



Examination of the Chelmsford Draft Local Plan

Hearing Statement

on behalf of the

North East Chelmsford Garden Village Consortium

Matter 8 – Infrastructure

Responses to Questions 75, 76, 77, 78 and 83

Andrew Martin MAUD DipTP(Distinction) FRICS FRTPI

November 2018 | AM-P Ref: 14010

Examination of Chelmsford Draft Local Plan
Hearing Statement on behalf of the
North East Chelmsford Garden Village Consortium





Matter 8 – Infrastructure

Main issues – Whether the Plan sets out a positively prepared strategy for infrastructure provision to meet the Plan’s development strategy and whether this is justified, effective and consistent with national policy. Are the policies relating to infrastructure sound?

Q75 The Plan sets out a range of infrastructure requirements which have been identified through the Council’s *Infrastructure Delivery Plan Update*’ (IDP) (EB018B). Is the approach set out in the IDP for identifying necessary infrastructure justified and consistent with national policy?

1. The Framework 2012 sets out that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. The policies in paragraphs 18 to 219, taken as a whole, constitute the Government’s view of what sustainable development in England means in practice for the planning system. Paragraph 7 explains that there are three dimensions to sustainable development: economic, social and environmental, which give rise to the need for the planning system to perform a number of roles under the headings of the three stated dimensions. These roles should not be undertaken in isolation, because they are mutually dependent. All three roles – economic, social and environmental, include the need for development to include the provision of different types of infrastructure to support growth and the achievement of sustainable development, including accessible local services that reflect the community’s needs and support its health, social and cultural well-being and mitigate the environmental effects (para 7).
2. Section 4 of NPPF2012 provides guidance on promoting sustainable transport; Section 8 advises on the policy to promote healthy communities including the provision of community facilities, such as schools, sports and recreation facilities etc. The section in the Framework providing guidance on plan-making (pages 37-43) sets out those matters that should be included in Local Plans that are key to delivering sustainable development, including: setting out strategic priorities for the area; the provision of the necessary range of infrastructure; the provision of health, security, community, cultural facilities and other facilities. Local Plans should plan positively for the development and infrastructure required in the area to meet the objectives, principles and policies of the Framework (para 157).
3. The Consortium considers that CCC has taken the Framework fully into account in preparation of the Plan and has identified the reasonable and appropriate range of infrastructure requirements that are



needed to achieve sustainable development. The Council has followed an approach and process that is commonly applied by local planning authorities in preparing its evidence base and supporting the policies and proposals in their local plans. In particular the items of infrastructure listed in the IDP have been examined in detail by the Consortium's consultant team. They have been found both to be necessary and viable in order to create a new sustainable Garden Community at NE Chelmsford, that is being planned to follow Garden Village principles established by the TCPA.

4. Consequently, in view of the above comments, the Consortium considers that the approach set out in the IDP for identifying necessary infrastructure is justified and consistent with national policy.

Q76 The Plan sets out in Strategic Policy S11 the approach to be taken for the provision of necessary infrastructure and lists some specific infrastructure requirements in relation to transport and highways, flood risk management, community facilities, green and natural infrastructure and utilities.

- a. Are these requirements based on robust evidence, are they all necessary to support development during the Plan period and are they viable and deliverable within the timescales of relevant site developments?

5. Strategic Policy S11 – Infrastructure Requirements sets out the priorities for infrastructure provision or improvements that are also contained within the relevant Strategic Policies and Site Allocation policies. The Consortium considers that these follow the NPPF guidance, summarised above. With specific reference to SGS4 – NE Chelmsford the Consortium has undertaken a thorough assessment of both the Council's and its own evidence base and considers this to be robust and that requirements for the SGS4 are necessary to support not only the allocation, but also Growth Area 2 and growth in Mid-Essex generally. The evidence produced by Turner Morum and others in their IDP Report (Appendix 3 to Consortium Hearing Statement for Matter 6b) confirms that the infrastructure/s106 requirements for NEC are reasonable and would not prevent the site from coming forward as anticipated in the Plan. The analysis also provides further clarity as to how each cost item is envisaged to be delivered.
6. The SOCG 21 North East Chelmsford – Strategic Matters that includes the Consortium Agreement and a Consortium Memorandum of Understanding, SOCG 17 North East Chelmsford – Highways and Transport and SOCG 24 Beaulieu Railway Station all demonstrate how the parties are working together to deliver the infrastructure.



7. Consequently the Consortium considers that the requirements are viable and deliverable within the timescales as set out in the evidence relating to SGS4.

Q76 The Plan sets out in Strategic Policy S11 the approach to be taken for the provision of necessary infrastructure and lists some specific infrastructure requirements in relation to transport and highways, flood risk management, community facilities, green and natural infrastructure and utilities.

- b. The policy states that infrastructure is not limited to those listed. Does this mean that other infrastructure is necessary and has this been clearly identified and set out in other policies?

8. The Consortium's Hearing Statement for Matter 6b confirms in paragraph 17 that further infrastructure improvements will be identified in the Transport Assessments that will accompany future planning applications. The City Council, Essex County Council and the Consortium have made an allowance for the corresponding cost of £10m.

Q76 The Plan sets out in Strategic Policy S11 the approach to be taken for the provision of necessary infrastructure and lists some specific infrastructure requirements in relation to transport and highways, flood risk management, community facilities, green and natural infrastructure and utilities.

- c. The supporting text in paragraph 6.57 lists transport and highways infrastructure schemes that are '*safeguarded from development or are allocated on the Policies Map*'. Are these allocations and safeguarded land clearly set out as such in specific policies?

9. The Consortium confirms that the section of the safeguarded route for Chelmsford North East Bypass that is within the ownership of the relevant member of the Consortium is safeguarded by an historic s52 agreement relating to the planning permissions for mineral workings. The Consortium is prepared to agree to any necessary subsequent variations of this safeguarded route that may be necessary at the detailed design stage and are working collaboratively with CCC and ECC to prepare a masterplan, based on the principles set out in the draft DFD at Appendix 1 to the Hearing Statement in respect of Matter 6b. Furthermore, the Policies Map 1 – Chelmsford Urban Area at AC255 clearly defines the



Safeguarded Corridor within the area controlled by the Consortium. Additionally, the corridor within the Beaulieu development is safeguarded by the s106 agreement relating to the extant outline planning permission (ref: 09/01314/EIA) for the new neighbourhood. In addition, plans attached to the Memorandum of Understanding relating to the transport strategy, referred to below, show the extent of the safeguarded corridor for the NE Chelmsford By-pass.

- Q77** Has the effect of proposed development on the strategic transport network been adequately assessed? Does the Plan provide sufficient measures to avoid any severe cumulative impacts, including through mitigation, and maximise opportunities for sustainable transport?
10. The Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) relating to the transport strategy prepared by TPA and at Appendix 4 of the Consortium's Hearing Statement relating to Matter 6b concludes that: *"Having received the evidence base insofar as it relates to the proposed development site, the Garden Village Consortium, TPA and Mayer Brown are satisfied that it provides a robust assessment of the transport implications of the proposed development and its associated transport infrastructure requirements, including improvements to the wider highway network"* (para 1.5)
11. A summary of the proposed transport strategy is set out in Section 3 of the MOU. Drawings appended to the MOU also show the extent of the safeguarded corridor for the NE Chelmsford By-pass. Additionally Appendix 3 of the Turner Morum IDP Report (at Appendix 3 of Hearing Statement relating to Matter 6b) provides a plan indicating the phased delivery of the By-pass and other strategic Infrastructure. SOCG 17 - NEC Highways and Transport and SOCG 24 - Beaulieu Railway Station set out the position agreed between the relevant parties.
12. Consequently, the Consortium considers, both from its own evidence base and that of the relevant Authorities, that the effect of the proposed development on the strategic transport network has been adequately assessed. The evidence also demonstrates that the Plan does provide sufficient measures to avoid any severe cumulative impacts in relation to Growth Area 2, including through mitigation, and maximise opportunities for sustainable transport. Further submissions to support this view are set out throughout the Hearing Statements and associated appendices submitted on behalf of the Consortium.



Q78 Does Strategic Policy S12 clearly set out how infrastructure will be secured and mitigation provided during the Plan period and is this justified, effective and compliant with national policy? Has the viability of providing necessary infrastructure been adequately assessed?

13. SOCG 17 North East Chelmsford - Highways and Transport, SOCG 21 North East Chelmsford – Strategic Matters and SOCG 24 Beaulieu Train Station, together with the Consortium’s Hearing Statement and accompanying evidence submitted in relation to Matter 6b, confirm that the Plan generally and specifically Strategic Policy S12 clearly set out how the necessary infrastructure will be secured and how the mitigation provided in the Plan period, and beyond, as far as NEC is concerned, is justified, effective and compliant with national policy.
14. Additionally both the Consortium’s and Council’s evidence base demonstrate that the proposals for NEC and the provision of the necessary infrastructure has been assessed by both parties, and the County Council, to be viable.

Q79 No comments

Q80 No comments

Q81 No comments

Q82 No comments



Q83 Are any changes to the infrastructure policies necessary for reasons of soundness?

15. In view of the evidence provided by the Consortium and the Council, it is not considered that any changes to the infrastructure policies are necessary for the reasons of soundness.