between the spatial distribution of development and the transport strategy for each zone?

1.48 Are the measures necessary to achieve the intended changes in travel behaviour sufficiently reflected in the Plan and site-specific policies?

Localised and cumulative impacts

1.49 Have the cumulative effects of Sites 16a and 16b on Junction 18, the A414 and the surrounding network been sufficiently assessed?

1.50 Has potential displacement of traffic onto surrounding local roads been adequately assessed?

1.51 Is there sufficient certainty about how any necessary cumulative mitigation will be secured and delivered?

Cross-boundary effects

1.52 Does the evidence adequately assess traffic movements between Chelmsford and neighbouring authority areas, particularly along the A414?

1.53 What uncertainties arise from emerging growth proposals in neighbouring authorities?

1.54 Is there an effective mechanism for identifying and securing any additional cross-boundary mitigation which becomes necessary?

Overall effectiveness and soundness

1.55 Overall, does the transport evidence provide sufficient certainty that the scale and distribution of development proposed by the Plan can be accommodated without unacceptable effects on the strategic and local transport networks?

1.56 Are any main modifications necessary to ensure that necessary transport mitigation is identified, secured and delivered at the appropriate stage?