HS076

GLADMAN

Chelmsford Local Plan Review 2022-2041

Examination

Matter 6 – Site Selection

October 2026

Stakeholder number: 1301644

Comment ID numbers: PSQ25-6309, PSQ25-6313, PSQ25-6314, PSQ25-6315, PSQ25-6316, PSQ25-6317, PSQ25-6318, PSQ25-6319, PSQ25-6320, PSQ25-6321, PSQ25-6322, PSQ25-6323, PSQ25-6324, PSQ25-6325, PSQ25-6326, PSQ25-6327, AS-993, AS-994, AS-995, AS-996, AS-997.

Word count: 2,638

1 SITE ASSESSMENT AND SELECTION

6.2 Is the approach of requiring masterplans/planning briefs an effective mechanism to secure sustainable development across the plan area?

1.1.1 Gladman recognises the Council's aspiration to positively influence the form and quality of development through the preparation of masterplans and planning briefs. It notes that the Council has sought to adopt a proportionate approach through the introduction of three distinct masterplanning routes based on the scale of proposed development.

1.1.2 However, Gladman cautions that the mandatory preparation of masterplans or planning briefs for all allocations may not always represent the most effective mechanism for securing sustainable development. Whilst such documents can provide a valuable framework for the delivery of larger or more complex sites, extensive masterplanning requirements can impede delivery timescales, create additional costs and uncertainty, and delay the delivery of much-needed housing, particularly where they are required prior to the submission or determination of outline planning applications. It is noted that a number of the sites brought forward through the Focused Consultation Additional Sites (Regulation 19) Document were identified specifically to help ensure that the Council's housing requirement could be met during the earlier part of the plan period and it is therefore important that the proposed masterplanning process does not frustrate the timely delivery of those allocations.

1.1.3 Gladman is concerned that the Revised Masterplan and Planning Brief Procedure approved by Cabinet on 13 October 2026 extends the indicative timescales for the preparation and approval of masterplans and planning briefs, which risks causing unnecessary delay to development coming forward. The Council should seek to avoid introducing additional layers of policy, assessment and approval that duplicate matters more appropriately considered through the planning application process. The level of detail required should remain proportionate to the type of application proposed. For example, outline planning applications should not be required to

secure approval of a detailed masterplan where matters relating to layout, design and appearance can be addressed through subsequent reserved matters applications.

1.1.4 Overall, any requirement for masterplans or planning briefs should remain sufficiently flexible, proportionate and focussed on facilitating delivery. The Council should ensure that masterplanning supports the efficient delivery of sustainable development rather than becoming a barrier to it.

Issue 1 Site Allocations

6.3 What is the current planning status of the site (eg masterplans, permissions, completions)? Have there been any changes since the Plan was submitted for examination and if so, are any modifications needed?

1.1.5 This hearing statement has been prepared in respect of Gladman Developments Ltd's (herein referred to as 'Gladman') land interests at South of Rough Hill Complex, The Tye (SGS17c) and at South and Southeast of East Hanningfield (SGS17d) (together referred to as 'the sites'). Gladman is actively promoting the sites on behalf of the landowners and has the benefit of a signed Promotion Agreement in respect of both sites.

1.1.6 Both SGS17c and SGS17d are currently at the pre-application stage. An initial pre-application meeting has been held with the Council, and the parties are currently exploring the use of a Planning Performance Agreement (PPA) to facilitate the Council's proposed masterplanning procedure. Technical work to support the submission of planning applications is currently underway.

1.1.7 There have been no material changes to either site that would affect their suitability, availability or deliverability since the submission of the Local Plan.

6.4 For the housing sites, what is the basis for the proposed capacity?

1.1.8 Gladman understand that the capacities have been established through initial masterplanning by the Council. We are in the process of undertaking our own masterplanning as part of early planning application preparation and there is nothing that would preclude the delivery of the figures as envisaged by the policy although there may be capacity to deliver slightly in excess of 115 dwellings on Site 17c. This

will ultimately be determined through the ongoing masterplanning but if in excess is likely to accord with the policy of 'around 115',

6.5 For the sites which include non-residential uses, what is the basis for the scale and type/mix of employment and other uses proposed? Is it justified?

1.1.9 The sites do not include non-residential uses.

6.6 Are the development requirements clear, and are any further safeguards or mitigation measures necessary to achieve an acceptable form of development?

1.1.10 Gladman considers that the requirements set out within Policies SGS17c and SGS17d are clear and provide an appropriate basis for the development of the sites.

1.1.11 Gladman does not consider that any further safeguards or mitigation measures are necessary at this stage. Any additional mitigation requirements can be addressed through the development management process.

6.7 What is the expected timescale and rate of development for the housing sites and is this realistic?

1.1.12 The supporting text to the respective allocation policies indicates that the Council anticipates that the sites being delivered between 2028 and 2031.

1.1.13 Gladman considers that the earliest delivery for the sites will be between 2029 and 2032. However, this will be dependent on the timely progression of the Council's proposed masterplanning process, and any delay in securing approval of the masterplans could have implications on delivery.

1.1.14 Should planning permission be secured, Gladman would market the sites to prospective national and regional housebuilders who would expect to deliver the sites at a rate of approx. 35-40 dwellings per annum respectively based on average build-out rates.

6.8 Are any modifications to the site policy needed for soundness?

1.1.15 Gladman considers that Policies SGS17c and SGS17d are sound and that no substantive modifications are required.

1.1.16 However, for clarity and to avoid unnecessary constraints on delivery, the policy could be amended to confirm that an approved masterplan is not required prior to the submission of an outline planning application and can instead be secured at the reserved matters stage.

Location 17 - Does the quantum of development proposed in sites 17a-17e, both individually and cumulatively, accord with the Spatial Principles and Spatial Strategy set out in Strategic Policies S1 and S7? S.

1.1.17 This is primarily a matter for the Council to justify. Gladman discusses the Council's spatial principles and spatial strategy within Matter 3.

1.1.18 Notwithstanding this, Gladman supports the identification of East Hanningfield as a Service Settlement capable of accommodating additional growth. The allocation of Sites 17a-17e is consistent with Strategic Policies S1 and S7 insofar as it directs development to a sustainable settlement identified for growth within the settlement hierarchy.

1.1.19 Overall, Gladman considers that the quantum of development proposed across Sites 17a-17e, both individually and cumulatively, accords with the Spatial Principles and Spatial Strategy set out in Strategic Policies S1 and S7.

2 LOCATION 17 – EAST HANNINGFIELD – STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE POLICY 17C

2.1 What is the likely impact of the proposed allocations, including the cumulative impact, on the following factors:

- **The strategic and local highway network including public transport and active travel**
- **Agricultural land quality, landscape character, biodiversity and heritage assets**
- **Flood risk, air quality, noise and light pollution**
- **Other infrastructure, including education, health, recreation and utilities**

How were the above impacts assessed, and what evidence is the Council relying on?

2.1.1 This is a question for the Council to respond to.

2.1.2 Gladman have already undertaken a series of background technical studies and assessments to support the site's delivery, and we are currently in the process of refining these documents with a view to informing a future planning application. The preparation of these documents has not identified any constraints that would preclude the site's development:

- **Transport and Accessibility:** Gladman is satisfied that there will be no unacceptable impacts on the strategic network and that the site can be safely accessed from Main Road via a simple priority junction. Appropriate cycling and walking routes would be provided within the site and will be incorporated into any development proposals. A future outline planning application on the site will be supported by a Transport Assessment and a Framework Travel Plan. Gladman is willing to provide proportionate developer contributions towards any identified need for enhanced accessibility infrastructure.

- **Natural and Historic Environment:** The development will be carefully masterplanned to take account of and retain all existing landscape features wherever possible, accompanied by new areas of green infrastructure planting. The development will also achieve a minimum of 10% biodiversity net gain. Development of the site will not have an unacceptable impact on the setting or significance of any heritage assets including Willis Farm, Rails Farm, The Old Forge, and K6 Telephone Box.

- **Flood Risk:** A surface water drainage strategy developed in accordance with Sustainable Urban Drainage principles will be employed as part of the site's development, ensuring the proposals do not increase the risk of flooding on-site or elsewhere,. The site can be safely developed in relation to flood risk and the risk of flooding will not pose a constraint to development. The proposals will be designed to mitigate the impacts of climate change, with noise and air quality assessments forming part of a future planning application submission.

- **Community Facilities and Other Infrastructure:** The development will be accompanied by proportionate developer contributions towards the delivery of new community infrastructure, including any identified need to provide additional primary and secondary school facilities and increased healthcare capacity. Gladman would be willing to agree to all requests for developer contributions that meet the relevant requirements of paragraph 57 of the 2023 NPPF and the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations 122 and 123.

2.2 Are the essential site specific requirements and mitigation measures justified, and will they, along with other policies in the plan, be effective in achieving sustainable development on the sites?

2.2.1 This is again a question for the Council to respond to and clarify. However, Gladman considers that the SGS17c is capable of coming forward for development in a sustainable manner and without giving rise to any unacceptable impacts.

2.2.2 Gladman would be willing to make appropriate and proportionate contributions towards infrastructure and mitigation where these are demonstrated to be necessary and directly related to the development.

2.3 Can required capacity increases in wastewater treatment and disposal be provided to support development in East Hanningfield within the timescales set out?

2.3.1 This is a matter to be addressed by Anglian Water in its capacity as the statutory undertaker.

2.3.2 The proposed allocation policy requires that any development proposals demonstrate that there is sufficient capacity for wastewater treatment and disposal to serve the site, including any associated sewer connections and any required mitigation within the sewerage network. Any necessary upgrades can be secured through the appropriate mechanisms. Indeed, under the provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991, the sewerage undertaker has a statutory duty to provide and maintain a public sewerage system and to undertake any works necessary to accommodate additional foul water flows arising from development.

2.3.3 Gladman has submitted a pre-development enquiry to Anglian Water in order to better understand the available sewer capacity and the planned upgrades to South Woodham Ferrers Water Recycling Centre over the current and subsequent Asset Management Periods (AMP).

2.3.4 There is no evidence to indicate that the necessary capacity increases cannot be delivered within the timescales envisaged by the Plan or that wastewater infrastructure constraints would preclude delivery of the site.

3 LOCATION 17 – EAST HANNINGFIELD – STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE POLICY 17D

3.1 What is the likely impact of the proposed allocations, including the cumulative impact, on the following factors:

- **The strategic and local highway network including public transport and active travel**
- **Agricultural land quality, landscape character, biodiversity and heritage assets**
- **Flood risk, air quality, noise and light pollution**
- **Other infrastructure, including education, health, recreation and utilities**

How were the above impacts assessed, and what evidence is the Council relying on?

3.1.1 This is a question for the Council to respond to.

3.1.2 Gladman have already undertaken a series of background technical studies and assessments to support the site's delivery and we are currently in the process of refining these documents with a view to informing a future planning application. The preparation of these documents has not identified any constraints that would preclude the site's development:

- **Transport and Accessibility:** Gladman is satisfied that there will be no unacceptable impacts on the strategic network and that the site can be safely accessed from Old Church Road via a simple priority junction. Appropriate cycling and walking routes would be provided within the site and will be incorporated into any development proposals. A future outline planning application on the site would be supported by a Transport Assessment and a Framework Travel Plan. Gladman is willing to provide

proportionate developer contributions towards any identified need for enhanced accessibility infrastructure.

- **Natural and Historic Environment:** The development will be carefully masterplanned to take account of and retain all existing landscape features wherever possible, accompanied by new areas of green infrastructure planting. The development will also achieve a minimum of 10% biodiversity net gain. Development of the site will not have an unacceptable impact on the setting or significance of any heritage assets including Willis Farm, Rails Farm and Paprills Farm, and the non-designated asset of Shepherds Cottage.
- **Flood Risk:** A surface water drainage strategy developed in accordance with Sustainable Urban Drainage principles will be employed as part of the site's development, ensuring the proposals do not increase the risk of flooding on-site or elsewhere. The site can be safely developed in relation to flood risk and the risk of flooding will not pose a constraint to development. The proposals will be designed to mitigate the impacts of climate change, with noise and air quality assessments forming part of a future planning application submission.
- **Community Facilities and Other Infrastructure:** The development will be accompanied by proportionate developer contributions towards the delivery of new community infrastructure, including any identified need to provide additional primary and secondary school facilities and increased healthcare capacity. Gladman would be willing to agree to all requests for developer contributions that meet the relevant requirements of paragraph 57 of the 2023 NPPF and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations 122 and 123.

3.2 Are the essential site specific requirements and mitigation measures justified, and will they, along with other policies in the plan, be effective in achieving sustainable development on the sites?

3.3 This is again a question for the Council to respond to and clarify. However, Gladman considers that the SGS17d is capable of coming forward for development in a sustainable manner and without giving rise to any unacceptable impacts.

3.4 Gladman would be willing to make appropriate and proportionate contributions towards infrastructure and mitigation where these are demonstrated to be necessary and directly related to the development.

3.5 Can required capacity increases in wastewater treatment and disposal be provided to support development in East Hanningfield within the timescales set out?

3.5.1 This is a matter to be addressed by Anglian Water in its capacity as the statutory undertaker.

3.5.2 The proposed allocation policy requires that any development proposals demonstrate that there is sufficient capacity for wastewater treatment and disposal to serve the site, including any associated sewer connections and any required mitigation within the sewerage network. Any necessary upgrades can be secured through the appropriate mechanisms. Indeed, under the provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991, the sewerage undertaker has a statutory duty to provide and maintain a public sewerage system and to undertake any works necessary to accommodate additional foul water flows arising from development.

3.5.3 Gladman has submitted a pre-development enquiry to Anglian Water in order to better understand the available sewer capacity and the planned upgrades to South Woodham Ferrers Water Recycling Centre over the current and subsequent AMP periods.

3.5.4 There is no evidence to indicate that the necessary capacity increases cannot be delivered within the timescales envisaged by the Plan or that wastewater infrastructure constraints would preclude delivery of the sites.