

## **CHELMSFORD POLICY BOARD – 18 May 2026**

### **PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND STATEMENTS**

#### **Agenda Item 5 – Chelmsford Local Plan – Submission to Secretary of State for independent examination**

##### **Question from Mr H**

What specific, costed, funded and legally secured replacement infrastructure package now exists for Hammonds Farm relating to A12 Junction 18, A12 Junction 19, the A414 and the affected local road network including North Hill/The Ridge, Church Road and Colam/Holybred Lane?

If no such package is yet secured, how can the council conclude that Hammonds Farm is deliverable, sustainable and sound? Will the council delete or defer the Hammonds Farm allocation before submitting the Local Plan?

The draft plan and Arup infrastructure documents states that the Local Plan traffic modelling concluded that the full A12 Junction 19 DCO improvements are 'critical' and required as a minimum to deliver the strategic growth in the Local Plan Review.

##### **Question from B**

This is a submitted question and statement for the Chelmsford Policy Board meeting scheduled for the 18 May 2026 to discuss and approve the submission of the Local Plan to the Secretary of State for independent examination. The Council carried out a focused consultation for additional sites between December 2025 and January 2026. This question and statement is in relation to site 19- Land West of Patching Hall Lane that is included in the additional sites. In the consultation response there were a high level of objections from residents and from Broomfield Parish Council both to the main consultation and the separate consultation on the IIA. Objections were on the basis that the proposed site did not comply with some of the strategic priorities and spatial principles set out in the original 2020 Local Plan and the Chelmsford Local Plan review Preferred Options 2024 and that it did not take into account the Broomfield Parish NP. There were also issues raised with the methodology and the resultant scoring of the site in the IIA and that it had been incorrectly weighted to show a favorable conclusion. The focused Council response to the consultation as set out in its feedback report of March 2026 and in its Regulation 22 consultation statement for the Chelmsford Policy board has not adequately addressed the objections and issues raised that the proposed site does not meet the Strategic priorities and spatial principles set out in the Local Plan. Neither has the Councils response to the IIA consultation adequately answered the concerns regarding the assessment scoring. In my own detailed response where I outlined why I thought the additional site did not meet the Local Plans strategic priorities and spatial principles I cannot find any meaningful engagement with the issues raised in the Councils response contained in the feedback report or Reg 22 consultation statement. Similarly in the response to the issues raised

in the IIA consultation the Council has responded with a standard 'cut and paste' response for my own comments and for many other responses. With such a large number of objections and valid concerns both from local residents and Broomfield Parish Council on the suitability of this site for inclusion and its lack of compliance with the Strategic objectives and spatial principles of the Local Plan why is the site still included in the Additional Sites - Local Plan ? Why has the Councils response to the consultations for this particular site been inadequate and has not sufficiently addressed the issues raised?