



Report to Chelmsford Borough Council

by Mary Travers BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Date: 13th January 2012

PLANNING AND COMPULSORY PURCHASE ACT 2004

SECTION 20

**REPORT ON THE EXAMINATION INTO
CHELMSFORD BOROUGH SITE ALLOCATIONS
DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT**

Document submitted for examination on 10 August 2011

Examination hearings held on 15-16 November and 15 December 2011

File Ref: PINS/W1525/429/5

Non-Technical Summary

This report concludes that the Chelmsford Borough Site Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD) provides an appropriate basis for the planning of the borough up to 2021 and beyond. The Council has sufficient evidence to support the site allocations and policy designations, can show that they have a reasonable chance of being delivered and that they provide an effective basis for managing proposals for development, as appropriate.

A limited number of changes are needed to meet legal and statutory requirements. These can be summarised as follows:

- amendment to confirm that new site allocations will be brought forward through a review of this plan or by means of another DPD if a need is identified for additional sites in the period up to 2021, in order to ensure an effective overall planning framework for sites for gypsies and travellers;
- redefinition of Site Allocation 1 at Chelmer Village to exclude an area used for car parking for the ASDA store, in order to ensure that the allocation is justified and likely to be effective;
- amendment of the defined settlement boundaries at West Hanningfield, Little Baddow and Stock in order to ensure that they are justified;
- designation of land south of Chelmer Village Way for recreation, to ensure conformity with the borough's Core Strategy;
- amendment of certain open space designations to ensure that they are justified, and of the Writtle College Special Policy Area in the interests of justification and effectiveness, and
- updating of the defined cycle routes and in regard to the Local Nature Reserve at Franklands Field for effective implementation of the borough's overall planning framework.

All of these changes have been proposed by the Council in response to points raised or suggestions discussed during the examination. They do not alter the thrust of the Council's overall strategy.

ABBREVIATIONS USED IN THIS REPORT

CS	Core Strategy
CTCAAP	Chelmsford Town Centre Area Action Plan
DPD	Development Plan Document
DSB	Defined Settlement Boundary
FC	Focused Change
LDF	Local Development Framework
LNC	Local Neighbourhood Centre
MGB	Metropolitan Green Belt
NCAAP	North Chelmsford Area Action Plan
NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
PPG	Planning Policy Guidance Note
PPS	Planning Policy Statement
R	Revised Focused Change
RS	Regional Strategy (East of England Plan)
SPA	Special Policy Area
UAB	Urban Area Boundary

Introduction

1. This report contains my assessment of the Chelmsford Borough Site Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD) in terms of Section 20(5) of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. It considers whether the DPD is compliant in legal terms and whether it is sound. Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 12 (paragraphs 4.51-4.52) makes clear that to be sound, a DPD should be justified, effective and consistent with national policy.
2. The starting point for the examination is the assumption that the local authority has submitted what it considers to be a sound plan. The basis for the examination is the submission DPD (August 2011) which is the same as the document published for consultation in October 2010.
3. The submission DPD (the Plan) was accompanied by a schedule of proposed changes (PC) [SD2] that sought to add clarity and/or resolve in full or in part some of the representations made on the Plan as published in October 2010. Subsequently the Council proposed a small number of additional changes to update/correct or improve the Plan. All of these changes were subject to sustainability appraisal and were published for consultation as the Focused Change Consultation, October 2011 [FC1]. Most of these changes are not necessary for the soundness of the Plan but I have taken all of them, the comments made upon them and the Council's further document [FC7] (which suggests revisions to a few of the focused changes in the light of responses to the consultation and discussion at the hearings) into account.
4. This report deals with the changes that are needed to make the Plan sound and they are identified in bold in the report (**FCx** or **Rx** where x is the focused change (FC) or revised focused change (R) reference number); these are set out in detail in Appendix A. All of these changes have been brought forward by the Council and none of them should materially alter the substance of the Plan and its proposals, or undermine the sustainability appraisal and participatory processes undertaken.
5. As referred to above most of the Council's focused changes are of a minor nature that bring the document up to date factually, correct minor errors, add clarity or improve consistency. As these changes do not relate to soundness they are not generally referred to in this report although I endorse the Council's view that they improve the Plan. These minor changes are set out in Appendix B.
6. I am content for the Council to make any additional minor changes to page, figure, paragraph numbering and to correct any spelling errors prior to adoption.
7. References in square brackets [] are to documents in the Site Allocations Development Plan Document evidence base.

Preamble

8. The Localism Act 2011 which received Royal Assent in November 2011 paves the way for the abolition of the regional tier of planning including

regional strategies. However, pending consideration of environmental assessment reports and any subsequent revocation orders, regional strategies, including the East of England Plan 2001-2021 which is relevant to Chelmsford Borough, remain part of the statutory development plan.

Assessment of Soundness

Main Issues

9. Taking account of all the representations, written evidence and the discussions that took place at the examination hearings, there are three main issues upon which the soundness of the Plan depends.

Issue 1 – Taken as a whole, whether the Plan's site allocations and policy designations have a sound basis, having regard to the borough's needs and demands, the relationship with other plans, strategies, national policy and the Government's objectives, and the evidence base and preparatory processes that underpin the Plan

Strategic Context and Overall Needs and Demands

10. The Plan is the final element in the Council's proposed suite of DPDs to underpin the Local Development Framework (LDF) for the borough up to 2021 and beyond, and it has been brought forward in the context of the Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD (CS), adopted in 2008. It covers parts of the Chelmsford urban area, South Woodham Ferrers urban area and the rural part of the borough. The Plan should also be considered in the context of the Chelmsford Town Centre Area Action Plan (CTCAAP), adopted in 2008, and the North Chelmsford Area Action Plan (NCAAP), adopted in July 2011, which provide the detailed planning framework for those areas.
11. The 2021 time horizon of the CS reflects the strategic context set by the East of England Plan (RS), although that plan had not been finalised when the CS was adopted. The Site Allocations DPD makes provision for housing, employment and other land requirements that accord with the CS and the strategic framework provided by the RS and are consistent with the CTCAAP and NCAAP. It also assists in managing change in accordance with the CS objectives, defining settlement boundaries and Special Policy Areas (SPAs), designating areas for protection in the defined Green Wedges, and making detailed changes to the boundary of the Metropolitan Green Belt (MGB) in accordance with the CS. The Plan's overall approach is sound, being clearly based on the principles and objectives that were tested and found sound in the CS, and fundamentally underpinned by the strategy for growth and change that was established through the RS.
12. With regard to housing, taken together with the CTCAAP and NCAAP, the Plan would result in overall provision being made for at least 16,000 additional dwellings in the borough by 2021. Thus it is in accordance with the RS requirement. Nonetheless, the economic downturn and slippage in delivery rates compared with the CS's expectations have given rise to concerns. It has been suggested that the Plan should seek to redress the current shortfall in housing delivery to a greater or lesser extent by allocating sites in and around settlements and in the countryside that could

be readily delivered, contribute to a broader mix of housing, and support the sustainability of local centres of population.

13. However, I agree with the Council that such an approach would be unjustified. There is insufficient reason to diverge from the urban focus of the CS that directs most new development to Chelmsford town centre and the north-eastern and north-western extensions of the town that are guided by the NCAAP. Even though the most recent housing trajectory [OHS2] shows there could be under-delivery of about 480 dwellings against the RS requirement by 2021, this is based on a snapshot in time and is not a good enough reason to shift the focus of growth towards higher levels of development in the Plan area.
14. The borough's overall housing trajectory appears to be continuously and rigorously monitored and is based on a worst case scenario. While the current position reflects underperformance in recent years against the average annual housing requirement, there is evidence to suggest that delivery rates will improve in the short term. Also there is insufficient reason to doubt that the major developments that are coming on stream in North Chelmsford will boost the supply figures to a significant extent. In accordance with CS Policy CP3, there is also flexibility to bring forward the NCAAP's greenfield sites if necessary to compensate for slower rates of brownfield development in the borough. The Council remains confident that the RS requirement will be met if not exceeded and the evidence is not so compelling as to conclude otherwise.
15. A more dispersed pattern of development would arise from additional housing allocations in a variety of smaller settlements and extensions of village envelopes that are sought in the representations. Incursions into the MGB, Green Wedges and countryside would be entailed. In isolation such changes might appear small and non-strategic, but their cumulative effect would undermine the CS's approved urban focus. Also, they would make it more difficult to manage pressure for expansion into the countryside which is a significant issue in this borough. And they would pre-judge review of the CS which will provide the appropriate, longer-term perspective for addressing the implications of economic and other factors affecting the borough.
16. More detail in regard to specific designations is set out in Issue 3 below. But in summary, it would therefore not be justified to change this Plan to make additional housing allocations or relax/redraw policy designations to allow further expansion of development into areas that should be protected in the interests of overall sustainability.
17. Nor would it be justified to allocate more housing land in order to boost the supply of affordable dwellings. Two specific allocations are made for this purpose and all others will be subject to CS policy on affordable housing. There is significant need for affordable housing in the borough but MGB, flooding and other constraints in the Plan area mean that opportunities to meet housing needs and demands are limited. The CS has been found to strike the right balance in this respect and the Plan is in accordance with it. Also its proposals are sufficiently flexible to ensure that the most appropriate contribution to affordable housing provision and other social

and physical infrastructure can be decided on a case by case basis, taking economic viability and other factors into account.

18. More is said about specific housing allocations in Issue 2 below but the overall conclusion is that there are no insuperable obstacles to delivery of the Plan and, as a result, sufficient developable and deliverable housing sites are allocated within the relevant parts of the borough.

Distribution of Housing Development and Selection of Sites

19. The distribution of housing allocations has been challenged on the basis that good opportunities to boost the land supply have been overlooked and that modest expansion of small rural settlements will be unsustainably curtailed by the Plan. However the distribution of the allocations accords with the CS's settlement hierarchy, providing for most of the growth in the Chelmsford urban area and in smaller allocations in the Key Defined Settlements, in addition to the proposal at Runwell Hospital (see Issue 2 below).
20. The CS does not quantify how the housing requirement for the Plan area should be distributed across the different levels of the settlement hierarchy, but this does not support the argument that the Plan's distribution of growth is misguided or that smaller rural settlements have been overlooked. It is clearly in accordance with Policy CP2 of the CS which has been found sound and is a sustainable basis for the planning of the borough as a whole, including its rural communities. Desirable as it might appear, it would not be appropriate or feasible to seek to balance housing provision with employment opportunities in the smaller rural settlements.
21. Also, the proposed distribution has emerged from an open, transparent process for the testing of options that have been informed by sustainability appraisal and subject to public consultation. It has achieved widespread public support. Taking all of these factors into account and the conclusions elsewhere in this report about the soundness of the specific proposals, there is insufficient reason to adjust the proposed distribution.
22. The allocated housing sites have been selected through systematic study of urban capacity, stakeholder engagement, public consultation and sustainability appraisal. Infrastructure requirements, flood risk, ecological interests and other relevant factors have been taken into account. Initial proposals have been deleted or new sites added as part of the consideration of options in the Plan preparation process. Inevitably, this has required balancing of criteria and some qualitative judgements and it is mainly on these grounds that the justification for the final selection of sites has been questioned.
23. However, the selection of sites has been properly informed by the CS policies and objectives and a comprehensive evidence base. The sustainability appraisal should not be read in isolation. In the light of all of the above, there is ample justification for the selection of the allocated sites from the much larger number that were publicised and evaluated throughout the process. Site-specific matters are considered in more detail below but the overall conclusion is that the housing allocations are sound.

Special Needs Housing

24. The Plan makes two allocations for specialist residential accommodation but there is concern that overall there would be insufficient provision for the growth in needs, especially for extra care facilities for the oldest group in the population. It is not disputed that needs are growing and that expansion of provision will be required. However there is insufficient justification for a further specific allocation for a large-scale scheme of a particular format in the Plan. Also the particular allocation sought in Boreham would entail significant extension of the settlement into the countryside, beyond the boundary formed by the A12 and railway line. Viability and site availability factors for developments of this type are not so compelling as to justify additional provision in the Plan, especially since there appears to be potential for development in the NCAAP area to help meet future needs in a more sustainable location.

Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation

25. The Plan, as amended by FC13 [FC1], would not make any allocation of sites to meet the needs of gypsies and travellers. Instead, it relies on the development management process, together with an allocation in the NCAAP, to meet future needs. The Council selected this approach because the NCAAP allocation is likely to meet identified need up to 2016 and the basis for assessment of longer-term need is uncertain, with on-going consultation on changes to national policy and possible revocation of RS.
26. However the Council accepts that this does not amount to a plan-led approach to meeting needs, especially since delivery of the NCAAP allocation is not yet secured. It therefore proposes an amendment of paragraph 3.91 of the Plan to bring forward new site allocations through a review of the Plan or by means of another DPD if a need is identified for additional sites in the period up to 2021 (**R13**). This change is necessary for effectiveness and I endorse it accordingly.

Employment Provision and Designations

27. The Plan allocates 20 existing employment locations and three new employment sites, consistent with the CS provision for longer term employment needs. The significant new allocation at Temple Farm, West Hanningfield, requires the deletion of land from the MGB but the need for this was established through the CS, and planning permission has subsequently been granted for the proposal. There is no basis to question the defined boundaries of the allocation.
28. So far as the existing locations are concerned, the Plan has sought to establish robust site boundaries. The balance of the evidence indicates that this has been achieved through detailed study, evaluation and consultation. Representations seeking changes to the detailed boundaries set out in the Plan are not justified. Sufficient provision is made for the longer-term needs of the borough, having regard to the CS and the evidence base that underpinned it. There are no new factors of such importance that additional employment or mixed use allocations in the MGB, Green Wedge or countryside are necessary for soundness.

29. Given the above, and notwithstanding any potential to improve the existing appearance of the land, the proposal for a new SPA or major developed site in the Green Belt at Great Baddow, adjoining the BAE site, is not justified and no change to the Plan is necessary.

Open Space, Sports and Recreation Provision and Community Facilities

30. A number of policies in the CS seek to ensure that existing recreational provision is protected and enhanced and that new development is provided with adequate green spaces and outdoor leisure facilities. The Plan takes forward the policies and objectives of the CS and is informed by a comprehensive evidence base including the responses to consultation on the earlier stages of the Plan. Key pieces of evidence are the PPG17 Open Spaces Assessment [EB56 & 57] and the Playing Pitch Strategy [EB58], published in 2005. Drawing on this evidence the standards set out in the CS were found to be justified.
31. Concerns have been raised that notwithstanding the existing facilities, provision associated with new development in the borough, the major new open space proposed at Bulls Lodge Quarry, or provision south of Chelmer Village Way (in accordance with Policy CP12 of the CS), open space deficits in already developed areas will not be addressed. However, the Plan is not the only element in the Council's strategy for open space and recreation provision. In the developed parts of the borough it is likely that implementation of the Green Infrastructure Strategy will lead to improvement and re-configuration of provision in a way that will better meet needs. New development proposals may also create opportunities of this type.
32. The Council is committed to preparing a strategy for allotments but in the meantime, EB56 and EB57 are helpful in identifying a standard for provision and assessment of the extent to which the standard is met in different parts of the borough. The Chelmsford Urban Area as a whole appears to have a surplus of provision, although some wards show a deficit. As in the case of the overall strategy for green infrastructure, the allotments strategy is likely to develop ways of making better use of existing facilities that will help to address need.
33. Overall, there is no substantive evidence that the Plan has failed to make appropriate provision for recreational needs or that EB56 and 57 are significantly outdated. The particular case of Kings Road, Chelmsford (Site Allocation 7) is discussed below.
34. The Council has concluded on the basis of all the evidence that specific allocations of sites for community facilities in the Plan are not required and there is no compelling reason to find otherwise. Appropriate provision will be secured through other DPDs and in accordance with the core policies and development management policies of the CS, particularly CP4 and CP16-18.

National Policy and the Government's Objectives

35. Turning to overall national planning policy, the evidence as a whole leads to the conclusion that the Plan is consistent with current national policy. In

refining the options for the Plan the Council has rightly considered questions of balance between policy objectives, of which more is said below, but there is insufficient reason to depart from its conclusions. Furthermore, it is not accepted that the Plan would undermine achievement of the Government's objectives to plan for growth¹. On the contrary, as set out in more detail elsewhere in this report, the Plan provides a sound package of site allocations and policy designations that will positively contribute to the sustainable growth of the borough.

36. During the course of the examination the draft National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published for consultation. The weight to be attached to it, given its draft status, is limited, but I agree with the Council's assessment [HS1a] that the Plan is in conformity with the draft. There are particular issues that may need to be addressed, depending on the final content of the policy framework, but these are matters that would be more appropriately dealt with in other LDF documents. And for similar reasons there is inadequate justification for the Plan to make provision for post-2021 needs, since the most appropriate framework for consideration of longer-term issues and requirements is through review of the CS in due course.
37. Subject to the change endorsed above, I conclude that Plan's site allocations and policy designations are soundly based, having regard to the borough's needs and demands, the relationship with other plans, strategies, national policy and the Government's objectives, and the evidence base and preparatory processes that underpin the Plan. It is noteworthy that it has achieved a great deal of consensus. Taking all of the above into account, there is insufficient justification in principle for making additional allocations of land for development through this Plan or making associated changes to policy designations to facilitate such development.

Issue 2 – Whether the allocated housing sites and specialist residential accommodation sites are justified, consistent with national policy, and likely to be delivered within the Plan period

As concluded above, the site allocations are sound in principle. Accordingly the following section considers only the specific issues about particular allocations that have given rise to soundness concerns.

38. The proposal to allocate part of the ASDA car park (Site Allocation 1) as well as the petrol filling station at Chelmer Village has raised concern about adequacy of the remaining area for parking and circulation. As a result the Council has reviewed matters and proposes an amendment to the allocation to exclude any of the existing car parking area. On this basis the proposal is justified and deliverable and the proposed changes **FC19, FC20 and FC Map B4** are endorsed accordingly; provided that the Plan is amended in accordance with these changes and that the Proposals Map reflects them the allocation is sound.
39. A disused allotments site to the rear of Kings Road, Chelmsford forms part of Site Allocation 7 for a small scale housing development. During the

¹ Minister of State for Decentralisation's statement on *Planning for Growth* (March 2011).

course of the examination the Council resolved to grant planning permission for development of the site, subject to completion of a legal agreement. Local concerns about the most appropriate mix of uses on the site have evolved to a point where it has been requested that the site should be developed entirely for affordable housing, ideally for elderly people, whereas the resolution to grant permission would only require 35% of the units to be affordable. However, while I understand local aspirations, the proposed allocation offers reasonable flexibility to achieve a viable, deliverable housing scheme and enable wider community benefits to be secured.

40. In regard to the loss of open space potential, I agree with the Council's conclusion that this loss would not be harmful, taking account of the PPG17 study [EB56 & 57] and availability of allotment plots in the vicinity of the site. Public open space would not be provided within the new development but this is acceptable given the relatively small size of the proposal and the site's relationship with existing dwellings along its boundaries. Developer contributions to improvement of open space facilities in the area would be secured, and this and other elements of the scheme would provide for reasonable enhancement of community facilities. Taking all of these factors into account, I consider that the allocation is justified, deliverable and consistent with national policy, and no amendments to the Plan are required for soundness.
41. Land south of Clements Close, Chelmsford (Site Allocation 8) is constrained by its proximity to a water treatment plant. The Red rating given to the site by Anglian Water is concerned with the implications for a cordon sanitaire, rather than any insufficiency in provision of infrastructure. Nonetheless, the Council is confident that the constraint is not so significant that it could not be overcome by detailed site planning and design. On balance, I agree there is reasonable likelihood that a satisfactory residential scheme can be delivered on this site. And in regard to Site Allocation 9 at Waterhouse Lane, Chelmsford which entails the re-location of the Council's Parks Depot, there is no substantive evidence that this site will not be deliverable in the Plan period.
42. Redevelopment of St Johns Hospital in Chelmsford (Site Allocation 11) is one of the major proposals in the Plan and is likely to yield in the order of 300 dwellings. It was allocated in the Chelmsford Borough Local Plan (local plan) [EB9] and was subject to a resolution to grant planning permission in 2007, but the pace of redevelopment has been affected by complex issues about relocation of NHS activities, preservation of the conservation area, protection of locally listed buildings and other matters. Even so, a revised application is in preparation and there is no fundamental reason to discount the expected contribution from this key site close to the town centre. Some of the focused changes proposed by the Council, albeit not essential for soundness, give helpful guidance and clarify objectives for the scheme. In all the circumstances, the timescale for delivery appears to be realistic and the allocation is sound.
43. Site Allocation 13 (Land between Shearers Way and the Cock Inn, Main Road, Boreham) is intended for general market housing and the evidence does not provide sufficient justification to reserve it for other uses or limit it

to a more specialised form of housing. As referred to above, taking this Plan and the other DPDs for the borough into account, the Council's approach to meeting the need for specialist residential accommodation appears sound.

44. The allocation at Edney Common (Site 14) is on a disused brownfield site in a small settlement surrounded by the MGB. The Plan's definition of a settlement boundary for Edney Common, excluding the core of the settlement and the allocation site from the MGB, aims to strengthen the village community and it accords with the identification of Edney Common as a new defined settlement in the CS. The decision to allocate this site while turning away other proposals in rural settlements in the borough has raised questions about the way in which the sustainability of options has been assessed. However, the Council is entitled to make a reasoned, balanced judgement, informed by the relative needs of settlements, their characteristics, responses to consultation and all the other evidence. And given all these factors, I conclude that the allocation is justified, deliverable and is consistent with national policy.
45. In a similar manner, Site Allocations 16 and 23 (Morelands Industrial Estate) are brought forward on a brownfield site in the MGB at East Hanningfield. Existing uses of the site and its surroundings, only some of which are lawful, include storage and dismantling of vehicles, and there is no doubt that the site is in need of significant environmental improvement. The allocations for general and specialist housing would help to address these issues and ensure that there would be no greater impact on the openness of the MGB than the existing uses. Development is subject to a number of requirements that would protect the MGB and improve visual and other amenities in the surroundings. This location is relatively remote from services and facilities but balancing all of the above, the beneficial effects of the allocations would clearly outweigh any harm in Green Belt policy or other terms. There is little doubt that the proposals are deliverable.
46. Redevelopment at Runwell Hospital (Site Allocation 17), a major developed site in the MGB, is the other major housing-led allocation in the Plan. It carries forward a commitment from the local plan, and the site was subject to a resolution to grant planning permission for over 600 dwellings in 2005. A legal agreement in relation to that scheme was not completed and submission of a new planning application will be required. The Homes and Communities Agency now owns the site and a masterplan for its redevelopment is expected within 12 months. Access, water quality, relocation of NHS uses and other considerations affecting development of the site are being addressed and there can be reasonable confidence about its delivery. The concern about potential disturbance to the Running Well to the north-west of the site is noted, but there is insufficient evidence to conclude that the size and nature of the proposal would have any detrimental impact on this feature.
47. Site Allocation 18 (land off Brookmans Road) in Stock entails redevelopment of garages that have fallen into disuse. The adequacy of the vehicular access arrangements have been questioned. But given the size of the development and that the site has been used for parking, the

proposal is unlikely to have a significant traffic impact. Also, it makes good use of a brownfield site in the village. On balance the allocation is justified and likely to be delivered and it is sound.

48. Taking the above and all the issues raised in connection with the other housing allocations, I conclude that each of them is properly justified, consistent with national policy and is likely to be delivered within the Plan period. As a result they are sound. A number of alternative or additional sites were put forward during the examination, including some that had been considered as options during the preparation of the Plan. However, given the conclusion above about the adequacy of the overall provision and the soundness of the Plan's allocations, there is insufficient justification to allocate additional land that would generally lead to a greater focus on the rural part of the borough, contrary to the adopted CS.

Issue 3 – Whether the settlement boundaries and other policy designations are justified, likely to be effective, and consistent with national policy

As concluded above, the settlement boundaries and other policy designations are sound in principle. Accordingly the following section considers only the specific issues about particular designations that have given rise to soundness concerns.

Settlement Boundaries

49. The Plan defines the urban area boundaries (UABs) for Chelmsford (excluding the northern edge) and South Woodham Ferrers, and the defined settlement boundaries (DSBs) for the Key Defined Settlements and other Defined Settlements². This accords with the Core Strategy's settlement hierarchy and its aim of managing growth and protecting the countryside and is consistent with the approach taken in the NCAAP.
50. Clear and objective criteria have informed the definition of the settlement boundaries. These are summarised in the Plan but I have no doubt that the finally selected boundaries have emerged from a thorough process of sustainability appraisal and testing against the detailed criteria set out in the Potential Options document [EB182], evaluation of the consultation responses to that document [EB183], and revision and refinement of the proposed boundaries in the light of all the evidence.
51. As in the case of the site allocations, decisions regarding the settlement boundaries have required balanced judgements on the weight to be accorded to particular criteria, but these are supported by a sound policy basis and a clear, open and inclusive decision-making process. There is no substantive evidence of any conflict between the Council's approach and national planning policy. The CS policies offer appropriate flexibility for consideration of development proposals outside settlement boundaries, for example in the case of rural diversification schemes. And also in the development management context, if the approved NPPF gives rise to a need to re-consider any CS policies or other matters in the Council's LDF, this will be addressed in due course.

² Village envelopes for Great Waltham, Little Waltham and Broomfield are defined in the NCAAP.

52. UABs and DSBs are drawn tightly around the existing edges of settlements where land is not allocated for development, reflecting the CS objectives for managing growth and accommodating most new development in Chelmsford and its northern extensions. With the limited exceptions referred to below, there are insufficient grounds to alter any of these boundaries, which are sound for the reasons set out above. Similarly, where the DSB comprises two or more separate elements, I agree with the Council's decision to exclude certain areas, the subject of representations, from the DSBs. As defined, including for example at Chatham Green, Danbury and Ramsden Heath, the DSBs help to avoid the consolidation of more dispersed patterns of development; they also protect land of predominantly rural character that contributes to the setting of the borough's settlements and local distinctiveness. As a result, the UABs and DSBs assist in achieving the objectives of the CS and national policy.
53. Where properties are on the edge of settlements and have extensive or long back gardens, the boundary is generally drawn 25m from the rear of the building. The criticism that this is arbitrary and unsustainable is not accepted. It provides a reasonably defensible boundary and rightly curtails opportunities for cumulative, small-scale encroachment on the countryside. I have found no convincing evidence that the 25m criterion has been applied indiscriminately without regard to all other relevant factors.
54. The flank wall approach, drawing the settlement boundary along the flank wall of buildings that have a large side garden on the edge of a settlement, was introduced in the publication version of the Plan. This appears justified, recognising that the elongation of settlements in this way should also be controlled. There is no reason to expect that the relevant development management policies of the CS would be applied inflexibly, and any application for alterations or extensions to an existing building whose flank wall abuts the settlement boundary would be treated on its merits.
55. Therefore, with a few exceptions which the Focused Changes address as set out below, the designated settlement boundaries in the Plan are justified by the evidence, likely to be effective, and consistent with the CS and with national policy for sustainable development, including protection of the countryside. I endorse the Council's proposal to delete the second, smaller DSB for West Hanningfield, east of the church; this is necessary for a properly justified plan since it would be appropriate to treat this area as countryside within the Green Belt (**FC1** and **FC Map F**). Also **FC Maps H** and **I** are necessary for reasons of justification since they correct inconsistent application of the DSB criteria in Little Baddow and in Stock. Provided that the Plan is amended accordingly, and that the Proposals Map reflects these changes, the designated UABs and DSBs are sound.

Green Wedges

56. As paragraph 3.75 of the Plan sets out, the justification in principle for the designation of Green Wedges through urban Chelmsford has been established through Policy CP9 of the CS. The CTCAAP and NCAAP have already defined the boundaries of the Green Wedges that lie within the areas covered by those DPDs. Clear objectives and principles as set out in

paragraph 3.76 of the Plan have guided the process of boundary definition, and the details have been informed by the Chelmsford Landscape Character Assessment [EB46], Nature Conservation Reference Guide [EB43 & 44] and other published evidence including the results of public consultation. Overall there is a sound basis for the defined boundaries in the Plan.

57. The inclusion of land within the Green Wedge that is not readily visible from public vantage points at Seven Ash Green/Chichester Drive has been questioned. However the policy designation aims to secure a multi-faceted green network that maintains and enhances the biodiversity as well as the landscape attributes of the river valleys and the valley sides. The defined boundaries protect against the incursion of residential and other development into the valley sides since this would be likely to undermine the biodiversity value (existing and potential) of the Green Wedge if not its visual quality. Protection of the integrity of the Green Wedges is necessary for an effective policy and I consider that the boundaries as defined in the Plan are properly justified.
58. Land south of Chelmer Village Way is included within the Green Wedge where an alternative proposal for residential development and recreational provision including a tennis centre has been put forward. However, the incursion of housing into this part of the Green Wedge would harm the setting of the Chelmsford urban area, conflicting with the aims and objectives of CS policy, and there is insufficient justification on recreational grounds for this breach. The Council's proposed masterplan will help to guide the recreational development of the area but no change to the Plan would be justified in the interests of soundness other than **R9** and **FC Map B3**. These changes would ensure consistency with the CS by carrying forward Policy CP12 which designates the land for recreation. Provided that the Plan is amended accordingly and that the Proposals Map reflects this, the Green Wedge designations are justified, likely to be effective, and are consistent with national policy.

Open Space

59. In the context set out in paragraph 30 above, existing open spaces and recreational facilities will continue to play an important part in meeting the borough's needs and these are designated through the Plan. In line with PPG17 and with Policy DC39 of the CS, the designated areas include privately owned facilities, including the amenity space at Church Lane, Ford End and the cricket ground at Chignall Smealy.
60. If such facilities were to be withdrawn from amenity/recreational use by the current owners, any proposed change of use or other development of the land would be a matter for consideration by the Council, as appropriate, and the implications for the supply of amenity spaces and recreational facilities to meet the borough's needs would be taken into account. However, the right of owners to withdraw their land from use as public open space in favour of agriculture is not a good reason to set aside the existing value of these areas for recreational and/or amenity purposes, especially since in some cases at least, they have served multi-functional open space purposes for many years. EB57 does not reflect that the open

space at Church Lane, Ford End is no longer used for cricket, but this does not override the considerations above; there is sufficient evidence of its value in terms of PPG17's advice to support its designation.

61. Notwithstanding current owners' intentions and uncertainty about the means to secure the areas as open space for the longer term, the designations should not be deleted for reasons of deliverability. To do so in the case of existing open space could encourage its loss. Also, the evidence indicates that the plan-making process for bringing forward these designations (and the Plan as a whole) has been in accordance with the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement [EB4], the Local Development Regulations (as amended) and PPS12 advice on participation and the involvement of key stakeholders.
62. **FC Maps A, E and L** which correct mapping errors or entail important updating, are necessary in the interests of justification. Provided that the Proposals Map reflects these changes, the Plan's open space designations are sound and no other changes are necessary on the grounds of justification, effectiveness or consistency with national policy.

Special Policy Areas

63. SPAs are an established policy mechanism in the borough, introduced in the Local Plan and carried forward in Policy CP2 of the CS, to enable particular facilities/institutions to be planned strategically even though they are located in the countryside/MGB where development would normally be constrained. The Plan has provided the opportunity to review the boundaries around the four SPAs at Great Leighs Racecourse, Hanningfield Reservoir Treatment Works, Sandford Mill and Writtle College, and sets out key objectives and specific objectives for future development of these sites. The policy designations and objectives are based on substantive, relevant and up to date evidence and have taken account of representations. For the most part the Plan is clearly sound in this regard.
64. In response to concerns about the effect of excluding Sturgeons Farm from Writtle College SPA, the Council has accepted that it should be included to permit further improvements to this key part of the college which contains the centre for livestock studies. This change is shown on **FC Map G** and together with **FCs 5, 6 and 7** which explain the importance of this part of the college, these changes are necessary in the interests of a justified and effective plan. However, I do not support other representations seeking changes to the SPA designations and provisions, since they would entail conflict with the key objectives for these areas and with CS policies for managing growth and protecting the environment. Provided that the Plan is amended as referred to above, and that the Proposals Map reflects this, the proposals for the SPAs are justified, likely to be effective, and are consistent with national policy.

Other Policy Designations

65. There is no policy basis for defining boundaries around Local Neighbourhood Centres (LNCs) which are identified in the CS. However Policies CP25 and DC63 seek to protect community facilities, as well as other uses in centres, and Policies CP16 and CP17 (promoting social

inclusion and reducing deprivation) and DC37 (protecting existing local community services and facilities) are also supportive in this regard. Therefore, while noting the important community role of the centre at Kings Road, Chelmsford, no change to the Plan is necessary on this matter.

66. Regarding the defined boundaries for South Woodham Ferrers Town Centre and Warwick Parade LNC, similar considerations apply. The concern that the Plan does not appear to reflect the wider context of the supplementary planning document (SPD), *A Plan for South Woodham Ferrers*, is understood. However, the SPD remains an important material consideration, and the Plan's policy designations and the relevant policies of the CS together provide an appropriate framework for protection and enhancement of these centres in their wider context. There is no need for a separate inset map for the town centre.
67. Amongst other matters, the Plan also sets out proposed cycle routes that form part of sustainable transport strategies being developed with Essex County Council and other partners. In order to update the Plan, the Council has put forward **FCs Maps B2a** and **B2b** which show the proposed cycle routes that have been agreed with all the necessary stakeholders. Provided that the Proposals Map reflects the updated position shown in these changes, the Plan would be effective and sound in this regard.
68. As identified in **FC Map K**, Franklands Field is now a formally declared Local Nature Reserve and the Plan needs to be updated in this respect. This will enable CS Policy DC13 to be implemented effectively. Provided that the Proposals Map reflects this updating, this aspect of the Plan is sound.

Other Matters

69. In addition to the specific issues referred to above, it is clear that the Plan as a whole has been developed on a sound assessment of the key infrastructure requirements. Delivery mechanisms for the housing and employment allocations are clearly understood and there is no evidence that key partners are not signed up to delivery. There are well-established, appropriate mechanisms for monitoring the Plan, giving confidence that risks to delivery will be kept under review and contingency action taken in response.
70. The Plan's proposals are reasonably flexible and are not dependent on one or two major projects or delivery of major infrastructure. The borough has many strengths and a well-developed planning framework to respond to improved economic conditions. Overall, the Plan is likely to be effective.
71. Proposals on a range of other topics that help to implement the adopted spatial strategy for the borough are set out in the Plan. On the balance of all the evidence these are properly justified and likely to be effective. A range of concerns and suggestions have been put forward in the representations and at the hearings but those that do not affect the soundness of the Plan are not referred to in this report. Nonetheless it is evident from the minor changes proposed by the Council that it has endeavoured to address these points wherever appropriate in the interests of improving the Plan.

Legal Requirements

72. The examination of the compliance of the Plan with the legal requirements is summarised in the table below. I conclude that it meets all the requirements.

LEGAL REQUIREMENTS	
Local Development Scheme (LDS)	The DPD is identified within the approved LDS 2009 which sets out an expected adoption date of May 2011. Although the content of the DPD is compliant with the LDS, some delays in its production have occurred and these have been identified in the Annual Monitoring Report.
Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) and relevant Regulations	The SCI was originally adopted in 2006. Consultation has been compliant with its requirements which applied at the Regulation 27 publication stage. Pre-submission consultation has been carried out in accordance with the 2008 Regulations. The SCI First Review was adopted in May 2010.
Sustainability Appraisal (SA)	SA has been carried out as a parallel process to the preparation of the DPD and is satisfactory.
Appropriate Assessment (AA)	The Habitats Regulations Assessment Screening Report (July 2011) sets out why likely significant effects on the identified European sites will be avoided by the proposals in the DPD.
National Policy	The DPD complies with national policy except where indicated and changes are recommended.
Regional Policy	The Regional Planning Body (for so long as it was operational) was consulted throughout the stages of preparation of the DPD. No concerns about the general conformity of the DPD with the adopted regional strategy (East of England Plan 2001-2021) have been raised.
Sustainable Community Strategy (SCS)	Satisfactory regard has been paid to the Chelmsford Community Plan: Chelmsford Tomorrow 2021.
2004 Act and Regulations (as amended)	The DPD complies with the Act and the Regulations.

Overall Conclusion and Recommendation

73. I conclude that with the changes proposed by the Council, set out in Appendix A, the Chelmsford Borough Site Allocations DPD satisfies the requirements of s20(5) of the 2004 Act and meets the criteria for soundness in PPS12. Therefore it is recommended that the Plan be changed accordingly. For the avoidance of doubt, the Council's proposed minor changes, set out in Appendix B, are also endorsed.

Mary Travers

Inspector

This report is accompanied by:

Appendix A (separate document): Changes proposed by the Council to make the Plan sound

Appendix B (separate document): Minor changes proposed by the Council

APPENDIX A: CHANGES PROPOSED BY THE COUNCIL TO MAKE THE PLAN SOUND

Note: The reference numbering system is not sequential because some of the changes proposed by the Council appear in Appendix B

Ref No	Section	Change (Deletions , <u>Additions</u>)
Text Changes		
FC1	Page 17 Para 3.38 West Hanningfield	The Defined Settlement <u>Boundary</u> comprises two parts, with a short section of continuous built-up frontage lying to the east of the main village. For the reasons outlined, the DSB is tightly drawn round the existing consolidated built-up edges of the village, but includes a site with planning permission for local needs affordable housing on land East of Middlemead (see Topic 10).
FC5	Page 24 Para 3.65 Writtle College	The Western Section is the location for the Rural Education and Training Centre at the Cow Watering Lane Campus. The Western Sections are the location for the Rural Education and Training Centre and Centre for Livestock Studies - both at Sturgeons Farm, along Cow Watering Lane.
FC6	Page 24 Para 3.66 Writtle College	The Special Policy Area is divided into two <u>three</u> sections.
FC7	Page 24 Para 3.67 Writtle College	The Western Section of the Special Policy Area at Sturgeons Farm, along Cow Watering Lane, is an important campus for equestrian college activities. The boundary is drawn to include the existing built-up part of the Campus whilst allowing for planned minor expansion in the north-east corner. However, it excludes adjacent land to the west which is rural and open in character and not part of the site's function and operations. A tight boundary is appropriate to reflect the College's aspirations to consolidate activities away from this Campus to the Lordship Road Campus. <u>The Western Sections of the Special Policy Area at Sturgeons Farm, along Cow Watering Lane, are important for equestrian college activities and livestock studies. The boundaries are drawn to include the existing built-up parts of the Farm whilst allowing for planned minor expansion in the north-east corner of the southern SPA. Land between the SPAs is excluded as it is rural and open in character and not part of the site's function and operations. Tight boundaries are appropriate to reflect the College's aspirations to consolidate activities away from Sturgeon's Farm to the Lordship Road Campus.</u>

Ref No	Section	Change (Deletions, Additions)
R9	Page 27 Para 3.78 River Chelmer East and Chelmer & Blackwater Navigation Green Wedge	<p>Sandford Mill is identified as a Special Policy Area within the Green Wedge where less restrictive policies may be applied in relation to its future development, <u>where only development that is compatible with PPS25 will be permitted</u> – see Topic 4.</p> <p>Add new sentence at end: <u>Land south of Chelmer Village Way is notated as 'Recreation' on the Core Strategy Proposals Map in connection with Policy CP12 of the Adopted Core Strategy. The southern part of this area lies within the Chelmer floodplain. Policies CP9 and DC9 on Green Wedges allow for recreation compatible with natural conservation. There is no existing formal recreation in this area and it is not covered by Topic 14 on Open Spaces. The scope for development for recreation is limited by landscape character, and any recreational use should be open air activities only. In the River Chelmer East and Chelmer and Blackwater Navigation Green Wedge, management of the landscape as countryside with enhanced walking and cycling access will be encouraged. The Borough Council will seek to develop a landscape masterplan for this area in conjunction with the landowners which will identify locations for specific recreation uses that will be suitable to meet the needs of the Borough whilst conserving the landscape character and special qualities of the area, and being compatible with that objective.</u></p>
R13	Page 33 Para 3.91 Balanced Communities	<p>Revise as follow:</p> <p><u>The SADPD does not make any further allocation for new Gypsy and Traveller sites. This is due to current uncertainty surrounding the intended revocation of the East of England Plan, new emerging Government policy and the need to review the evidence base for future provision beyond 2016. As at January 2011, there were a total of 81 approved pitches in the Borough. Another 10 pitches are allocated in the NCAAP and programmed to be delivered by 2016. This complies fully with the targets for the period up to 2016 and provides the Borough with a 5 year supply. Due to the proposed withdrawal of the East of England Plan and its supporting evidence base, further work will be needed in due course to identify the local need of any further Gypsy and Traveller sites in the Borough beyond 2016. If a need is identified for additional sites, the Borough Council will bring forward new site allocations through a Review of this document, or</u></p>

Ref No	Section	Change (Deletions , <u>Additions</u>)
		<p><u>another Development Plan Document within the Borough Council’s Local Development Framework, for delivery in the Plan period 2016 – 2021.</u> In the interim period, the Borough Council will seek to meet any identified need in accordance with Policy DC34 of the Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD. This follows the revocation of the Regional Spatial Strategies in July 2010 which contained targets for providing new pitches for Districts in the East of England. As at July 2010, there were a total of 81 approved pitches/ plots in the Borough with another 10 pitches allocated in the NCAAP. Further work will be needed in due course to identify the level of need for any further Gypsy and Traveller sites in the Borough in the period to 2021.</p>
FC19	Page 34 Para 3.99 Site 1 ASDA	<p>Replace as follows:- The site currently forms part of the car park for Asda Superstore at the Chelmer Village Principal Neighbourhood Centre. The site presently contains the self service petrol station. The vehicular access for the site is proposed from Village Gate. The site is allocated for residential development and located at a prominent location and new development will need to be design led and reflect the character and appearance of the area combined with the site’s location and proximity to services and facilities. <u>The site currently forms part of the car park for the Asda superstore and businesses at the Chelmer Village Principal Neighbourhood Centre. The site presently contains over 300 car parking spaces plus staff parking and a self service petrol station. The car park is surrounded by back garden boundary walls. The car park area contains sufficient area to accommodate some development taking advantage of its close relationship to essential local services. The allocated site area retains shopper parking for the centre and allows for vehicular access from Village Gate. Development will need to reflect the character and appearance of Chelmer Village.</u></p>
FC20	Page 35 Figure 1 ASDA	Insert an amended plan.

Mapping Changes		
FC Map A	Map 1 Borough North	Amend open space designation at Chignal St James Church to exclude the area of private garden with no public access.
FC Map B2a and b	Map 3 Chelmsford Urban Area	Update the Proposed Cycle Routes.
FC Map B3	Map 3 Chelmsford Urban Area	Identify ‘Land Allocated for Future Recreation Use’ at Chelmer Village Way.
FC Map B4	Map 3 Chelmsford Urban Area	Revise boundary of Site Allocation 1 – ASDA and the surrounding Principal Neighbourhood Centre.
FC Map E	Map 11 Little Baddow	Amend open space designation along Holybread Lane and North Hill.
FC Map F	Map 32 West Hanningfield	Delete separate DSB along Church Road (east of the Church), West Hanningfield.
FC Map G	Map 34 Writtle	Expand Sturgeons Farm Special Policy Area to include the Centre for Livestock Studies.

FC Map H	Map 19 Little Baddow	Amend back garden boundary to approximately 25 metres at the rear of Nurses Cottages, North Hill.
FC Map I	Map 30 Stock	Amend Defined Settlement Boundary to the rear of 59 and 36 Birch Lane, Stock.
FC Map K	Map 4 South Woodham Ferrers Urban Area	Show designation of Franklands Field as a Local Nature Reserve (LNR).
FC Map L	Map 9 Danbury	Amend Open Space notation at Land Adjacent Danbury Mission Evangelical Church Maldon Road

Note: The FC Maps listed above are contained in the Focused Change Consultation, October 2011 [Document FCI] in the SADPD evidence base.

Abbreviations

Initials	Abbreviation of ...
CTCAAP	Chelmsford Town Centre Area Action Plan
DPD	Development Plan Document
DSB	Defined Settlement Boundary
DWF	Dry Weather Flow
ECC	Essex County Council
HRA	Habitat Regulations Assessment
LNR	Local Nature Reserve
LDF	Local Development Framework
NCAAP	North Chelmsford Area Action Plan
SADPD	Site Allocations Development Plan Document

SADPS	Site Allocations Development Plan Document Proposed Submission
SPA	Special Policy Area
SPD	Supplementary Planning Document
SWF	South Woodham Ferrers
VDS	Village Design Statement

APPENDIX B: MINOR CHANGES PROPOSED BY THE COUNCIL

Note: The reference numbering system is not sequential because some of the changes proposed by the Council appear in Appendix A

Ref No	Section	Change (Deletions , <u>Additions</u>)
Text Changes		
FC2	Page 19 Para 3.42 Park and Ride Overview	Park and Ride is a major component of Essex County Council's transport strategy and Chelmsford Borough Council's planning policy. Chelmsford's first Park and Ride site opened at Sandon in March 2006 and has been extremely successful, having been extended twice. There are currently 1,175 spaces with planning permission for a further 250 spaces, should they be required. A second site, Chelmer Valley, is currently under construction in north Chelmsford on Essex Regiment Way <u>opened in April 2011</u> . The site will comprise <u>comprises</u> 700 spaces with planning permission for a further 300 spaces, should they be required. The site is due to open in Spring 2011.
FC3	Page 19 Para 3.43 Widford Park and Ride Area of Search	A Park and Ride site at Widford has been identified as an 'Area of Search'. however work is currently on hold as Chelmer Valley Park and Ride is progressed. It would intercept vehicles from the A414 Harlow corridor and Three Mile Hill (A12 / B1002 London / Brentwood) which currently use Waterhouse Lane or New London Road to reach the town centre. Work is required to identify an exact location and prepare the necessary business case is still required and timescales for implementation are yet to be determined.
FC4	Page 22 Para 3.55 Sandford Mill	Add new sentence at the end: <u>The sequential approach will be applied to the Special Policy Area. As such, appropriate measures and assessment will need to be carried out which will influence the range of future uses. Furthermore, development within the Special Policy Area will be expected to mitigate potential effects on the European Sites downstream.</u>
FC8	Page 25 Para 3.71 Environmental Protection	The Borough Council seeks to protect and enhance the Borough's natural, <u>historic</u> and built environment in line with the environmental strategic objectives of the Adopted Core Strategy.

Ref No	Section	Change (Deletions, Additions)			
FC8a	Page 26 Para 3.76 Objectives	Under Visual Enhancements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improvement of paths and access ways through the use of pooled developer contributions and through the use of planning obligations <u>and/ or Community Infrastructure Levy</u> 			
FC10	Page 31 Table 3 Protected Lanes	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Woodham Ferrers and Bicknacre</td><td>Edwins Hall Road</td><td>2</td></tr> </table>	Woodham Ferrers and Bicknacre	Edwins Hall Road	2
Woodham Ferrers and Bicknacre	Edwins Hall Road	2			
FC11	Page 32 Para 3.87 Flood Alleviation Scheme	During an extreme flood event (1 in 1000 year) or 'design' flood event (1 in 100 year), current defences offer limited safeguards to existing properties and future development sites.			
FC12	Page 32 Para 3.89 Flood Alleviation Scheme	Add new sentence at the end: <u>The design of the flood alleviation measures must avoid any significant impact on the European Sites.</u>			
FC14	Page 33 Para 3.93 Housing Sites	Add new sentence at the end: <u>Some site allocations provide information about constraints that effectively limit the developable area and may provide layout guidance. In some site allocations as estimated housing capacity figure is given. This is only a general indication of what the Council expects could be achieved and is not a minimum requirements or a maximum limit, unless stated explicitly. The figure is used to compile aggregate figures for Council monitoring. Actual site capacity will depend on:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Site constraints – some of which will only be understood with detailed site specific studies and will tend to reduce the capacity</u> <u>Design ingenuity – which may enable a higher number of dwellings.</u> <u>The site allocations represent land that is vacant, underused, contains problematic uses, where change is anticipated where there are locational or regeneration reasons for promoting development. Within</u>			

Ref No	Section	Change (Deletions, Additions)
		<u>existing defined settlements boundaries, there may be some cases where adjoining land could be added to a site area for the purposes of good site planning. The Council will consider this even if land is not explicitly allocated.</u>
FC15	Page 33 Para 3.94 Housing Sites	All have been assessed as part of the Sustainability Appraisal. And the <u>The Borough Council will require that each site is developed in accordance with policies set out in the Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD as well as any all relevant SPDs and Development Briefs for specific sites-site specific advice produced by Council officers. All new housing allocations will be required to provide adequate open space within the development site in line with Core Strategy Policy DC40. Furthermore, all</u> All new housing will also be subject to developer contributions in accordance with the Borough Council's adopted guidance <u>and/ or Community Infrastructure Levy.</u>
R16	Page 34 Para 3.94 Housing Sites	Insert new paragraph after 3.94 <u>The majority of the proposed housing site allocations lie within Flood Zone 1, meaning there is a low risk of flooding. Planning applications for site allocations will need to manage surface water drainage without increasing risk on or off site and consider flood risk at scheme design stage using the most up to date Environment Agency flood mapping. The Council has carried out PPS25 sequential tests to establish the principle of development of allocated sites lying in Flood Zones 2 and 3. Planning applications for these sites would need to be accompanied by a site specific flood risk assessment.</u>
FC17	Page 34 Para 3.95 Housing Sites	Create new 4 th bullet point: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Create high quality, sustainable places that integrate well with existing settlements.</u>
FC18	Page 34 Para 3.96 Housing Sites	Amend 1 st sentence: Within Chelmsford Borough (outside the NCAAP and CTCAAP areas) the following sites are allocated as predominantly residential on the Proposals Map to deliver housing targets identified in the Borough Council's Adopted Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD. <u>to meet the needs of the changing pattern of households in Chelmsford, to create homes of a very high standard and strengthen</u>

Ref No	Section	Change (Deletions, Additions)
		<p><u>community, as indicated by the targets within the Adopted Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.</u></p> <p>Amend 2nd sentence: The scale of the allocations at Runwell Hospital <u>and St John's Hospital</u> merits a more detailed site descriptions, which is are set out at Site Allocation 17 <u>and Site Allocation 11 respectively.</u></p>
FC21	Page 38 Para 3.107 Site 4 Government Offices	<p>Amend as follows:-</p> <p>The redevelopment of this site would create an opportunity to provide housing in a well connected part of Chelmsford that benefits from close proximity to a range of facilities. Residential-led development here would allow for the provision of open space and a new access road serving Westlands Community Primary School and Chelmsford Adult Community College. there is potential to accommodate scope to provide improved access to both the Westlands Primary School and the Resources Centre. Redevelopment should be planned around this new road. An objective for this allocation is reducing congestion around the school entrance and thereby providing a safer environment for children. A development scheme for the allocated site should enable improvements to circulation and parking on the adjoining school and college site. The access may be from any point on Beeches Road and should enable a link into the site south of the College building. The development should make some land available to improve the layout and circulation within the Westlands site. Redevelopment of the site is dependent on the relocation of the employment uses. New development should respect the particular character of the Beeches Road bungalow estate. Access to the site would be via Beeches Road though consideration needs to be given to the flood risk that exists on the existing entrance.</p>
FC22	Page 38 Figure 4 Government Offices	Add diagrammatic access road to plan.
FC23	Page 40	Add new 2 nd sentence:

Ref No	Section	Change (Deletions , <u>Additions</u>)
	Para 3.113 Site 6 Byron Road	<p><u>The site is protected against flood risk by a bund along the south boundary.</u></p> <p>Amend now 3rd sentence: ...of approximately 19 dwellings.</p> <p>Amend now 4th sentence: Future development needs to be respectful of the <u>Chelmer and Blackwater Navigation</u> Conservation Area and Green Wedge to the south.</p>
FC24	Page 41 Para 3.121 Site 7 Kings Road	<p>Insert new 1st sentence: <u>This part of the site allocation results from local initiatives.</u></p>
FC25	Page 41 Para 3.122 Site 7 Kings Road	<p>Delete last sentence: This site allocation results from local initiatives.</p>
FC26	Page 44 Para 3.128 Parks Depot	<p>Amend 2nd sentence: It is allocated for a housing development of approximately 44 dwellings suitable for housing development.</p> <p>Insert new 4th sentence: The site layout should enable a pedestrian access to be created from Canuden Road.</p> <p>Amend now 5th and 6th sentences: Landscape screening would be required to the south of the site to separate the site from the allotments to the south. Care also needs to be taken due to the site backing onto gardens of residences to the west. <u>Buildings and spaces should be designed to face out over the allotments to the south. Private gardens</u></p>

Ref No	Section	Change (Deletions, Additions)
		<u>should be designed to adjoin the existing back gardens on the west and north boundaries of the site.</u>
FC27	Page 46 Para 3.134 Site 11 St Johns Hospital	Objective
FC28	Page 46 Para 3.135 Site 11 St Johns Hospital	This site is a former hospital covering an area of approximately 5.3ha. The Mid Essex Hospital Services NHS Trust are in the process of re-locating all remaining healthcare services and functions from the site to Broomfield Hospital. This process is due to be complete in October 2010. The site allocation also includes a parcel of land controlled by the North East Essex Mental Healthcare Trust. <u>The allocated site is a former hospital covering a total area of approximately 5.3ha. It contains a number of healthcare services, most of which have been relocated to Broomfield Hospital.</u>
FC29	Page 46 Para 3.136 Site 11 St Johns Hospital	The complex of buildings within the centre of the site formed part of Chelmsford's former Workhouse and are locally listed. These buildings also lie within a Conservation Area which covers approximately two thirds of the site area. <u>The complex of buildings within the centre of the site formed part of Chelmsford's former workhouse. They lie within the St Johns Hospital Conservation Area and are included in the Council's Register of locally significant buildings. A character appraisal was published in 2003 and now forms part of the Council's evidence base. Several trees have tree preservation orders. The site adjoins Chelmsford Golf Club course and an existing hole runs parallel to the south west boundary.</u>
FC30	Page 46 Para 3.137 Site 11 St Johns Hospital	St Johns Hospital is not a new housing site. The majority of the site was originally identified by the Borough Council for residential development within the now superseded Chelmsford Borough Local Plan 1997 (Housing Allocation H8). Following its inclusion as an allocated housing site, a resolution to grant planning permission for 292 new homes and ancillary retail and leisure uses was made by the Borough Council in 2007. A planning brief for the site was adopted by the Borough Council in 2006. <u>The site is an unrealised land allocation from the previous development plan (Chelmsford Borough Local</u>

Ref No	Section	Change (Deletions , Additions)
		<u>Plan 1997 – housing allocation H8). Now that the site is vacant it is crucial to bring forward residential-led development to regenerate the land for the benefit of the town.</u>
FC31	Page 46 Para 3.138 Site 11 St Johns Hospital	<p>The housing numbers contained within Policy CP2 of the adopted Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD take into account the 292 new homes as ‘housing commitments’ and have been included within the Borough Council’s Housing Trajectory.</p> <p><u>A resolution to grant planning permission for 292 new homes and ancillary retail and leisure uses was made by the Borough Council in 2007 after extensive design development on layout and architecture. The Council is prepared to consider alternative proposals in the light of the ownership structure of the site and the housing.</u></p>
FC32	Page 46 Para 3.139 Site 11 St Johns Hospital	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residential development in the region of 300 dwellings
R33	Page 46 Para 3.140 Site 11 St Johns Hospital	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Public open space</u> • Neighbourhood-scale retail and community/leisure uses if appropriate <u>health, community and leisure</u> • Small business premises which are compatible within a residential area <u>uses, if appropriate where practicable</u>
R34	Page 46 Para 3.141 Site 11 St Johns Hospital	<p>Dependencies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retention of important buildings or structures within the Conservation Area • Retention and protection of protected trees <p><u>Land Use Principles</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Inclusion of any non-residential facilities (such as health and community uses) to be guided by robust</u>

Ref No	Section	Change (Deletions , Additions)
		<p><u>evidence of both existing provision in the locality and anticipated demand.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Dwelling sizes to ensure a mix of household types and at least 25% houses to ensure a balance of flats and houses.</u> • <u>An appropriate level of car parking to meet anticipated demand provided in a manner that ensures cars do not dominate the environment.</u>
R35	Page 46 Para 3.142 Site 11 St Johns Hospital	<p>High quality urban design required which protects and enhances the existing buildings and spaces within and around the site. A planning brief for the site was adopted by the Borough Council in 2006.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>The Borough Council will seek any planning application for part of the site to reflect the site planning principles for the whole allocated area. This will ensure a coherent overall layout and will enable separate development phases to be integrated without compromising the remainder of the site.</u> • <u>Limit the number of vehicle access points from Wood Street and place pedestrian access points on desire lines relating to surrounding movement patterns, bus stops and services. Provide a physical route through the site designed for ease of internal circulation and connectivity with Wood Street.</u> • <u>Within the conservation area, retain trees and buildings of local historic and townscape importance and integrate them into a new development layout to contribute to character. Convert and adapt retained buildings for residential and non-residential uses to optimise their use.</u> • <u>New public spaces to provide a clear recreational function, be accessible for new and existing residents and have a good sense of enclosure and oversight from buildings.</u> • <u>Rationalise the boundaries between different land ownerships to optimise the efficiency of site area. Use building fronts framing public space as a means to integrate different phases of development.</u> • <u>Public realm to be designed as shared pedestrian and vehicle space, with pedestrian priority and convenience.</u> • <u>New development to be designed to have a positive relationship with the adjoining Chelmsford golf course, to allow buildings to face over landscape while protecting against risk of damage from golf balls.</u> • <u>Remove the high wall on Wood Street opposite the Fox and Hounds public house.</u> • <u>Improve pedestrian footways on Wood Street where practicable and improve pedestrian crossing facilities.</u>

Ref No	Section	Change (Deletions , <u>Additions</u>)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Car parking to be designed into a layout using a mixture of front-access on-plot, undercroft, parking squares and parking courts, to avoid visual intrusiveness of parking areas, avoid compromising green spaces and optimise the efficiency of site area.</u>
FC36	Page 49 Para 3.149 Site 13 Boreham	<p>Amend 1st sentence: This 'brownfield' site comprises a waste recycling business (earth grading). and provide an opportunity for approximately 25 additional dwellings in the village.</p> <p>Insert new penultimate sentence: <u>Development would also need to be sensitive to the Conservation Area which adjoins the western site boundary.</u></p>
FC37	Page 49 Figure 13 Boreham	Show <u>Conservation Area</u> on site plan.
FC38	Page 50 Para 3.152 Site Allocation 14 Edney Common	<p>Amend 1st sentence: The site comprises a barn/ storage warehouse and vacant <u>former industrial and storage</u> land.</p> <p>Amend 3rd sentence: This would strengthen the village community and make use of a disused 'brownfield' site <u>and improve visual character.</u></p> <p>Amend 6th sentence: The design and layout of the development should reflect the surrounding low density residential development to the west <u>and the open, rural character to the east. Houses should be set back from a green at the north east of the site, well spaced within abundant tree planting and a landscape-dominated layout.</u></p>

Ref No	Section	Change (Deletions , <u>Additions</u>)
FC39	Page 50 Figure 14 Edney Common	Show existing footpaths and replace ' Woodside Cottages ' with ' <u>Woodland</u> '.
FC40	Page 51 Para 3.155 Site 15 Galleywood	<p>Insert new 2nd sentence: <u>The Council will require a masterplanned approach to the whole area prior to approving any application for part of the site.</u></p> <p>Amend now fourth sentence: The loss of the green space on the north-east of the site would need to be balanced by incorporating new green space elsewhere on the site <u>improved public recreational space, accessible to the wider neighbourhood.</u></p> <p>Expand last sentence: <u>and may also be possible from Pym's Road.</u></p>
FC41	Page 52 Para 3.158 Site 16 Morelands	Substantial parts of the site are currently degraded by as a consequence of legitimate as well as unauthorised industrial activity <u>unauthorised uses and activities</u> which now leave the site requiring significant environmental improvement. <u>Consultation with Natural England should take place at the earliest stage in the planning application process.</u>
FC42	Page 53 Para 3.162 Site 17 Runwell	Replace 67ha with <u>65.5ha</u> .
FC43	Page 53 Para 3.163 Site 17 Runwell Hospital	The site is allocated as a Major Developed Site for housing-led development.

Ref No	Section	Change (Deletions, Additions)
FC44	Page 53 Para 3.164 Site 17 Runwell	Add to end of paragraph: <u>The Borough Council did not issue this permission as the relevant planning obligation was never completed. Having regard to changes in legislation and procedures since the resolution any redevelopment proposals will need to be subject to a new application for planning permission.</u>
FC45	Page 53 Para 3.165 Site 17 Runwell	Penultimate sentence: delete only . Add to end of paragraph:- <u>The estimated capacity for the site is about 600 homes. Consultation with Natural England should take place at the earliest stage in the planning application process.</u>
FC46	Page 53 Para 3.166 Site 17 Runwell Hospital	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residential-led development in the region of 600 dwellings
FC47	Page 53 Para 3.167 Site 17 Runwell	Amend 1 st bullet point to:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Open space, retention of sports hall and sports pitches <u>Recreational open space, sports facilities, open landscape</u>
R48	Page 53 Para 3.168 Site 17 Runwell	Replace Dependencies with <u>Design Principles</u> Add new 2 nd bullet: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>A package of improvements to the A132 (Runwell Road) to improve pedestrian and cycling connectivity and mitigate any adverse impact to the highway network created by new development.</u> Add to the end of now 3 rd bullet:

Ref No	Section	Change (Deletions , <u>Additions</u>)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>and protection and enhancements of wildlife habitats.</u> <p>Amend now 4th bullet:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Retention or replacement</u> of existing sport facilities including sports pitches <p>Add new 7th bullet:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Ensure there are linkages to other footpaths and cycleways and that Safer Routes to School are incorporated.</u> <p>Amend now 8th bullet:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>and education, pedestrian and cycle route network, open spaces, landscape and education including a new Primary School and Early Years and Childcare facility to support the pupil demand from the development. If required, suitable sites will be identified within the wider site allocation to accommodate such uses.</u> <p>Add new 9th bullet:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Provision of any necessary improvements to waste water treatment and foul sewer network capacity to serve new development.</u> <p>Add new 10th bullet:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Consideration of any contamination associated with the previous use and remedial measures that may need to be carried out.</u> <p>Amend now 11th bullet:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Revise proposals for listed building Protect and enhance the setting of the Church which is a Listed Building and encourage secure an appropriate use for this building</u> <p>Delete now 12th bullet:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comprehensive approach by masterplanning of the site

Ref No	Section	Change (Deletions , <u>Additions</u>)
		<p>Add following new bullets:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>A landscape design-led layout within which trees, woodland and natural features are integrated with new development, a new access road is sensitively designed and the A130 is adequately screened.</u> • <u>A coherent overall layout based on legible pedestrian routes linked to existing footpaths, views out into countryside and public facilities located together to form a neighbourhood heart.</u> • <u>Public realm to be designed as shared pedestrian and vehicle space, for pedestrian priority and convenience.</u> • <u>New development to be designed to have a positive relationship with the adjoining Medium Secure Unit.</u> • <u>Car parking to be designed into a layout using a mixture of front-access on-plot, parking squares and parking courts, to avoid visual intrusiveness of cars in the environment. Minimise garages to reduce overall building footprint and maintain openness.</u> • <u>The development is within the catchment of Wickford Wastewater Treatment Works where there is no capacity for growth within the existing dry weather flow (DWF) consent. A revised DWF flow consent will have to be applied for.</u>
FC49	Page 54 Para 3.169 Site 17 Runwell	Delete ' <u>urban</u> ' and merge 3.169 to the end of 3.168.
FC50	Page 55 Para 3.172 Site 18 Stock	<p>Replace unviable with <u>impracticable</u> in third sentence</p> <p>Add new sentences at end: <u>A development proposal should be accompanied by proposals supported by evidence for any necessary replacement car parking. No buildings should be placed within the 15m of the adjoining pumping station, as required by Anglian Water.</u></p>

Ref No	Section	Change (Deletions , <u>Additions</u>)
FC51	Page 56 Picture 19 Site 19 Writtle	Picture Figure 19
FC52	Page 59 Para 3.184 Site 20 East Hanningfield	Amend 1 st sentence: Any development would be in the region of 10 dwellings. The Council will not give permission for more than 10 dwellings. Amend 3 rd sentence: Delete comma after site; Expand last sentence: <u>and should be arranged so that building fronts face the roads and the open countryside to the west.</u> <u>Existing trees and hedgerows should be conserved within a scheme, based on an ecological assessment.</u>
FC53	Page 62 Para 3.191 Site 22 St Giles	Insert new 3 rd sentence: <u>Development would need to consider the need for additional primary health care provision informed by robust evidence on existing provision and consultation with the Mid-Essex Primary Care Trust.</u>
FC54	Page 64 Para 3.192 Site 16 Morelands	Substantial parts of the site are currently degraded by as a consequence of legitimate as well as unauthorised industrial activity unauthorised uses and activities which now leave the site requiring significant environmental improvement.
FC55	Page 65 Para 3.194 Economic Prosperity	Add new sentence at end: <u>All new employment sites will also be subject to developer contributions in accordance with the Borough Council's adopted guidance.</u>

Ref No	Section	Change (Deletions, Additions)			
FC56	Page 65 Para 3.196 Employment Areas	The Adopted Core Strategy provides for a new Employment Area to be allocated in the SADPD at Temple Farm, West Hanningfield.			
FC57	Page 65 Para 3.198	Insert additional bullet: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure development in the following Employment Areas avoids any significant impact on European Sites – Eastern Industrial Estate, Ferrers Road Industrial Area, East Hanningfield Industrial Estate and Saltcoats Industrial Area, Mayphil Industrial Estate 			
FC58	Page 66 Table 7 Employment Areas	Site Allocation 24 – Temple Farm	DC52	Amend final sentence: In 2008, a planning application was received for the development of the site, and a decision on that application is awaited. <u>Planning permission was granted in 2010 for the development of the site.</u>	31
FC59	Page 69 Para 3.202 Neighbourhood Centres	The SADPD defines the boundary of South Woodham Ferrers Town Centre, and this is shown on <u>Map 4</u> . the Proposals Map and Inset 4.			
FC60	Page 69 Para 3.204 Neighbourhood Centres	Insert additional bullet: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Ensure development in South Woodham Ferrers Town Centre and Warwick Parade avoids any significant impact on European Sites</u> 			

Ref No	Section	Change (Deletions , Additions)
FC61	Page 69 Table 8 Neighbourhood Centres	<p>Amend Warwick Parade: There are currently no planning applications for this site.</p> <p>Amend 1st sentence of The Village, Chelmer Village: This large neighbourhood centre provides a wide range of services including ample food and drink stockists, as well as services such as a launderette and betting office for the Chelmer Village area.</p> <p>Amend 2nd sentence of The Vineyards, Great Baddow: There is a good selection of stores including greengrocers, TV sales, betting office and a bakery.</p> <p>Amend Bodmin Road: There are currently no planning proposals for this neighbourhood centre.</p> <p>Amend Byron Road: There are currently no planning proposals for this neighbourhood centre.</p> <p>Amend Corporation Road: The neighbourhood centre has no current planning applications.</p> <p>Amend Forest Drive: The centre contains a large food store, hairdressers, bookmakers and restaurants takeaways. Currently, there are currently no planning applications affecting this centre.</p> <p>Amend Havengore: There are no planning proposals currently affecting the centre.</p> <p>Amend Hylands Parade: There are no planning proposals currently affecting the centre.</p>

Ref No	Section	Change (Deletions , <u>Additions</u>)
		<p>Amend Meadgate Avenue: There are currently no planning applications affecting the site.</p> <p>Amend Melbourne Avenue: There are currently no planning applications affecting the centre.</p> <p>Amend Meon Close: There are currently no planning applications affecting this site.</p> <p>Amend Robin Way: There are no planning proposals currently affecting the site.</p> <p>Amend Sunrise Avenue: There are no planning proposals currently affecting the centre.</p> <p>Amend Waterhouse Lane: There are currently no planning applications affecting the centre.</p> <p>Amend Bicknacre (Monks Mead): There are no current proposals affecting this neighbourhood centre.</p> <p>Amend Boreham (The Larches): Currently, there are no planning applications affecting this neighbourhood centre.</p> <p>Amend Galleywood (Watchouse Road): There are currently no planning applications affecting the centre.</p> <p>Amend Ramsden Heath (Downham Road and Dowsetts): There are currently no planning applications affecting the centre.</p>

Ref No	Section	Change (Deletions , <u>Additions</u>)
		<p>Amend Stock (Mill Road, Stock Road and The Square): There are currently no planning applications affecting the centre.</p> <p>Amend Writtle (Long Brandocks): There are currently no planning applications affecting the site.</p> <p>Amend Writtle (The Green, Bridge Street and St John's Green): Currently, there are no planning applications for this area.</p>
FC62	Page 76 Para 3.211 Open Spaces, Sports and Recreation	Policy DC39 of the Adopted Core Strategy protects <u>all existing public</u> open space from development as identified on the Proposals Map which includes:
FC63	Page 78 Para 3.218 Bulls Lodge Quarry	This would set out the type and extent of recreational land uses to ensure it is compliant with the LDF and complements the development of new neighbourhoods in North East Chelmsford and <u>the existing community of Boreham.</u>
FC64	Page 81 Para 3.236 Minerals and Waste	<p>The most recent stage in the preparation of the Minerals Development Framework was the 'Additional Sites Allocations Issues and Options Paper', which was published for consultation by Essex County Council in September 2009. Consultation on the Waste Development Document Issues and Options is expected to take place during 2010.</p> <p><u>The most recent stage in the preparation of the Minerals Development Framework was consultation on the emerging preferred strategy for future mineral supply in December 2010. The document indicates the likely scope of development management policies and identifies the emerging 'preferred sites' for future mineral extraction and transshipment. A consultation on the Joint Waste Development Document: Issues</u></p>

Ref No	Section	Change (Deletions, Additions)				
		<u>and Options was also undertaken in October – December 2010. This identifies possible options for future waste management in the County.</u>				
FC65	Page 82 Para 4.8 Monitoring & Implementation	Expand paragraph: <u>For all the site allocations in this document and subsequent development proposals, when these are taken through to planning application stage the applicants must be able to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Environment Agency, Anglian Water and other statutory undertakers that there is existing adequate capacity in the Waste Water Treatment Works and the foul sewerage network, or that the capacity can be created. It must also be ensured that all allocations within the SADPD comply with the Water Framework Directive objectives (which include Habitats Directive requirements).</u>				
FC66	Page 83 Para. 4.11	Insert new paragraph after existing 4.11: <u>New development will also be expected to consider the opportunity for renewable energy as well as energy and water efficient design in line with Policies in the Adopted Core Strategy.</u>				
FC67	Page 83 New section of text after new Para 4.12	<u>Flood Risk</u> <u>A Strategic Flood Risk Assessment for Chelmsford was undertaken in October 2008. The Chelmsford Water Cycle Study Phase 2 Technical Report, May 2011 included further work on Flood Risk Management. An assessment of suitable housing development locations based on a review of the Environment Agency Flood maps is shown in Table 9.</u> <u>Table 9: Flood zone assessment for settlements within the Site Allocations Document area</u> <table><tr><th><u>Settlement</u></th><th><u>Flood Zone Assessment</u></th></tr><tr><td><u>Boreham,</u> <u>Broomfield,</u> <u>Danbury,</u> <u>Galleywood,</u> <u>Great Leighs,</u></td><td><u>These settlements are outside of the flood zones and are unlikely to be affected by fluvial or coastal flooding.</u></td></tr></table>	<u>Settlement</u>	<u>Flood Zone Assessment</u>	<u>Boreham,</u> <u>Broomfield,</u> <u>Danbury,</u> <u>Galleywood,</u> <u>Great Leighs,</u>	<u>These settlements are outside of the flood zones and are unlikely to be affected by fluvial or coastal flooding.</u>
<u>Settlement</u>	<u>Flood Zone Assessment</u>					
<u>Boreham,</u> <u>Broomfield,</u> <u>Danbury,</u> <u>Galleywood,</u> <u>Great Leighs,</u>	<u>These settlements are outside of the flood zones and are unlikely to be affected by fluvial or coastal flooding.</u>					

Ref No	Section	Change (Deletions, Additions)	
		<u>Stock</u>	
		<u>Bicknacre</u>	The flood maps show a narrow area in Flood Zone 2 along the watercourse through Bicknacre. This is unlikely to affect any identified development within Bicknacre.
		<u>Writtle</u>	Parts of the east of Writtle are within Flood Zones 2, 3a and 3b, and at risk of flooding from the River Wid.
		<u>Runwell</u>	Runwell is considered at risk from flooding from the River Crouch in the area between the A132 and the railway.
		<u>South Woodham Ferrers</u>	Large parts of South Woodham Ferrers are at risk from coastal flooding to the east, south and west sides of the town and these areas would not be suitable for additional housing development. These areas are also Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI).
FC68	Page 84 Table 9 Evidence Base	Table 9 <u>10</u>	
FC69	Page 87 Table 9 Evidence Base	Expand to include ' <u>A Plan for SWF SPD, June 2008, CBC</u> '	
FC70	Page 89 Table 9 Evidence Base	Expand to include ' <u>Essex Wildlife Trust Living Landscapes – A Vision for the future of Essex, Essex Wildlife Trust</u> '	

Ref No	Section	Change (Deletions , Additions)
FC71	Page 89 Table 9 Evidence Base	Expand to include <u>'Chelmsford Borough Water Cycle Study Phase 2, HALCROW'</u>
FC72	Page 89 Table 9 Evidence Base	Expand to include <u>'PPS25 Sequential Test for Spatial Strategy in Chelmsford Borough Submission Site Allocations DPD, January 2011, CBC'</u>
FC73	Page 89 Table 9 Evidence Base	Expand to include <u>'Flood Alleviation Scheme Stage A - legal & funding agreement, March 2011, CBC and Environment Agency'</u>
FC74	Page 89 Table 9 Evidence Base	Expand to include <u>'Developer's Guide to Infrastructure Contributions – Education Supplement – Our approach towards mitigating the impact of development of schools and Early Years and Childcare Provision, July 2010, ECC'.</u>
FC75	Page 87 Table 9 Evidence Base	Essex School Organisation Plan, 2005-2010 <u>2010-2015, ECC</u>
FC76	Page 89 Table 9 Evidence Base	Stock Village Design Statement, Oct 2011, Stock Parish Council
FC77	Page 89 Table 9 Evidence Base	Rettendon Village Design Statement, Oct 2011, Rettendon Parish Council

Mapping Changes		
FC Map BI	Map 3 Chelmsford Urban Area	Extend open space and Employment Area designations North of Cuton Hall Lane and Chelmer Village Way to be co-terminous with the Springfield Park Employment Area.
FC Map C	Map 4 SWF	Show Warwick Parade Neighbourhood Centre, SWF as retail frontage rather than secondary frontage.
FC Map D	Map 7 Boreham and Map 1 Borough North	Correct area of Boreham Inset.
FC Map J	Map 3 Chelmsford Urban Area	Amend Open Space notation at The Vineyards, Great Baddow.

Note: The FC Maps listed above are contained in the Focused Change Consultation, October 2011 [Document FCI] in the SADPD evidence base.

Abbreviations

Initials	Abbreviation of ...
CTCAAP	Chelmsford Town Centre Area Action Plan
DPD	Development Plan Document
DSB	Defined Settlement Boundary
DWF	Dry Weather Flow

ECC	Essex County Council
HRA	Habitat Regulations Assessment
LNR	Local Nature Reserve
LDF	Local Development Framework
NCAAP	North Chelmsford Area Action Plan
SADPD	Site Allocations Development Plan Document
SADPS	Site Allocations Development Plan Document Proposed Submission
SPA	Special Policy Area
SPD	Supplementary Planning Document
SWF	South Woodham Ferrers
VDS	Village Design Statement