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

12 November 2026 NOT BEFORE 11.30 am and 2.00 pm

MATTER 5

Issue 1 – Whether the Plan will provide for the right mix of housing

Policy DM1

1.1 Is the requirement for specialist residential accommodation on every development of more than 100 dwellings justified, or should provision instead be directed to larger developments in suitable and sustainable locations?

1.2 How will accessibility to services and public transport be taken into account when determining whether specialist residential accommodation should be provided on site?

1.3 Is the requirement for 5% self-build and custom-build plots on developments of more than 100 dwellings justified, having regard to the practical implications of Community Infrastructure Levy and section 106 obligations?

1.4 Should the requirement instead apply only to larger developments that are better able to accommodate self-build and custom-build plots?

1.5 Is the meaning of “older persons’ accommodation” sufficiently clear?

1.6 Is a definition or other clarification necessary to ensure that the requirement is interpreted and applied consistently?

1.7 Are main modifications necessary to Policy DM1 for soundness?

Issue 2 - Whether the Plan will deliver sufficient affordable housing

Policy DM2

1.8 Does the proposed tenure split of 70% affordable rent and 30% shared ownership appropriately reflect the evidence of local need?

1.9 In what circumstances would:

- a site-specific viability assessment be accepted;
- a review mechanism be required; or
- an off-site contribution be permitted?

1.10 Is limiting rural exception sites to land adjacent to defined settlement boundaries justified and consistent with national policy?

1.11 Does requiring a parish-wide housing-needs survey provide an effective and proportionate basis for establishing:

- the scale and type of local need;
- qualifying local connections; and
- the subsequent allocation of homes?

1.12 Is permitting up to 50% market housing necessary and proportionate to facilitate affordable-housing delivery? What evidence would be required to demonstrate that market housing is essential?

1.13 Are any main modifications necessary to make Policy DM2 justified, effective and consistent with national policy

Issue 3 - Whether the Plan makes adequate provision for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

Policy DM3

1.8 Is the identified need for Travelling Showpeople plots up to date, including the additional needs identified through the Broomfield appeal? Does that decision indicate a need to modify Policy DM3 to enable permanent accommodation

1.9 Should the identified need be met through specific allocations or is reliance on windfall provision under Policy DM3 justified and effective?

1.10 Should land east of Main Road, Broomfield be allocated for 11 permanent Travelling Showpeople plots?

1.11 Is the requirement for 13 Travelling Showpeople plots at Site 16a justified and deliverable?

1.12 Should the Plan allow the Site 16a requirement to be met off site and, if so, how would suitable and timely alternative provision be secured?

1.13 Is requiring compliance with all ten criteria justified? Does the policy allow appropriate weight to unmet need and the lack of alternative sites?

1.14 Are the adverse-impact tests in criteria (ii) and (vi) justified, or should they be qualified by “significantly”?

1.15 Is paragraph 8.50 justified, given the different purposes of Green Belt and Green Wedge designations? Would adding “normally” address the objection?

1.16 Are any main modifications necessary to ensure that the identified need for Travelling Showpeople accommodation will be met over the Plan period?