

# Chelmsford Draft Local Plan

Schedule of Pre-Submission Local  
Plan, Sustainability Appraisal and  
Habitats Regulations Assessment  
Representations in Document Order

June 2018

*Our Planning Strategy to 2036*





## Schedule of Pre-Submission Local Plan representations – Document Order

This document provides a schedule of representations made to the Pre-Submission Local Plan. This schedule lists the representations in order of the consultation point in the Pre-Submission Local Plan in which the representation has been attributed to.

The schedule includes the following information under the column headings:

Column Heading	Contents
Consultation Point	The paragraph, table, figure, question, map or policy in the Pre-Submission Local Plan which the representation has been attributed to.
Rep ID	The unique reference number given to each representation.
Person ID	The unique reference number given to each respondent.
Name/Organisation	Name or organisation of the respondent who made the representation.
1. to 4.	Boxes ticked in response to questions 1 to 4. Where no boxes were ticked or a letter was received rather than a completed questionnaire these have been left blank.
Summary of Rep	Summary of the main issues raised by the representation. These summaries comprise the executive summary provided to question 5 where this was completed. Where there was no executive summary provided the Council have summarised the representation to cover the main issues raised.

Please note that this document does **NOT** provide full copies of every representation or any supporting information submitted alongside the representation. Full copies of each representation can be viewed via the Council's Consultation Portal:

[www.chelmsford.gov.uk/planningpolicyconsult](http://www.chelmsford.gov.uk/planningpolicyconsult)

A guide on how to view comments in the Consultation Portal can be found at:

<http://www.chelmsford.gov.uk/EasySiteWeb/GatewayLink.aspx?alId=258345>

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
1.1	PS483	1095105	Mr Gordon Ingram	No	No	No			•		No	The local Plan does not take into account local views and appears ill informed.
1.1	PS36	1151764	Mr James Knight	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•		No	The plan should be infrastructure led. The road infrastructure indicated does not meet the needs of residents nor support sustainable growth. An outer ring road is needed. The rail infrastructure cannot meet existing demand at peak times. The plan does not adequately cover educational needs or other local services including GPs, dentists etc.
1.1	PS57	1151991	Mr Gary Cremer	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	No	The plan does not prioritise transport and local infrastructure which are already under pressure. Concern that flooding around Old Wickford Road will get much worse. Facts and opinions of local residents have been ignored.
1.1	PS66	1097862	Mr Nigel Duchars	No	No	No	•	•	•			Concerns regarding congestion, train provision, parking, provision of healthcare facilities, provision of secondary education and impact of traveller site at SWF.
1.1	PS128	1094666	Mr Alan Cudmore	No	No	No	•	•	•		No	Concern SWF residents have not been informed of proposals. Concern regarding congestion in/out of SWF, new pedestrian crossing will cause traffic, healthcare services will be overstretched, damage from heavy vehicles - traveller site could be problematic for this reason, and consider additional parking.
1.1	PS126	1075936	Mrs Helen Lyall	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	No	Development should be infrastructure led. Concern for increased traffic on B1012, flood risk, education provision, GP provision and rail provision.
1.1	PS177	1075656	Mr Stuart Pepper				•		•			Need road infrastructure to reduce congestion, substantial healthcare facilities, car parking, avoid town division. Concern SWF will become a large undesirable housing estate.
1.1	PS183	1153205	Mrs Karen Dickson	No	No	No		•			No	The plan does not appear to consider impact of the developments or views of local residents. The plan is not justified since there are thousands of brownfield sites in the south east that could be used if needed. Road and local infrastructure is inadequate.
1.1	PS213	1153244	Mr Peter Dixon	No		No		•		•	Yes	The plan does not comply with the NPPF. Too much development in the urban area and inadequate infrastructure and transport improvements will lead to strangulation and gridlock. Public transport is continually being ignored. Green spaces are important lungs and should not be built on. The St Peter College development will exacerbate traffic gridlock especially being far from employment opportunities. The Essex Police HQ site has no access to strategic roads, sufficient space for parking is required, bus services are inadequate and trains are at capacity. This site should also provide additional parking areas and access for the Rugby and Cricket clubs nearby who do not have enough parking and a cricket net facility.
1.1	PS226	1097554	Mrs Elizabeth Suddick	Yes	Yes	No	•		•		No	Concern for congestion especially on B1012 and A132. Current infrastructure is insufficient to support traffic. The bridge planned for B1012 needs to be wheelchair and pushchair accessible. Concern pedestrian crossings will increase traffic and pollution. A more thorough investigation of the traffic issues involved and possible solutions.
1.1	PS262	1096766	Mr Ken Wilkinson			No	•	•	•	•	No	Serious concern about CCC's evidence base especially as roads are already at 96% capacity. There seems to be a lack of understanding of traffic levels through Writtle and no evidence of impact of Crossrail. Development to the East of Chelmsford seems more reasonable, near existing infrastructure.
1.1	PS313	1092791	Mrs L Dowling	No								The B1012 cannot take any more traffic without total road blockage, especially when emergency services needs to get through.
1.1	PS340	1154922	Mrs Stephanie Rutter	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	No	Development is detrimental to air quality and the environment. Cutting down trees will increase flood risk. Concern for increase congestion. Local infrastructure could not sustain development. The area in question is completely unsuitable environmentally, economically and socially and must be reconsidered.
1.1	PS341	1154494	Mrs Jennifer Mizzi	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	No	The area around Avon Road is unsuitable both environmentally, socially and economically. It must be reconsidered and a more suitable site located.
1.1	PS371	1097312	Mr Kenneth Gray	No		No	•	•	•	•		Attachment is South Woodham Ferrers Action Group Template. Predominantly against all development for SWF. Please see PS411 PS412 PS413 PS414 PS415 PS416 PS417 PS418 PS419 PS420 PS421 PS422 fo individual paragraph summaries.
1.1	PS375	1097313	Mrs Fiona Gray	No	No	No	•	•	•	•		Attachment is South Woodham Ferrers Action Group Template. Predominantly against all development for SWF. Please see PS424 PS425 PS426 PS427 PS428 PS429 PS430 PS431 PS432 PS433 PS434 PS435 fo individual paragraph summaries.
1.1	PS423	1154875	Mr Derek Burrell	Yes	Yes	No		•	•		No	The A1060 Maldon Road is already congested during peak hours. Housing, employment and visitors centre at Location 3 will add to the problems. Concerned that the local infrastructure required will not be delivered if the developer has viability issues.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
1.1	PS509	1155297	Mrs Rhoda Ingram	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	No	The Plan does not appear to conform to national objectives of consultation. Proposals do not address the foreseeable problems of congestion, lack of local facilities etc especially for Warren Farm. There should be a full appraisal of the impact on heritage. Inadequate consideration given to a new Village to the East of Chelmsford, where there are already good road links and no impact on existing dwellings.
1.1	PS553	1075982	Mr Alex Knowles	Yes	Yes	Yes					No	The new homes are desperately needed, the sooner the better! The planned increase in passenger capacity on the trains will resolve the main concern for many. Upgrading the local roads needs to be part of a wider strategy planned alongside road improvements to the main roads. 1000 homes may not be enough to fund the infrastructure improvements needed. There is plenty of wasted land in the area which could be better used than sitting dormant and overgrown.
1.1	PS934	1156304	Mrs Joyce Colvin	No	Yes			•				Question much more traffic will there be in the town of South Woodham Ferrers if 1000 more homes are built. Concerns on access through South Woodham Ferrers for emergency services. Concerns on pedestrians crossing the road to and from new development. The local infrastructure will be unable to cope should the new homes in South Woodham Ferrers be built.
1.1	PS665	1156103	Mr Colin Howard	Yes	Yes	No	•		•		No	The road and rail infrastructure does not meet the needs of existing and future residents. The A132 has fast traffic, no crossing facility and no street lighting or footpath. A dual carriageway needs to be considered between the A132 Rettendon Turnpike and the SWF roundabout. Hayes Country Park needs to have a safe entrance/exit and traffic lights or a roundabout.
1.1	PS706	1156269	Professor Alastair Thomas	No	No	No	•		•		No	The proposal for Writtle is contradictory to the NPPF in that it will not improving the conditions in which people live, work, travel and take leisure. More detailed traffic management is required for the west of Chelmsford. See also attachment which questions the accuracy of the traffic modelling.
1.1	PS783	961966	Mr Alan Brunning	No	No	No	•				Yes	This document and the ability to add comments is near impossible to use. The methods and complication of adding comments to each section is deliberately made difficult. As such meaningful comments are being deterred this cannot be a legal and reasonable approach. As such the process should be re submitted making it easy for comments to be added on each section of the plan.
1.1	PS805	1152526	Mr David Purcell	No	No	No	•	•	•		No	Concern for congestion, flood risk, impacts of traveller site, doctor/dental provision.
1.1	PS809	1074842	Mr Trevor Lathrope	No	No	No	•	•	•		No	Not enough is being done to consult the residents of SWF. Road infrastructure is inadequate. Concern for impact on schools, dentists, doctors, congestion, rail services. Concern for safety with lack of full time fire, police or ambulance station. Object to travelling site allocation.
1.1	PS903	1095906	Mr Kevin Carley	Yes	Yes	No		•			No	The infrastructure cannot and will not cope. Schools, Police, Fire services, already under serious financial constraint as well as under-staffed. Impact on roads, not just new local traffic but the extra burden from the Dengie Peninsula - extra housing, new power station etc. Houses are not selling now so why more? CCC has a very poor record on affordable housing. Local roads around SWF station already clogged and dangerous, the new plan will make it worse. Flooding - The B1012, Hullbridge Road and others flood from water off Radar Hill now, with new housing this would increase the problem hugely. Travelling Show people are historical from the days of Fairs and Circus, no relevance now. New housing built with limited parking and hoped for car share would be unlikely to work. Concern about pedestrians crossing the B1012 with potential for casualties on a regular basis.
1.1	PS936	1156299	Mr William D Phillips	No	No	No	•		•		No	Does not set out details of affordable housing or 55+ housing, nor take into account infrastructure issues in and around South Woodham Ferrers. Local residents comments and submissions in the South Woodham Ferrers area have been ignored.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
1.1	PS1053	1156395	Mr Thomas Chapman	Yes	No	No	•		•		Yes	The plan is has not given due consideration to the volume of traffic using the A132 between South Woodham Ferrers and the Rettendon Turnpike, in relation to vehicles trying to join or cross the traffic flow and the volume of pedestrians which need to cross the road to reach public services . During peak traffic periods there is almost a continual flow of traffic along this section of the A132. This is not because of the roundabouts at either end, they flow nicely, but because of the volume of traffic on a single lane road, and this will be considerably increased by the extra traffic the proposed housing and commercial outlets planned will create. At present the Woodham Road is already used as a “rat run” during peaks hours to get to and from the roundabouts at either end of this section of the A132, this will only increase with the proposed developments and bring with it all the complaints and dangers that rat runs create in congested areas. This section of the A132 should be increased to a dual carriage way and the entrance to the Hayes Country Park improved to include street lighting and a crossing.
1.1	PS1037	1095909	Mr Anthony Wood	No	Yes	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	Pre-submission SA identifies likely negative effects on Biodiversity and Geodiversity, water and flood. Significant negative effects on the Crouch and Roach Estuaries SPA/Ramsar and Essex Estuaries SAC and the rare and unique nature of this habitat are identified and therefore alternative sites should be considered that are lower risk and have no need for mitigation strategies. Increased traffic. Not sustainable due to lack of infrastructure investment, roads would become dangerous for users and pedestrians. Over-crowded train station and service not being upgraded. Insufficient Community Infrastructure Levy to fund additional services that would be required especially healthcare. Not consistent with National Policy. Not protecting the countryside and designated habitats. Significant negative effect on Flood Risk.
1.1	PS1034	1156965	Mr Brian Selwood	No	No	No		•			Yes	No evidence of sufficient improvements to infrastructure to support the increase in population. Roads are overcrowded at certain times. Trains are overcrowded and cannot sustain the increase in population. No increase in service proposed. Development divided from the existing Town by the main B1012 forming a separate community. Re-route the B1012 round the North of the development.
1.1	PS1049	1097627	Mrs Sophie Gibbs	No	No	No	•		•		No	Improvements needed to the local transport network to support the increased population. Need a clear plan for how additional local amenities, new surgery, out of hours provision, school and nursery places will be provided. How much of the housing will be 'affordable'. Improvements needed to A132 to cope with rush traffic congestion. Platforms at South Woodham Ferrers needs to be extended to allow for longer trains. Environmental impact of any building needs to be fully considered.
1.1	PS1060	966318	Mr Paul Costello	No	No	No	•	•	•			Process is overly complicated. Hammonds farm has been ignored. Traffic congestion in the city and around Writtle and safety concerns around the Writtle Primary School. Single point of access to and from Site 2 onto already congested road. Pedestrian access to amenities falls outside 25 minute pedestrian journey time which offers the greatest potential to replace car journeys. Issue with crossing the A1060 to access the national cycle route and safety concerns over Public Right of Way. Need to install a safe crossing facility across the Roxwell Road. Limited bus services Would a site-wide travel plan overcome traffic problems? Unsure if existing healthcare facilities could cope with additional housing. School is unlikely to be developed until all houses complete. Impact on flooding and pollution. East of Chelmsford would be a more sustainable long term solution where there are better transport links. Council should work with Writtle and Chignal Parishes to resolve the congestion and pedestrian safety issues in Writtle and surrounding roads. Insufficient attention has been paid to essential infrastructure.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
1.1	PS1142	1096393	Mr Murrough O'Brien	Yes	Yes	No	•	•		•	No	Concerns for the sustainability of South Woodham Ferrers if Site 7 – North of the town is proceeded with - road and rail capacity, no improvements proposed to the railway, safety issues for getting to the school from new development, primary school should be provided on site, no evidence to substantiate statements for revitalising the town centre, lack of parking provision, flooding, protection of ramsar, SSSI and historic environment. The minimum of infrastructure requirements for the town and urban area, will require funding that far exceeds that which can be generated from the new development. Appendix 12 of the Pre-Submission Document indicates that the infrastructure to support the Local Plan has a cost of £648m, with known funding of £307m, leaving a funding gap of £341m. The costs (identified so far) that can be met by C.I.L. amount to £39.6m. This still leaves a funding gap of £301.4m, with no clear indication of how this shortfall will be met. In the submission many instances were found where the Local Plan failed to meet the requirements of the N.P.P.F. The numbers quoted in that paper were N.P.P.F. 7, 9, 99, 100, 102, 103, 118, 132 and 173. A Local Plan which is non-compliant with the requirements for it to be viable and deliverable is not sustainable and therefore not “sound”. Contravening N.P.P.F. 18
1.1	PS1172	1097151	Mr John Bennetts	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•		No	Not thought out or based on sound evidence. Traffic Consultants Report not adequately considered. Traffic Congestion on Roxwell Road and Chignal Road and also increase in traffic and pollution on Lordship Road and The Green in Writtle. The plan does not provide for suitable access. Crossings would be needed for Lordship Road. Impact on Writtle from traffic accessing Shenfield and CrossRail. Too far out for local amenities. School and GP clinic in Writtle will be overwhelmed as those proposed for the Area 2 site will not be built till the very end of the project. Pedestrian route along Roxwell Road by traffic and polluted road. Cycle route will have to cross a busier 60mph road. Unlikely for bus services to be increased. Writtle will lose the uniqueness that make it a desirable place to live. More suitable locations with better facilities and transport links in East Chelmsford.
1.1	PS1227	1097236	Mr Andrew Hutchinson	No	No	No	•	•	•		No	I strongly object to the proposed development at STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD (Warren Farm) as the increase in traffic movements through the village of Writtle will lead to increased pollution (noise and air pollutants). The road infrastructure in Writtle is inadequate to take any more vehicle movements through the village. The extra development at Warren Farm will undoubtedly lead to a significant increase of vehicles travelling through the village to the A12 and past the Writtle primary school, with potential for school children to be seriously injured or killed with the increased traffic flows. Strategic road infrastructure must be incorporated in to the proposed local plan if Warren Farm is to be permitted.
1.1	PS1236	1095909	Mr Anthony Wood	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	No EIA has been carried out for South Woodham Ferrers.
1.1	PS1317	1157201	Mr Dixon	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	No	Traffic congestion and lack of full consultation on the Plan.
1.1	PS1321	1157206	Mrs Selina Muir			No		•				Unclear how development will be mitigated. Travelling along the Rainsford/Roxwell road in the evening peak is already nearly impossible. Unclear how people will be encouraged to cycle. Area is prone to flooding. Infrastructure is a concern e.g. pressure on existing schools and local surgeries. Local roads are already congested.
1.1	PS1529	976647	Tendring District Council	Yes	Yes	Yes						I would draw your attention to our comments to your Preferred Options Local Plan sent by email on 10th May 2017. TDC is pleased to see that at paragraph 1.1 Chelmsford City Council have a plan period that will last until 2036 broadly in line with the Tendring District Council draft local Plan.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
1.1	PS1988	1097273	Mrs Norah Perry	No	No	No		•	•		No	The size of the proposed development will drastically change the nature of this "small riverside town". The Council lacks ambition in using this opportunity for major expansion of SWF to establish sustainable infrastructure that it obviously requires. A new development of 1000 dwellings plus other buildings should involve a levy on the developers. Inadequate capacity of the B1012 Burnham Road during weekday mornings and evenings. This will be made much worse with the new Sainsbury store and proposed roundabout and pedestrian crossings. The traffic survey carried out by the Council was obviously undertaken during off-peak times. By significantly extending the town north of the B1012 without re-directing this arterial road north of the new development, two separate communities will be created, with an adverse effect on social cohesion. The train service is at capacity during the busy morning and evening periods, and will not cope with a significant increase in the town's population. Plans do not include significant additional employment within SWF, and the train operator has no intention of increasing the service. Car parking in residential roads near the station is already a problem which will worsen with the additional development, including air pollution. Additional pressures on other public services - police station and fire station are now largely abandoned. Similarly the Council "shop" has been closed after a significant outlay. Despite this, the new development plans include further public facilities at the Sainsbury site. Should make full use of existing property. A travelling show person site, if it were really essential, should be sited well away from any residential area. I fail to see why such a site is necessary within an expended SWF.
1.2	PS29	1094049	Mrs Claire Styles									Source is missing for the statement: 'Over the coming decades, Chelmsford is forecast to be the major growth location for new homes and jobs in Essex.'
1.2	PS108	956304	Mr Martin Perry	No								Concern that this is development with no infrastructure, there are empty promises and comments are not listened to.
1.2	PS314	1092791	Mrs L Dowling		No	No	•	•	•			Traffic surveys to be undertaken at the right times. Concern over local services already at capacity, localised flooding and local parking problems around the railway station. An SSSI survey to be undertaken by the MOD Radar Hill woodland due to rare flora and fauna being present. We should respect the memory of a young teenager that took her own life recently and not build around her final resting place. Build in and around Chelmsford and leave South Woodham Ferrers alone. Concern about the travelling hard standing site given the recent problems in Basildon.
1.2	PS767	961966	Mr Alan Brunning			No		•			Yes	The document claims good transport connections but for area 7 South Woodham the plan is to leave the road network unaltered. The data for this application is flawed and the recommendations cannot be supported by the data in the traffic report for this application No changes to rail either. CCC are passing the responsibility to developers and network rail. Without adequate infrastructure the lives of people living on the Dengie will be blighted by travel congestion . This is not a sustainable development
1.2	PS782	961966	Mr Alan Brunning			No		•				The document claims good transport connections but for area 7 South Woodham the plan is to leave the road network unaltered. The data for this application is flawed and the recommendations cannot be supported by the data in the traffic report for this application No changes to rail either. CCC are passing the responsibility to developers and network rail. Without adequate infrastructure the lives of people living on the Dengie will be blighted by travel congestion . This is not a sustainable development
1.3	PS180	1093089	Dr Richard Rolfe	No	No	No			•		Yes	Lack of detailed infrastructure plans - particular reference to B1414, B1012, B1418, Rettendon Turnpike, rail/bus links/services. Concern for lack of affordable homes, residents views are not being taken seriously, difficult software for consultations.
1.3	PS315	1092791	Mrs L Dowling								No	Traffic surveys to be undertaken at the right times. There are existing problems with flooding at the base of Radar Hill residential sites. There should be better sites to build new homes, businesses and a travellers site such as Chelmsford.
1.3	PS474	1155000	Mrs Claire Thorogood		No							Chelmsford and South Woodham Ferrers are both referred to as 'Chelmsford' which is misleading and is therefore not represented clearly in the Local Planning documentation.
1.3	PS475	1155000	Mrs Claire Thorogood			No	•	•	•			Paragraph 1.3 is not sound as it is not positively prepared, justified or effective.
1.3	PS698	1156472	Mrs Christine Rowland	No	No	No	•	•	•		No	The plan has not given due consideration to the volume of traffic currently using the A132 between South Woodham Ferrers And Rettendon Turnpike. As a resident living along the A132, it is extremely dangerous to cross or join the traffic and extremely dangerous to cross as a pedestrian to reach public services.



Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
1.3	PS713	1156436	Mr Andrew Notman			No	•					Many houses to be built but the transport infrastructure is always delayed. The CNEB should be built now as traffic for the A12 from Braintree goes along Boreham Road, Great Leighs. This was a country lane but is now a rat run.
1.3	PS931	1156637	Mr Michael Burles	Yes		No	•		•		No	The ring road on which South Woodham Ferrers was designed upon will be removed with the new Local plan. A ring road to the north of South Woodham Ferrers should be included. Further traffic surveys should be carried out at various times including weekendsto estimate the future increased traffic at Growth Site 7, and development in Maldon and St Luke's Park.
1.3	PS933	1095482	Mrs Carol Selwood	No	No	No	•		•		No	In the 1970's residents were assured there could never be development to the north of the B1012. The infrastructure of the town was to be sufficient for approximately 18,000 people - and cannot cope with the proposed additional people. Concern that the necessary infrastructure will not be provided. The Town centre includes sheltered housing in the town centre specifically so that they can have easy access to the facilities such as the clinic, library, shops, G.P surgeries, etc. within walking distance. There are empty buildings in the town centre that could be used. The proposal to re-locate a clinic and G.P surgeries to the other side of town across a major road is nonsensical and impractical. The B1012 as shown on the plan would cause the town to be split in two. It should be diverted to the north of any development in order to make any new development a cohesive part of the existing town. There would need to be some dualling of the A132 to ease traffic. Proposed sites for travellers: These sites will not be welcomed by existing residents and consideration should be given for these to be removed from the plan altogether. More houses are needed in South Woodham Ferrers - will the development include enough social housing and will there be any help for first time buyers, particularly those who are long term existing residents?
1.3	PS990	1096556	Mrs Joyce Bliss	No	No	No	•	•	•		No	Question whether the Plan is legally compliant if it does not take into consideration views put forward. South Woodham Ferrers will be split in two from the new development. Increased traffic and congestion on Burnham Road Increased pressure on local services. Impact on flooding. The percentage of affordable housing should be greater than market housing so infrastructure can be provided,
1.4	PS220	1154250	Mr Ben Jenkins	No	No	No			•		No	
1.5	PS199	1093143	Mr David Pepper	No								The approach to "Infrastructure led growth sites" (eg North East Chelmsford) is not carried through to the towns and villages which are therefore disadvantaged by Council choice
1.6	PS13	1151479	Mrs Elinor Dew		No		•					Concerned about traffic especially at peak time to South Woodham Ferrers. The Rettendon Roundabout is hazardous.
1.6	PS920	1156794	Mrs Janice Adams			No			•		No	Not enough consultation with local residents as to how the roads , rail and infrastructure will cope with the increase of residents already living in South Woodham Ferrers
1.6	PS939	1153202	Mrs Sharon Gooch	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	No	Object to the Baddow Road Bus Gate and the impact it will have on Baddow Road residents.
1.6	PS1021	1155270	Mrs Lyndall Collins	No	No	No						Document is not written in a way that ordinary residents of Chelmsford can comment as it is written in language intended for folk with technical knowledge and expertise. It is not a public consultation as simply concerns can not be raised. Do not consider that communication is in a way that allows for free comment. Write it in plain English and allow the public to write their comments instead of answering the questions.
1.7	PS709	964813	Mr Geoffrey Woricker	No	Yes	No	•				No	A condition of allowing the building of South Woodham Ferrers was that we had a guarantee from Essex County Council, minuted and stored at Essex Record Office, to say that there would be NO future building North of the B1012 Burnham Road. This proposal should be removed from the plan. The River Crouch is at full capacity now. All surface water will drain into Fenn Creek and then to the River Crouch. Traffic on the B1418, which cannot be widened and has other problems, will be adversely affected.
1.7	PS746	963136	Mrs Sarah Clark		No	No		•	•	•	Yes	The plan is not compliant with the 2012 regulations since housing is proposed near roads at full capacity (B1008) when there are more sustainable solutions available. The plan does not have a positive strategy to promote energy from renewable and low carbon sources. This breaches the NPPF paras 93-108. With regards the SA appraisal, there is no option that is alternative pro-growth, hence the plan is not legally compliant. it is unclear whether meaningful collaboration has taken place with neighbouring councils. The proposals are not compliant with para 14 of the NPPF. The SA use inaccurate population data for Broomfield. Chelmsford's woodland cover (6%) is insufficient to mitigate green house gas emissions

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
1.7	PS2045	312318	Cogent Land	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	These representations, and the previous consultation responses that underpin them, confirm that the land south west of The Lion Inn should be considered one of these most sustainable and deliverable sites to accommodate the future growth needs of the City. They also outline the sustainability of the site as well as the importance of an evidence base in preparing a sound plan.
1.8	PS203	1093143	Mr David Pepper			No	•					Strategic Assessments for SWF saying roads are not heavily congested is not true.
1.8	PS317	1095168	Mrs Heather Frost	No	No	No	•	•	•		No	Comments made at consultation meetings have clearly not been given sufficient weight. Local infrastructure including roads, rail, health facilities and educational needs are inadequate. Roads are at capacity, waiting times for GP appointments is unacceptable. Concern for detrimental affect on education, flood risk. SWF will not be well connected.
1.8	PS757	963136	Mrs Sarah Clark	No		No		•	•	•	Yes	The Council is trading off the environment for economic growth. This is indicated by the absence of clear targets and expectations on renewable energy and zero carbon building in the appendix document 'Developers Guide' and contrary to paras 1.30-1.34 in the NCAAP. The plan also fails to provide a climate change action plan and mitigation policy in line with the Paris Agreement and Sustainable Development Goals.
1.8	PS935	1156825	Mrs Kathy Everett									Object to the development of 800 properties on Warren Farm. Will increase pollution, traffic and congestion on roads within the area. Do not accept CCC's statement that the majority of the new development will use bikes or walk. Will place further pressure on all local facilities. Will increase existing flooding issues. Question whether proposed infrastructure will be delivered. Hammonds Farm is a better location.
1.12	PS331	962473	Mr Gail Aston			No	•	•	•		No	Strongly oppose development on Site 2. It is not well thought out and the evidence is spurious. The A1060 is already congested and causing major traffic issues at Lordship road and in Writtle. People will not walk or cycle.
1.12	PS758	963136	Mrs Sarah Clark	No			•		•	•	Yes	Full public participation not possible since the search function didn't work for certain words. This contravenes The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. Screen shot attached of a failed search from the Council's Evidence base page.
1.17	PS1199	1097080	Ms Shyy Sachdev	Yes	Yes	No		•	•		Yes	The Draft Local Plan fails to identify sufficient small sites for development in accordance with NPPF changes and is not justified or effective as it has a strategy that has an over-reliance on larger site. The Green Wedges and Green Corridors Review Report is unsound as it was not subject to public consultation to test changes to boundaries. Land at Rembrandt House, Broomfield does not perform the functions of the Green Wedge and should be removed and allocated for development. Including it means the Plan is not justified or effective.
1.17	PS1200	1097080	Ms Shyy Sachdev	Yes	Yes	No		•	•		Yes	The Draft Local Plan fails to identify sufficient small sites for development in accordance with NPPF changes and is not justified or effective as it has a strategy that has an over-reliance on larger site. The Green Wedges and Green Corridors Review Report is unsound as it was not subject to public consultation to test changes to boundaries. Land at Rembrandt House, Broomfield does not perform the functions of the Green Wedge and should be removed and allocated for development. Including it means the Plan is not justified or effective.
1.17	PS1201	1097080	Ms Shyy Sachdev	Yes	Yes	No		•	•		Yes	The Draft Local Plan fails to identify sufficient small sites for development in accordance with NPPF changes and is not justified or effective as it has a strategy that has an over-reliance on larger site. The Green Wedges and Green Corridors Review Report is unsound as it was not subject to public consultation to test changes to boundaries. Land at Rembrandt House, Broomfield does not perform the functions of the Green Wedge and should be removed and allocated for development. Including it means the Plan is not justified or effective.
1.17	PS1196	1097080	Ms Shyy Sachdev	Yes	Yes	No		•	•		Yes	The Draft Local Plan fails to identify sufficient small sites for development in accordance with NPPF changes and is not justified or effective as it has a strategy that has an over-reliance on larger site. The Green Wedges and Green Corridors Review Report is unsound as it was not subject to public consultation to test changes to boundaries. Land at Rembrandt House, Broomfield does not perform the functions of the Green Wedge and should be removed and allocated for development. Including it means the Plan is not justified or effective.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
1.18	PS1064	965747	Ms Angela Thomson	No	Yes	No		•				Government changes in White Paper on could revise the number of housing to be built upwards. Infrastructure is nearly at capacity now before all the sites planned until 2021 have been built. New railway station and north-east by-pass are not likely to be built in the next plan period. Incentives are needed to get people not to use their cars. How about totally free buses? Most of the proposed greenfield sites are on good Grade 2 & 3 farmland despite there being poorer Grade 4 & 5 land to the east of the city in Boreham/Little Baddow/Danbury area. Some sites were brought forward but rejected such as Hammonds Farm.
1.18	PS1814	1160052	North West Parishes Group	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•		Yes	LP should make clear its plans to accommodate the revised level of housing growth as per the change in which housing needs are calculated. This should include the identification of additional, suitable sites to accommodate this increased level of growth in the most sustainable manner. Consider Hammonds Farm
1.23	PS901	1156765	Epping Forest District Council									EFDC welcome the work undertaken to meet the identified needs in the area through a varied portfolio of site allocations and the role of Chelmsford as the 'Capital of Essex'. Joint work via the West Essex and East Herts Cooperation for Sustainable Development Board has been, and continues to be valuable in understanding cross boundary strategic matters. This Council has no concerns regarding the soundness of the plan. EFDC congratulate CCC on reaching this stage and wish all the best for moving forward to submission of the LP
1.23	PS913	812406	Colchester Borough Council	Yes	Yes	Yes						Colchester Borough Council considers the Chelmsford Local Plan to be legally compliant, sound and compliant with the Duty to Co-operate.
1.23	PS962	311148	Essex County Council	Yes	Yes	Yes					No	Considers Plan is sound, legally compliant in respect to Duty to Co-operate.
1.23	PS1097	973857	Persimmon Homes Essex	Yes	No	Yes					Yes	We share the HBF's concerns that the outcomes of co-operation on delivering needs across HMAs are not sufficiently reflected in the plan. We agree that Policy S8 should contain a positive statement with regards to reviewing the plan should neighbouring authorities be unable to meet their housing needs and require assistance. See also attachment which contains all the representations from this consultee.
1.23	PS1656	1159875	Home Builders Federation			No					Yes	Legal aspects of the duty to co-operate have been achieved. Suggest that the Council include a clause within policy S8 to provide for a more effective mechanism for co-operation on unmet housing needs from neighbouring authorities. This would require the Council to review their local plan to allocate additional sites should any of its neighbouring authorities or HMAs be unable to meet housing needs having undertaken the process identified in the 'Unmet Housing Needs Protocol'.
1.23	PS1902	927695	Redrow Homes								Yes	No further/updated evidence presented in terms of the extent of collaboration undertaken with neighbouring authorities. S8 should provide further flexibility by allocating further land to meet OAN and by helping other authorities meet their needs. CCC should ensure that it continues proactively to explore options of accommodating potential for housing overspill through the whole Plan period to ensure that concerns on the Duty to Co-Operate do not arise
1.23	PS2046	312318	Cogent Land	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	The Council's housing need evidence continues to underestimate the resultant additional need arising from London. We strongly urge the Council, as a local authority with strategic links to London, to update its evidence base and plan for the proposed uplift in the delivery of housing in the most sustainable locations. The importance of this is reiterated as a result of the additional strategic infrastructure that the Council is planning for as part of the draft Plan to sustain additional train capacity on the regional network by the introduction of Boreham Interchange which is in close proximity to the Site.
1.23	PS2095	1155666	Stow Maries Parish Council	No								Concern about lack of consultation on earlier stages of Local Plan preparation. Consultation not in accordance with statutory process, therefore flawed and invalid, and not lawful. Parish Council unable to research and absorb previous consultations to allow meaningful response, in the time frame available. CCC and Maldon District Council have failed to seek a view at any stage of consultation. Also refers to earlier letter (see attachment).
1.24	PS584	1096002	Basildon Borough Council									Basildon Borough Council therefore, have no concerns that Chelmsford City has failed in its Duty to Cooperate obligations. Basildon Borough Council will continue to work with Chelmsford City Council, and do not raise objections under Duty to Cooperate given there are no legal grounds.
1.24	PS1039	1095466	Dr Simon Heffer	Yes	No	No			•		No	Traffic Congestion on existing network include Great Leighs bypass, A131 and Essex Regiment Way from traffic coming into Chelmsford. Inadequate infrastructure. Invest in infrastructure.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
1.24	PS1613	1159743	Gladman Developments Ltd	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	LPA's within the HMA need to continue to work together. Chelmsford should also engage with the GLA to address the wider housing needs.
1.25	PS1337	1102437	The Russell Family	Yes	Yes	No			•		Yes	A Green Belt Review should have been undertaken
1.26	PS1339	1102437	The Russell Family	Yes	Yes	No			•		Yes	A Green Belt Review should have been undertaken.
1.27	PS1340	1102437	The Russell Family	Yes	Yes	No			•		Yes	A Green Belt Review should have been undertaken.
1.28	PS1341	1102437	The Russell Family	Yes	Yes	No			•		Yes	A Green Belt Review should have been undertaken.
1.29	PS1342	1102437	The Russell Family	Yes	Yes	No			•		Yes	A Green Belt Review should have been undertaken.
1.30	PS1343	1102437	The Russell Family	Yes	Yes	No			•		Yes	A Green Belt Review should have been undertaken.
1.31	PS1344	1102437	The Russell Family	Yes	Yes	No			•		Yes	A Green Belt Review should have been undertaken.
1.32	PS1345	1102437	The Russell Family	Yes	Yes	No			•		Yes	A Green Belt Review should have been undertaken.
1.33	PS1346	1102437	The Russell Family	Yes	Yes	No			•		Yes	A Green Belt Review should have been undertaken.
1.34	PS1347	1102437	The Russell Family	Yes	Yes	No			•		Yes	A Green Belt Review should have been undertaken.
1.35	PS1348	1102437	The Russell Family	Yes	Yes	No			•		Yes	A Green Belt Review should have been undertaken.
1.36	PS988	311148	Essex County Council	Yes	Yes	Yes				•	No	Add definition of a 'Heath Impact Assessment' (attached) in the glossary.
1.36	PS1350	1102437	The Russell Family	Yes	Yes	No			•		Yes	A Green Belt Review should have been undertaken.
1.37	PS1351	1102437	The Russell Family	Yes	Yes	No			•		Yes	A Green Belt Review should have been undertaken.
1.38	PS1352	1102437	The Russell Family	Yes	Yes	No			•		Yes	A Green Belt Review should have been undertaken.
1.38	PS1815	1160052	North West Parishes Group									CCC's stance in regard to NP's is welcomed. To be effective, the policy should specify that housing numbers for Local Plans would be identified by the Local Planning Authority and provided to the Parish Council or Neighbourhood Group, for their inclusion in the Neighbourhood Plan. Provision should be made for Parishes or Neighbourhood Groups to consider the detail of boundaries of the Green Wedges and Green Corridors
1.39	PS1360	1102437	The Russell Family	Yes	Yes	No			•		Yes	A Green Belt Review should have been undertaken.
1.40	PS477	1155000	Mrs Claire Thorogood									The Consultation Portal has proved extremely hard to navigate for those people even with computer literacy. This has had a bearing on the number of comments submitted in the short consultation period.
1.40	PS588	1075760	Miss Emma Williams	No	No	No		•	•		No	The document is extremely difficult to comment on and has not been publicised well. Simple documents are needed. The plan hasn't taken into account or listened to any of the concerns previously raised.
1.40	PS896	1483	Runwell Parish Council	Yes	Yes	Yes					No	The consultation portal has made it hard for people to make comments.
1.40	PS1124	968043	Mr Derek T Park									Cynical about the whole process. Many Governments and Politicians come and go, both centrally and locally. Public Inquiries, Commissions and Consultations have been instigated, findings are often ignored, shelved or watered down, invariably adding bureaucracy. Unconvinced that much or any notice is taken of views expressed by the public. If ECC and all Essex BC's had banded together, in conjunction with Government and planned the creation of one or two more New Towns within Essex (likened to Harlow or Woodham Ferrers) on a mixed development basis, the need to significantly update Local Plans save for the consideration of further limited development on brown field or infill sites, would be alleviated, without constant unreasonable disturbance of the Villages.
1.41	PS1804	1160014	Historic England	Yes	Yes							In preparation of the forthcoming local plan, we encourage you to draw on the knowledge of local conservation officers, the county archaeologist and local heritage groups. Please note that absence of a comment on an allocation or document in this letter does not mean that Historic England is content that the allocation or document forms part of a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment or is devoid of historic environment issues. Where there are various options proposed for a settlement, identification of heritage issues for a particular allocation does not automatically correspond to the support for inclusion of the alternative sites. This opinion is based on the information provided by the Council in its consultation. To avoid any doubt, this does not affect our obligation to provide further advice and, potentially, object to specific proposals, which may subsequently arise where we consider that these would have an adverse effect upon the historic environment.
1.41	PS2044	312318	Cogent Land	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	Lists the duties of Local Plans as outlined in the NPPF. Do not consider that the strategy and policies of the plan comply with the above requirements and the draft Local Plan is incapable of being found sound.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
Question 1	PS31	963123	Mr Michael Townley	No								Existing traffic and road conditions have not been taking into consideration nor have alternative sites been considered.
Question 1	PS193	1153528	Mr Stephen Buck	No	No	No	•	•	•		No	Concern for road infrastructure, congestion, emergency service provision, roads not fit for travelling sites' HGV's. Suggest improvements to train service and station, bus provision. Want to see the studies that have been carried out.
Question 1	PS321	1074844	Mr Brian Camplin	Yes		No	•		•		No	Not enough consideration has been given to the flow of traffic from SWF to the Rettendon Turnpike and from the Rettendon Turnpike to the A12, A127 and A13 - consider a more detailed traffic survey. Concern for traffic, schools, flood risk, pedestrian crossings
Question 1	PS699	952863	Mrs Christine Weir-Ewing	Yes	Yes	No				•	No	The proposal does not meet infrastructure and housing requirements of the NPPF. Very little infrastructure improvements are proposed. South Woodham Ferrers is in desperate need of smaller properties, paragraph 7.329 should be re-worded to require this. Public transport services are very poor. How will the town centre be revitalised when it is owned and controlled by one major retailer? There are already flooding issues in much of South Woodham Ferrers.
Question 1	PS689	1097047	Mrs Susan Parrotte	Yes		No	•	•	•		No	Traffic congestion is already high, the access road will add significantly to the problem. Increased vehicle access through Writtle will put children at risk who currently walk and cycle to school. It will not be safe to walk to Writtle. Inadequate local infrastructure. There are limited public transport options and it is too far to walk to the city centre. Concern about flooding.
Question 1	PS755	1156616	Mrs C Munday	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	No comments made
Question 1	PS1045	872955	Hammonds Estates LLP	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	This representation covers all attachments submitted by Hammonds Estates LLP, please see individual representations each main issue.
Question 1	PS953	1074834	Mrs Sarah Crane	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•	•	No	Existing residents have clearly not been taken into account in the proposal for the development North of our Town. We will be left with a divided town, clearly limiting access to some residents. At present it can take 10/15 mins to leave South Woodham Ferrers at 7.30am, with the proposed development here and current and future development on the Dengie Peninsular, the commute to work for South Woodham Ferrers residents is only going to get lengthier. How the infrastructure improvements are going to be funded is also not clearly indicated and if improvements are only made once the development is in place, this will be severely detrimental to both existing and new residents of South Woodham Ferrers. This plan is currently not deliverable and will lead to significant issues of sustainability for South Woodham Ferrers. In conclusion this proposal will not improve the conditions in which people live, work, travel and take leisure and may lead to the loss of biodiversity and is therefore in direct contravention of the National Planning Policy Framework.
Question 1	PS1010	1156915	Ms Roberta Hindman	Yes		No	•	•	•		No	Stress on overloaded schools. Congestion on the roads. No possibility of improving the rail service. GP surgeries are already sinking under the weight of patients without adding thousands more. South Woodham will no longer be a friendly semi rural place to live.
Question 1	PS1179	972034	Mrs Moya Cawood			No	•	•	•	•		Site 2 does not meet objectively assessed development, infrastructure requirements, and is not consistent with achieving sustainable development. Plan is not deliverable and not based on effective joint working - the views of Writtle (and Broomfield) parish councils and residents have not been fully taken into account. Strain on infrastructure and services: Traffic Congestion on Roxwell Road, Chignall Road, Writtle Green, roads in Writtle. Warren Farm and Reeds farm business areas will generate further traffic which adds to the congestion. Unlikely that the limited public transport available will improve. Walking is not a likely option for most people and cycling would be dangerous due to amount of traffic. Pollution will increase posing a danger to health. Doctors surgery already under pressure - how can they accommodate a further 800 families. Plan is not the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives, Hammonds Farm is more suitable located on East of Chelmsford near the existing road infrastructure. Landscape will be altered and Writtle will no longer be separate from Chelmsford losing much of its unique character. Site is on prime agricultural land. Run off from the development could add to the flooding in the area. Chelmsford needs more affordable housing.
Question 3	PS476	1155000	Mrs Claire Thorogood		No	No	•	•	•			In regard to SWF being infrastructure led, plan is not positively prepared, justified or effective.
Question 3	PS662	1076009	Mrs Sharon Robinsonbobby			No	•	•	•			Object to more large four and five bedroom houses which the younger generation cannot afford. Affordable housing is needed. The station is at capacity already and the roads around the new development would need to be expanded.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
Question 3	PS680	830229	Mrs Helen Sadler									LP is not justified as there are inequalities in the methodology and evidence base that serves to divide new and existing residents and favour the new allocations/major developers. LP has not been positively planned and is against local policies and those within the NPPF. As such, the local plan is unsound
Question 3	PS711	1156531	Mr Robert Allighan	No	No	No	•	•	•	•		I seriously doubt the traffic assumptions. The A1060 is not equipped with streetlights and is already subject to serious peak time congestion. Flow is measured as Volume / Capacity Ratio with 100% plus being high levels of congestion and journey time delay. Peak traffic along Chignal Road, Roxwell Road, Lordship Road and through the Green will be up to 100%. More than one access point is required. Most amenities falls outside a 25 min walk and Roxwell Road is unlikely to be desirable for walking. This road currently has no crossing facilities for pedestrians/ cyclists. Bus services are already very limited. A number of non transport issues have not been properly considered. Site 3b is a far more preferable and more sustainable location.
Question 3	PS688	1096989	Mr Richard Bridge			No			•		No	The present infrastructure will not be able to cope with the proposed expansion and will cause major traffic problems for South Woodham Ferrers and the Dengie Hundred. Strategic Growth Site 4 is infrastructure led, the same approach should be taken to this site.
Question 3	PS748	1097188	Mrs Faith Marchal			No	•	•	•			I consider the local plan not effective because it fails to include the Hammonds Farm site as a possible development area east of the A12 Bypass, and north of Maldon Road. Most of the existing substantial road and rail infrastructure of Chelmsford is concentrated to the east of Chelmsford, with a proposed new rail station near Beaulieu Park. It makes better economic and environmental sense to situate the bulk of Chelmsford's future housing and business development as closely as possible to existing and planned main transport links, namely, the A12 bypass and the new rail station. Concern about traffic in Broomfield's historic village centre, bisected by Main Road, particularly about access for ambulances and other emergency vehicles coming to and from Broomfield Hospital from Chelmsford city centre and from miles around, and it is already painfully slow during peak work / school hours. Further housing development to the north and west of Chelmsford would simply add to existing traffic congestion, not helped by the 'bolt-on to existing settlement areas' approach that this plan seems to favour.
Question 3	PS749	1096547	Mr Kenneth Canfield									Concern about road infrastructure. Writtle is already highly congested with the roads being a cut through to bypass Chelmsford. I don't believe that the Council has done a consultation concerning the present traffic situation. We often miss a bus because it is impossible to cross the road due to the volume of traffic. To add another 800 houses with at least 1 - 2 cars I believe could bring the area to a standstill at peak times. The idea that people are going to walk into Chelmsford in all weathers and carrying work / documents and shopping from Chelmsford to home etc. is quite unimaginable. Also there has been no mention of bus services.
Question 3	PS1046	872955	Hammonds Estates LLP	No		No	•	•	•	•	Yes	This representation covers all attachments submitted by Hammonds Estates LLP, please see individual representations each main issue.
Question 3	PS1145	961741	Mrs Sarah Mills			No	•	•	•			Chelmsford can not cope with this scale of house building. We do not have good transport links, schools, and the town's social problems are getting worse.
Question 3	PS1243	1157186	Mrs Christine Matthews	No					•			Increase in traffic on Writtle/Roxwell Road/Lordship Road and Chignal Road. Doctors and schools are already full. Road improvement schemes must be funded by planning obligations Chelmsford City Council and the Highways Panel must work together with Writtle and Chignal Parishes to resolve congestion and pedestrian safety issues in Writtle and the surrounding areas. Attention needs to be paid to infrastructure, traffic management and pollution.
Question 3	PS1299	1097295	Rebecca Matthews						•			I do not feel this plan provides effective solutions to the problems of pressure on local traffic and transport service. Congestion at peak times in Writtle Rd/Roxwell Rod/Lordship Road and Chignal Road areas is already at breaking point - it requires alleviating not adding to. Travel into town centre and railway station will be made much worse. Services such as the Doctors Surgery and local primary schools are also operating a full capacity. Strategic road improvement schemes must be funded by planning obligations. Chelmsford City Council and the Highways Panel must work together with Writtle and Chignal parishes to resolve the inevitable congestion and pedestrian safety issues in Writtle and the surrounding areas. Safe crossing facilities across the A1060 for cyclists and pedestrians must be included. More attention must be paid to infrastructure, traffic management and people and public health and pollution concerns.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
Question 3	PS1584	1074334	Mrs Mary Dove									Traffic concerns with increase of people travelling to Broomfield School and the station. Alternative site at Hammonds Farm - infrastructure (A12) already in place, better to have a big build in one place rather than causing congestion in Chelmsford where there is no infrastructure and no space for improvement.
Question 3	PS1801	1160014	Historic England	Yes	Yes	No						Not all of the changes suggested go to the heart of the Plan's soundness, but instead are intended to improve upon it. Specific comments on S11 and SGS 4. See summaries of reps on these consultation points for detail.
Question 3	PS2052	1098405	The North East Chelmsford Garden Village Consortium	Yes	Yes	Yes					Yes	See reps on Chapters 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, Appendix C, Appendix D, and Policies Map. Also attachments: Revised and Updated Masterplan and the Memorandum of Understanding on Transport Matters. The Consortium supports the City Council's approach for planning Chelmsford's growth up to 2036 and the identification of North East Chelmsford as a Strategic Growth Site as an allocation for a proposed Garden Village. The Consortium intends to bring forward a development which demonstrates that Chelmsford's growth can be accommodated on this Strategic Growth Site in a highly sustainable way, building on the success of the Beaulieu and Channel developments, supported by the necessary transportation and community infrastructure to support the development. To that end, the Consortium will continue to work in partnership with the City Council and other stakeholders in taking forward the proposals for the North East Chelmsford Garden Village. The Representations set out suggestions and comments to assist the City Council in making the Local Plan more robust and improving its soundness in terms of being positively prepared, effect, justified and consistent with national policy. They provide more information on the Consortium's proposals, the phasing and delivery of the proposed Garden Village, including housing, education, green infrastructure and transport, and illustrate how the emerging work will conform with the key principles of the Draft Plan in the updated masterplan with the representations.
1.43	PS898	1483	Runwell Parish Council	Yes	Yes	Yes					No	The consultation portal has made it hard for people to make comments.
2.1	PS827	1156704	South Woodham Ferrers Town Council	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•	•		The Town Council's concerns are for the sustainability of South Woodham Ferrers if the Strategic Growth Site 7 is proceeded with. Even the minimum of infrastructure requirements for the town and urban area will require funding that far exceeds that which can be generated from the new development. Many instances in the PS Local Plan have been found where it fails to meet the requirements of the NPPF including para 7, 9, 99, 100, 102, 103, 118, 132 and 173 of the NPPF, therefore we content that a Local Plan which is non-compliant with the requirements for it to be viable and deliverable is not sustainable and therefore not "sound".
2.3	PS910	1155273	Leon Lallyette			No		•				Concern that houses are not being well utilised and are under occupied and more smaller homes should be built. Concern at the number of people moving out of London. Growth should be encouraged in other parts of the Country by providing more jobs away from London.
2.8	PS923	1155273	Leon Lallyette						•			Concern over the impact growth will have on the road network. Public transport is not a reasonable alternative.
2.9	PS558	961749	Mr Keith Francis									Past/Current Completion figures highlight a serious problem for Delivery in the Plan Significant factors apply here not least the post 2008 recession and Brexit uncertainties. It would appear unrealistic for the Plan to achieve the numbers required as there continues to be a serious problem in meeting the actual needs, particularly in both the Affordable Rent and Affordable to- Buy elements.
2.11	PS924	1155273	Leon Lallyette						•			Roads should be improved before more homes are built. More need to be done to ensure jobs come forward where there are already issues with transport infrastructure.
Table 1: North and Mid Essex HMA - Objectively-Assessed Housing and Jobs Numbers 2013-2036	PS674	970996	Highways England									Support of the local plan. Support table 1 and accompanying text detailing how employment floor space will be allocated to ensure there is a sustainable balance between jobs and available labour force. LP will also assist in creation of new jobs and inward investment. See also PS675, PS676, PS677, PS678
2.14	PS1530	976647	Tendring District Council									We are pleased to see that at paragraph 2.14 the City Council refers to the joint strategic Part One Local Plan and wishes to include elements of this within their own objectives. At paragraph 2.43 we also welcome reference to a longer term strategic vision up to 2050. This broadly runs in line with the timescales of the North Essex Garden Communities.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
2.15	PS559	961749	Mr Keith Francis									Major challenges exist on funding that could be insurmountable, affecting the credibility of the Plan. IDP doomed to fail (lack of grasp of the scale of task) and no realistic prospect of the necessary funding being realised.
2.15	PS675	970996	Highways England									Provision of a number of strategic residential and employment locations in or close to the town centre could help to encourage sustainable travel and reduce the pressure on the highway network, which is welcomed. In particular, development located in close proximity to Rail Stations is welcomed as it could encourage long distance trips to shift away from private car use.
2.15	PS784	961966	Mr Alan Brunning	No		No	•					Recognises the historical lack of lack of infrastructure development and infers this will be addressed in the plan. The reality is that for area 7 no significant or meaningful action is planned. The only changes are both infeasible and ineffective. No evidence that the claims in 2.16 will be met. There will not be a plan for the whole development led and funded by CCC. It seems that this will be left to be implemented piecemeal by the developers. This is not a sustainable development
2.15	PS925	1155273	Leon Lallyette			No			•			Section 2.15 concedes this but does not offer any plan or solution for it.
2.16	PS560	961749	Mr Keith Francis									a) failure to identify necessary total funding streams b) not being addressed at this stage, new development will exacerbate current deficiencies etc c) how does ambition alone deliver sustainable new communities?
2.16	PS1883	1101348	Education & Skills Funding Agency									The ESFA strongly supports the strategic objective to address education and healthcare needs.
2.17	PS561	961749	Mr Keith Francis									The NGC at Beaulieu/NE Chelmsford will aggravate existing highway network capacity problems, producing unbearable congestion/environmental consequences in the area and beyond.
2.22	PS562	961749	Mr Keith Francis									The high level of vehicle movements has also created serious problems in residential areas that are not able to absorb the extraneous traffic caused by the distributor and major road network suffering serious capacity deficiencies.
2.22	PS911	1483	Runwell Parish Council	Yes	Yes	No			•		No	Concern over traffic impacts in the south, especially from site 7. Lack of consideration for cross boundary impacts from traffic.
2.23	PS563	961749	Mr Keith Francis									This is despite the unrecorded but significant relief already afforded by traffic flows on countless and undesirable routes through residential areas, causing widespread problems here also.
2.23	PS597	1155000	Mrs Claire Thorogood	No	No	No	•	•	•			The proposed dwellings will produce greater traffic flows in to Maldon District as well as along the A132. There is peak hour congestion already at junctions to the B1012 and near the train station nearing capacity. I do not think Chelmsford has not fully considered the potential impact on the wider highway network as a result of growth in South Woodham Ferrers, Maldon and parishes within the Dengie. The capability in this particular part of the rail network will always be limited by the nature of the single Southminster branch line and the capacity on the main line leading to Liverpool Street Station.
2.24	PS564	961749	Mr Keith Francis									Chelmsford does not have good connections with local regional airports. They involve indirect links with problem time/convenience/cost implications. Good connections would only be possible via direct links for which costs, for either improved road or rail access, have not been ascertained and/ or have been discounted on viability grounds and consequently not accounted for within the Plan processes.
2.24	PS963	311148	Essex County Council	Yes	Yes	Yes			•		No	Add details of urban and inter urban bus networks to paragraph 2.24.
2.28	PS1734	1160014	Historic England	Yes	Yes							It is advised that this section also makes reference to Heritage at Risk (HAR). There are only two entries on the 2017 HAR register for Chelmsford, these are the Grade II* listed Church of St Michael, Roxwell and the West End Conservation Area.
2.28	PS1737	1160014	Historic England	Yes	Yes							Paragraph 2.28 refers to historic park gardens however the correct term is Registered Park and Garden, it is advised that the wording is amended accordingly.
2.34	PS1736	1160014	Historic England	Yes	Yes							Paragraphs 2.34 – 2.37 outline the evolution of the settlement of Chelmsford from its Roman origins to the current day. This helps outline the locally specific and unique aspects of Chelmsford's history which contribute to character.
2.37	PS565	961749	Mr Keith Francis									The omission of vital new infrastructure ie appropriate highway, railway and road-based public transport improvements referred to in this overall submission, weaken the Plan. Their inclusion should be a pre-requisite for the Plan. Their absence undermines its sustainability.
2.39	PS566	961749	Mr Keith Francis									To reinforce my argument in 2.37 (PS565), the Council's determination for sustainability, critically depends on the necessary transport infrastructure for which, currently, there is no realistic delivery assured within the Plan.



Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
2.41	PS1914	1097127	Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd			Yes						The Council's commitment to plan for the longer term is fully supported. Welcome the Council's intentions to plan for the long-term increases insofar as it provides certainty which will in turn help to deliver a strategic framework to maximise the potential for infrastructure funding.
2.43	PS567	961749	Mr Keith Francis									Various suggestions on infrastructure is not enough for the here-and-now.
3.1	PS5	310830	Mr Stephen Parker	Yes	Yes	No			•		No	The Capital of Essex priority is irrelevant whereas there is no strategic priority directly associated with meeting the needs of an ageing population in respect of housing, health care, public transport etc.
3.1	PS514	1096179	Little Baddow Parish Council	Yes		Yes						The spatial strategy focuses development in sustainable locations where infrastructure exists or will be created. This avoids unnecessary pressure on transport and other infrastructure. LBPC strongly supports this approach. The decision to discount development east of the A12 between Junctions 18 and 19 is soundly based, leaving the A12 as a natural eastern boundary to Chelmsford avoiding urban sprawl into green wedges and corridors, and minimising pressure on these 2 junctions already subject to frequent congestion and vulnerable to more with the development of the CNEB, the continuing development in North Chelmsford, and the proposed new rail station.
3.1	PS785	961966	Mr Alan Brunning	No		No		•				SWF development will lead to 2 town centres splitting the customers base and the result is one or both will prove uneconomic for small / medium sized retail units that add character to a town centre. This will not be attractive and visitors will not be encouraged to stop rather travelling on to Basildon or Chelmsford. Note the success of Bond Street in Chelmsford (quoted 3.36) bringing a vibrant place for the community. This is not a sustainable development
3.1	PS780	956304	Mr Martin Perry									There will only be a minimal number of affordable homes hence it won't address the housing crisis. Inadequate road infrastructure proposed. Burnham Road will be very dangerous to cross. Unless the pylons are moved, the power lines could pose health risks. Several areas of South Woodham Ferrers are already prone to flooding, the proposal will make this worse. Concern about impact on travellers on community.
3.1	PS992	1097182	Mr Graham Pitwood	No		No	•	•	•		No	Site 6 is located further than maximum 2km recommended by walking to facilities, no satisfactory infrastructure has been proposed. Broomfield primary school should not be considered as an option to educate the 450 allocation from site 6 (North Broomfield), which is 2.4km away and unrealistic for 4-6yr olds to walk, especially during the Autumn and Winter. Place the allocation next to a larger development to help finance and facilitate a primary school and other facilities. 7.29 states; "Efforts should be made to provide safe and direct walking and cycling routes ..." This is unsatisfactory - does this mean there is no compulsion to provide such routes? If not it will not happen. Local Plan now assumes this is achievable but fails to indicate how. If a direct cycle route from site 6 to the city centre is not provided, Site 6 should not be made available for development. Great Waltham to City Centre cycle route is a welcome addition as a leisure route (it is unfit in places and crosses over remote farmland) – but not viable transport for a commuter. There is no room for a bus lane on the B1008; so buses will enjoy the same speed and traffic as a car, without any added convenience. Chelmsford City Council should show that other modes of transport are effective before committing the B1008 and Main Road Broomfield to additional development and congestion, concern of impact on traffic to hospital. This is the best agricultural land Chelmsford has, developing it should be at the last resort, not as a first option. Make the A12 fit for purpose – usage will increase but much is only two lanes each way. These proposals create a bottleneck at Boreham, where the Chelmsford bypass starts and is intended to stay two lanes for 5.5 miles, which is the very place where the NE bypass will join the A12. Improve the Broomfield/Little Waltham Bypass - widen the A130 to dual carriageway, with a slip road left where the A130 meets A131 for traffic heading to the A12. The use of the B1008 should be restricted to local traffic and not increased by the development of Area 6. Build on areas near to the A12 Corridor - to cut commuters' journey time by building close to the most convenient road and put resources into making the A12 fit for purpose. Funding should be secured for the NE bypass before development at Great Leighs is considered. Don't rely on the New Beaulieu train station (promised in the 1990's). Hammonds Farm is close to the proposed new rail station at Beaulieu Park, with travel via the dual carriageway A12 and not along existing congested routes. Development of Hammonds Farm and Boreham Airfield could be planned and developed in a way that would minimise the effects on the existing residents of the city. Easy connections to the A12. Owners and developers promoting the areas for development have offered to fund the infrastructure costs up front. These sites are close to

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
3.1	PS1035	1097709	Mrs Vivienne Ruiz Calzada	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	No	Previous comments not taken forward. Not an infrastructure led proposal. Overcrowded trains with no proposed improvements. Increase in road traffic resulting in an unacceptable level of pollution affecting the health of residents. No major improvement to the B1012 Burnham Road proposed. Safety concerns with road crossing - issue with children not using the crossings. Loss of all emergency services and doctor surgeries. Unsupervised site for travelling show people – how to be managed. Impact on drainage and sewage and flooding.
3.1	PS1048	1156931	mrs joanne atkins	No	No	No	•					Traffic Congestion on A1060 and Chignal Road Junction Safety concerns on the A1060 Air Quality and health concerns due to stationary traffic Limited bus services Flooding on Lordship Road Area to the East is a better location
3.1	PS1287	1157108	Campden Hill Limited	Yes	Yes	Yes					No	Redevelop Five Tree Works, Bakers Lane for housing and employment. Development would promote wider environmental and landscape benefits. Significant growth and change has occurred in the wider area. Broadly support the nine Strategic Priorities.
3.1	PS1262	1157185	Bressole Ltd	Yes	Yes	Yes					Yes	Broadly support the nine Strategic Priorities which are consistent with the Government's Core Planning Principles in the NPPF.
3.1	PS1254	1157165	Rosehart Properties LTd	Yes	Yes	Yes					Yes	Andrew Martin – Planning Ltd (AM-P) for BAE Systems Advanced Technology Centre (the BAE site), off West Hanningfield Road, Great Baddow, Chelmsford. The BAE site extends to 15.5 hectares (ha) (plan attached). The northeast part of 4 ha, is located within the defined Urban Area and comprises an allocated Employment Area. The remainder is in the Metropolitan Green Belt. Support the Strategic Priorities below paragraph 3.1, which are consistent with the Government's Core Planning Principles as contained at paragraph 17 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).
3.1	PS1735	1160010	David Lloyd Leisure and Aquila Holdings			Yes						Support Strategic Priority 1, Strategic Priority 2, Strategic Priority 3, Strategic Priority 4, Strategic Priority 8
3.1	PS1904	927695	Redrow Homes								Yes	Support S1
3.1	PS2053	1098405	The North East Chelmsford Garden Village Consortium	Yes	Yes	Yes					Yes	The Consortium supports the City Council's approach for planning Chelmsford's growth up to 2036 and the identification of North East Chelmsford as a Strategic Growth Site as an allocation for a proposed Garden Village. The Consortium intends to bring forward a development which demonstrates that Chelmsford's growth can be accommodated on this Strategic Growth Site in a highly sustainable way, building on the success of the Beaulieu and Channel developments, supported by the necessary transportation and community infrastructure to support the development.
3.1	PS2047	312318	Cogent Land	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	Strategic priorities broadly supported, but suggest that the current strategy is not reflective of these priorities, and unclear how the Council has used them to determine draft allocations. Consultation document does not have a full audit trail of how proposed sites were selected.
3.2	PS568	961749	Mr Keith Francis									One of many critical needs is for 'starter homes', in all communities, large and small. Meeting this need goes some way to sustaining them ie natural growth for the next generation. This similarly applies to 'affordable rent and buy' categories of new housing supply. Currently, the delivery of each of these categories is regularly undermined by the real fragility of the Planning process as developer/Applicants challenge policy on the grounds of 'viability'.
3.2	PS1005	1096379	Mrs Jacqueline Birch	Yes	Yes	No	•			•	No	The Plan has not been positively prepared, not deliverable, nor is it viable financially – infrastructure delivery, funding gap of with no evidence of how this will be met. Site 7 is not infrastructure led. Traffic modelling shows that the roads are at/or near to capacity and there is little improvement planned to alleviate the problem. Railway Capacity has not been addressed. SSSIs, Ramsar Site and Green Belt plus 6 Grade 2 Listed buildings are located around the site. These have not been taken into account. The SA pointed out the detrimental effect this development would have on these sensitive sites. Proposed development contravenes the following policies contained within the plan itself. Strategic Policies S1, S3, S4, S5, S6, S11, S13 and NE1. It also contravenes the National Planning Policy Framework Policies 2, 7, 9, 99, 100, 102, 103, 118, 132, and 173.
3.2	PS1363	1102437	The Russell Family	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•		Yes	Support aspiration of Strategic Priority 1 but this has not been achieved due to lack of development to the south and west of Chelmsford in the Green Belt. The approach to the distribution of development is unsustainable. Green Belt Review should have been undertaken. Promoted land at Margaretting should be removed from the Green Belt.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
3.2	PS1614	1159743	Gladman Developments Ltd	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	Supportive of Strategic Priority 1
3.2	PS1817	1160052	North West Parishes Group									Sustainable development should balance improvements to economic, social and environmental matters. Environmental consequences of the plan are compromised by lack of green belt review. Development would be more suitable near the A12 corridor, the new rail station and new Crossrail station. LP should make provision for changes in the NPPF.
3.3	PS569	961749	Mr Keith Francis									The balance (against impacts) must not be used to cause harm or exacerbate problems in the name of 'exceptions to policy' or meeting needs that are borderline, in terms of sustainability. Sustainability Appraisals need to be able to pass robust testing procedures.
3.3	PS1367	1102437	The Russell Family	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•		Yes	Support aspiration of Strategic Priority 1 but this has not been achieved due to lack of development to the south and west of Chelmsford in the Green Belt. The approach to the distribution of development is unsustainable. Green Belt Review should have been undertaken. Promoted land at Margaretting should be removed from the Green Belt.
3.3	PS1607	312374	Granville Developments		Yes	No			•	•		Text does not adequately define or explain what is meant by sustainable development or sustainable patterns of development. Reliance on the NPPF and The Brandt Report definition is not sufficient in this key respect. Seek clear statement of definition of sustainable development and sustainable patterns of development and advocate that the policy should include the aim of making the Plan area as a whole more self-contained and self-sufficient - the same aim being adopted for all the individual settlements.
3.3	PS1907	927695	Redrow Homes								Yes	Development at SGS3 meets the strategic priority. The proposed development would form an appropriate extension to the urban area being readily accessible to public transport. A range of pedestrian and cycle routes would connect across the site and beyond and a local centre could be provided.
3.4	PS570	961749	Mr Keith Francis									This is a valid statement that must be addressed with provision to meet the needs, as stated. High rents are a pressing problem requiring some intervention through new or amended legislation or high order planning guidance. A 'fair rents' policy was abandoned some years ago but such is the current crisis situation the former policy should be revisited.
3.4	PS927	1155273	Leon Lallyette			No		•	•			The local plan should not seek to reduce house prices in Chelmsford simply by raising supply. A national plan is needed to ensure commercial and industrial growth is better balanced to Northern parts of the UK.
3.4	PS1113	1097139	Mr J Hart & Mr G Moss	Yes	Yes	Yes						Broadly supports Strategic Priorities 1 – 9 and in particular supports Strategic Priority 2. This recognises Chelmsford's high average house prices, rents and sustained high demand for housing, and now recognises the significant demand for affordable housing or starter homes for first time buyers or those on lower incomes.
3.4	PS1368	1102437	The Russell Family	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•		Yes	Given that main delivery of affordable housing is through s106, failing to allocate development in the Green Belt will mean no affordable housing is provided in these areas.
3.4	PS1615	1159743	Gladman Developments Ltd	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	Supportive of Strategic Priority 2
3.4	PS1818	1160052	North West Parishes Group									Support priority but there is weakness in the ability to achieve this. Plan should also identify further sites to account for revision to the calculation of housing needs.
3.5	PS1369	1102437	The Russell Family	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•		Yes	Given that main delivery of affordable housing is through s106, failing to allocate development in the Green Belt will mean no affordable housing is provided in these areas.
3.5	PS1612	1156299	Mr William D Phillips	No	No	No	•		•		No	Does not set out details of affordable housing or 55+ housing, nor take into account infrastructure issues in and around South Woodham Ferrers. Local residents comments and submissions in the South Woodham Ferrers area have been ignored.
3.5	PS1610	312374	Granville Developments		Yes	No			•	•	Yes	There is a need to refer to the provision of all types of housing throughout the Plan area. This involves a recognition that over-concentration of homes within the urban areas and under-provision within the rural areas must be avoided. The role of new housing in underpinning the retention, improvement and delivery of new community facilities should be recognised at this point.
3.5	PS1913	927695	Redrow Homes								Yes	Buffer should be increased to 20% and factor in changes to government policy.
3.6	PS1616	1159743	Gladman Developments Ltd	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	Supportive of Strategic Priority 3

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
3.6	PS1606	312374	Granville Developments		Yes	No			•	•	Yes	The employment proposals are not based on any clear strategy. LP to establish whether it sees the future of Chelmsford as more or less reliant on employment sources outside the Plan area. Advocate that a strategic priority should be to not only provide local jobs for future residents but also to turn the tide by reducing the need for out-commuting in numerical as well as relative terms. Reducing the need to travel to work must be a major contributor to the achievement of sustainable development
3.6	PS1916	927695	Redrow Homes								Yes	Support priority. Flexibility should be provided in SGS3b for other uses such as Sui Generis.
3.7	PS571	961749	Mr Keith Francis									Affordability in housing is a key issue for employment within the local economy and as suggested, adequate and appropriate housing supply needs must be met.
3.10	PS515	664147	Sport England	Yes	Yes	Yes						Strategic priority 4 is supported as it aims to support and enhance leisure facilities as well as protecting existing assets.
3.10	PS1443	1156704	South Woodham Ferrers Town Council	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•	•		There is no evidence provided to substantiate the statements in para 3.10 and 4.2 about South Woodham Ferrers town centre or the proposed enhancement of this and other Neighbourhood areas. There is also no evidence provided on how the current lack of parking provision will be addressed. This contravenes NPPF, Section 2 Enhancing the Vitality of Town Centres.
3.10	PS1917	927695	Redrow Homes								Yes	Support priority
3.10	PS1978	669941	Lloyds Bank SF Nominees Ltd	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	Retail parks, such as Chelmer Valley Retail Park, are most appropriate locations to meet the identified retail needs that cannot be met at town centre and edge of centre sites. Definition of Accessible Locations should be added to the Glossary
3.13	PS6	310830	Mr Stephen Parker	Yes	Yes	No			•		No	If the Council has influence on broadband supply, focus it on upgrading the homes in the rural area with sub 10 mbps, specify number of homes with less and provide a time table of how this deficiency will be addressed.
3.13	PS1819	1160052	North West Parishes Group									This is vital. Plan needs to be realistic as to how likely change chosen mode of transport is - they use traffic report to support this argument. Significant need for infrastructure in a timely manner.
3.14	PS572	961749	Mr Keith Francis									Promoting change of behaviour including the provision of choice is key. But, encouragement through campaigns has not delivered the necessary results. The paramount example of improving 'the means' is bus travel, especially at the present time when passenger numbers are in decline. The Inspector, might incorporate the consideration of such a proposal for change in his/her findings/recommendations?
3.14	PS786	961966	Mr Alan Brunning	No		No		•				Acknowledged that the current roads are close to capacity and need updates. No realistic plan for area 7 SWF shows this will be improved.
3.14	PS964	311148	Essex County Council	Yes	Yes	No			•		No	Amend paragraph 3.14 to clarify that there is little spare capacity on much of the existing highways infrastructure although capacity exists on sustainable networks, and additional capacity in certain areas may come about from promoting a change in behaviour.
3.14	PS1318	872955	Hammonds Estates LLP	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	Plan identifies nine strategic priorities for Chelmsford, the keys ones are Strategic Priority 2, 5 and 6. Strategic Priorities 5 and 6 seek to ensure that adequate infrastructure is provided in respect of new homes and other development. The PSD comments that "one of the most challenging strategic infrastructure requirements is ensuring the transport network is sufficient to accommodate future growth" (paragraph 3.14) whilst paragraph 3.20 states that "plan-led growth provides the opportunity to address infrastructure needs, maximize the efficient use of existing infrastructure capacities and explore opportunities for new sustainable infrastructure". Whilst HEst supports the council's strategic priorities the spatial strategy (through the failure of a number of proposed strategic allocations to deliver) will fail to meet these priorities, particularly maximising use of existing infrastructure, and accordingly the spatial strategy is neither positively prepared nor effective, and does not comply with national policy.
3.14	PS1441	1156704	South Woodham Ferrers Town Council	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•	•		A change in how people travel is not valid here, unless there is extra capacity on the railway the only choice for a large number of residents is to travel by car.
3.14	PS1882	656512	Greater London Authority									Please also note that Chelmsford is located on the Strategic Infrastructure Priority 'Great Eastern Mainline (London – Ipswich – Norwich) and A 12'. These Priorities are set out in the Wider South East section of the new draft London Plan (see Policy SD3 and Figure 2.15).

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
3.15	PS573	961749	Mr Keith Francis									Local traffic modelling is obviously a pre-requisite to understanding current conditions but if they are simply used to tweak, with relatively minor benefits, they cannot address the deficits that exist in local Chelmsford-wide areas that is disguised by substantial volumes of traffic using residential area short-cuts/alternative routes causing their own problems for those local communities. Strategic and properly funded improvements need to be identified and provided.
3.15	PS707	1156269	Professor Alastair Thomas	No		No			•		No	One primary school will not be sufficient to serve 800 houses. The plans should be more ambitious to include: a secondary school (required 10 years after completion since the existing ones are difficult to get to), a surgery (the one on Lordship road has long waiting times), local shops (supermarkets are remote). Boundaries should be extended to allow for this. This will also allow many journeys to be carried out on food. The effect on traffic on the above factors has not been taken into account in the traffic modelling. See also attached comment on traffic modelling addressing some errors.
3.15	PS787	961966	Mr Alan Brunning			No		•				The ringway Jacobs detailing modelling does not extend to area 7 SWF. The data is clearly incorrect and needs to be recalculated from the survey. Crossing points have not been considered and the effect of a signalised pedestrian crossing is ignored.
3.15	PS966	311148	Essex County Council	Yes	Yes	No			•		No	Change paragraph 3.15 as follows: The modelling outputs indicate that the patterns and severity of congestion across Chelmsford would remain broadly consistent regardless of differences in Local Plan development allocation and the mitigation measures identified.
3.16	PS788	961966	Mr Alan Brunning	No		No		•				There is not a CCC driven plan for rainwater run off and represents consequential flood risk in to other areas in SWF. The plan is to leave it to the developers of each plot rather than CCC driving and funding a centralise strategy. It is not stated if the rainwater will be mandated as a separate system from the sewage network as now.
3.17	PS789	961966	Mr Alan Brunning	No		No	•					Nothing in the plan suggests that the Sewage treatment works in area 7 SWF has or will be assessed for capacity prior to starting development. It will be left to Essex and Suffolk Water in the same way as Network rail and the rail operator will have to deliver the rail improvements.
3.20	PS1918	927695	Redrow Homes								Yes	IDP details infrastructure items and associated costs for NE Chelmsford (SGS4) only, not for any other strategic sites. Development at SGS3 is able to meet infrastructure needs provided the appropriate quantum of residential can be secured
3.21	PS790	961966	Mr Alan Brunning	No		No		•				It is nonsense to assert that the CIL will provide the necessary Infrastructure funding. Later in the document it is shown that there is a £300m gap in infrastructure funding.
3.21	PS791	961966	Mr Alan Brunning	No		No		•				It is nonsense to assert that the CIL will provide the necessary Infrastructure funding. Later in the document it is shown that there is a £300m gap in infrastructure funding.
3.22	PS792	961966	Mr Alan Brunning	No		No		•				there is no provision for addition places in William de Ferrers and just a precautionary primary school. This is for 1000+ homes elsewhere new primary schools have been promised for less than new 800 homes. A simple calculation from demographics is all that is needed to quantify the need.
3.22	PS928	1155273	Leon Lallyette			No			•		No	There should be another primary school built in Broomfield.
3.22	PS1031	1156901	BJ Architectural Design									New developments have absorbed a few of the existing parking lots around the city centre. What alternatives are made for providing parking provisions in the city centre for the increasing number of cars in the future. Instead of a residential development north of Broomfield, should extend the existing Broomfield hospital towards the north; accommodating demand for hospital facilities and beds required to support houses in the surrounding new developments and people moving into the area. The proposed housing development at Broomfield could move further north or to another suitable location.
3.22	PS1617	1159743	Gladman Developments Ltd	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	Supportive of Strategic Priority 6 which seeks to deliver new and improved local infrastructure. However, this provision must not jeopardise the viability of developments.
3.23	PS574	961749	Mr Keith Francis									- where is the evidence, is it robust and terms of reference free of strictures?
3.23	PS598	1155000	Mrs Claire Thorogood		No	No	•	•	•			South Woodham Ferrers expansion is not effective in being an infrastructure lead project from highway or public transport aspect.
3.23	PS967	311148	Essex County Council	Yes	Yes	No			•		No	Change paragraph 3.23 as follows: The traffic modelling evidence base work has assessed the transport implications of the Local Plan throughout its preparation, and identified junction mitigation and sustainable infrastructure requirements, where appropriate.
3.24	PS516	664147	Sport England	Yes	Yes	Yes						Strategic objective 6 is supported as it aims to ensure that new or upgraded infrastructure is provided alongside development of new residential communities which specifically includes sports and leisure provision.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
3.24	PS912	1483	Runwell Parish Council	Yes		Yes					No	Need to redefine the phrase Community Facilities.
3.24	PS1089	965074	Mr Christopher Anstey			No	•		•		Yes	Increase in traffic. North Eastern A130 Bypass is essential to support planned development – but unlikely to be built prior to 2036. A12 Chelmsford Bypass needs to be upgraded to triple carriageway - not planned. Junction mitigation plans will not be sufficient. Suggested 5% movement to public transport, cycling and walking is not supported by any evidence base. Major infrastructure unlikely to be in place before or towards the end of the proposed major developments – how CCC will be able to grant Planning Permission if they adhere to Policy S12. Three main infrastructure projects must be delivered before new houses are built (The North East A130 bypass (not just the Radial Distributor Road), The new Railway Station and Widening of the A12 Chelmsford bypass to triple carriageway).
3.24	PS1140	965074	Mr Christopher Anstey	Yes	Yes	No	•		•		Yes	Increase in traffic. North Eastern A130 Bypass is essential to support planned development – but unlikely to be built prior to 2036. A12 Chelmsford Bypass needs to be upgraded to triple carriageway - not planned. Junction mitigation plans will not be sufficient. Suggested 5% movement to public transport, cycling and walking is not supported by any evidence base. Major infrastructure unlikely to be in place before or towards the end of the proposed major developments – how CCC will be able to grant Planning Permission if they adhere to Policy S12. Three main infrastructure projects must be delivered before new houses are built (The North East A130 bypass (not just the Radial Distributor Road), The new Railway Station and Widening of the A12 Chelmsford bypass to triple carriageway).
3.24	PS1919	927695	Redrow Homes								Yes	Site for nursery and primary school could support Great Baddow and Sandon area. Pedestrian/cycle routes could be implemented. Open space could be secured for formal and informal play space.
3.25	PS793	961966	Mr Alan Brunning	No		No		•	•	•		CCC intend to leave the provision of infrastructure to developers on an ad Hoc basis. This should be led by the CCC and implemented before the developers move in otherwise it is unlikely to happen. This is carte balance for developers to do whatever they like then leave the problems with residents and council tax payers.
3.26	PS678	970996	Highways England									The LP provides details of infrastructure funding, It is important that once the schemes are identified that the funding method for each is outlined, including any Central Government or Local Government funding that is available, the amount that could be collected from developers and any shortfall that could occur.
3.27	PS1370	1102437	The Russell Family	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	It is a significant failure of the emerging Plan to impose a blanket presumption that it is inappropriate to release any Green Belt land for development. Green Belt Review should have been undertaken. It is our veiw that there are sites in the Green Belt that play a poor Green Belt role and are suitable for development. One such site is our clients site at Margaretting, referred to in our Omission site representation.
3.27	PS1739	1160014	Historic England	Yes	Yes							Welcome Strategic Priority 7 which outlines the need to protect and enhance the historic environment. We request that Registered Parks and Gardens and Conservation Areas are also listed alongside Scheduled Monuments and Listed Buildings in paragraph 3.27. This will provide greater clarity as at present this section reads as if only Scheduled Monuments and Listed Buildings contribute towards local distinctiveness.
3.27	PS1820	1160052	North West Parishes Group									Strategy supported. However there is a case to suggest that a review of the green belt is needed.
3.27	PS1920	927695	Redrow Homes								Yes	SGS3 proposed development needs to be sensitively designed with regard to heritage assets
3.28	PS1371	1102437	The Russell Family	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	It is a significant failure of the emerging Plan to impose a blanket presumption that it is inappropriate to release any Green Belt land for development. Green Belt Review should have been undertaken. It is our veiw that there are sites in the Green Belt that play a poor Green Belt role and are suitable for development. One such site is our clients site at Margaretting, referred to in our Omission site representation.
3.28	PS1618	1159743	Gladman Developments Ltd	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	Environmental assets, other than Green Belt, will need to be considered alongside the need to deliver housing and employment growth in a balanced approach as set out in the Framework.
3.28	PS2075	1161039	Natural England		Yes	Yes					No	Strategic Priority 7 is sound but a minor alteration to para 3.28 is suggested to ensure a net gain for biodiversity and green infrastructure. The entire rep has been attached for completeness (1161039PS-A).

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
3.29	PS1372	1102437	The Russell Family	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	It is a significant failure of the emerging Plan to impose a blanket presumption that it is inappropriate to release any Green Belt land for development. Green Belt Review should have been undertaken. It is our view that there are sites in the Green Belt that play a poor Green Belt role and are suitable for development. One such site is our clients site at Margaretting, referred to in our Omission site representation.
3.29	PS2076	1161039	Natural England		Yes	Yes					No	Para 3.29 to be strengthened to make reference to high quality green infrastructure and the prioritisation of brownfield sites of low environmental value over other brownfield sites, followed by different grades of agricultural land. The entire rep has been attached for completeness (1161039PS-A).
3.30	PS599	1155000	Mrs Claire Thorogood		No	No	•	•	•			River Crouch is highly sensitive and protected by national and international designations. The growth area proposals could result in impacts on designated European sites through increased recreational activity.
3.30	PS1373	1102437	The Russell Family	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	It is a significant failure of the emerging Plan to impose a blanket presumption that it is inappropriate to release any Green Belt land for development. Green Belt Review should have been undertaken. It is our view that there are sites in the Green Belt that play a poor Green Belt role and are suitable for development. One such site is our clients site at Margaretting, referred to in our Omission site representation.
3.31	PS1374	1102437	The Russell Family	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	It is a significant failure of the emerging Plan to impose a blanket presumption that it is inappropriate to release any Green Belt land for development. Green Belt Review should have been undertaken. It is our view that there are sites in the Green Belt that play a poor Green Belt role and are suitable for development. One such site is our clients site at Margaretting, referred to in our Omission site representation.
3.32	PS794	961966	Mr Alan Brunning	No		No	•	•	•			Basically a deliberately misleading statement. SWF has a distinct style and was laid down in the Essex design guide. CCC has to enforce the style of the style of the dwellings so that they fit into the standards that were enforced for the 'new town',.
3.32	PS1922	927695	Redrow Homes								Yes	Support priority for SGS3
3.34	PS517	664147	Sport England	Yes	Yes	Yes						Strategic objective 8 is supported as it seeks to promote the health and well-being of communities by requiring development to provide new green spaces, sport and recreation facilities and to promote active and healthy lifestyles through the enhancement of walking and cycling.
3.34	PS859	908048	Essex Bridleways Association	Yes	Yes	No	•				Yes	The Plan should include access for all, including equestrians, and such should be embedded within the Plan from the 'top down' – within the Strategic Priorities.
3.34	PS2077	1161039	Natural England		Yes	Yes					No	An additional paragraph is suggested in this section emphasising that the Local Plan policies will seek to achieve a net gain for biodiversity by providing new green spaces built into the designs and masterplans of new development.' The entire rep has been attached for completeness (1161039PS-A).
3.35	PS575	961749	Mr Keith Francis									Have 'full' impact assessments been undertaken derived from completed development as a result of the full implementation/construction of the total of existing and this Plan's development? This again must be a pre-requisite for identifying all infrastructural needs, particularly relating to transport.
3.35	PS1619	1159743	Gladman Developments Ltd	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	Supportive of Strategic Priority 9.
3.36	PS950	1156883	Theatres Trust	Yes	Yes	Yes					No	The Council's stated encouragement of investment in leisure and cultural facilities is welcomed, as they are important in supporting the local and visitor economy by attracting people to the city where other businesses then benefit from the flow on effects. Participation in cultural events can contribute to social cohesion, reduce isolation and loneliness, encourage learning and the development of skills, as well as provide the entertainment and stimulation needed to develop vibrant communities and grow the economy. There is also a growing awareness of the role that the arts and culture play in attracting and retaining residents and a skilled workforce. An improved cultural offer would help support the Vision and achieve the objectives and targets for growth set out in this plan.
3.36	PS1923	927695	Redrow Homes								Yes	Support priority
3.37	PS951	1156883	Theatres Trust	Yes	Yes	Yes					No	The encouragement of investment in Chelmsford's arts and culture and the development of a strategy to enhance the West End is welcomed and supported by the Trust.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
4.1	PS795	961966	Mr Alan Brunning	No		No	•	•	•			Spatial principles these state the infrastructure will be provided but for area 7 SWF there is no evidence that the funding is available or adequate provision will ever be implemented. They intend to rely on the inadequate supply of cash from the CIL AFTER the building has started. This is not a sustainable development
4.1	PS2054	1098405	The North East Chelmsford Garden Village Consortium	Yes	Yes	Yes					Yes	The development proposals, and the emerging development concept as shown in the draft masterplan, for North East Chelmsford adhere closely to Strategic Policies S1, S2, S3, S4, S6, S7 and the Spatial Strategy set out in Section 6 of the PSLP.
4.2	PS1211	1097127	Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd	Yes	Yes	No			•		Yes	In order to ensure clarity for the Vision (and throughout the document), we suggest that references to Chelmsford should either be to "the Chelmsford area" or "Chelmsford City", depending on which is meant.
4.2	PS576	961749	Mr Keith Francis									The Vision reads well and includes improving the way people move around, by various means. It even includes public transport, so what can be expected? Unless radical changes, as suggested in 3.14 (PS572), the Vision as stated becomes meaningless/vacuous. It is imperative that these transport infrastructure are in place: NE Chelmsford Bypass, upgrading and reconfiguration of the A12 between junctions 17 and 19.
4.2	PS796	961966	Mr Alan Brunning	No		No	•	•	•			The summary is deliberately misleading Outcome for SWF will be that there will be 2 town centres no spending on infrastructure and an overcapacity main road that divides the community in two. The declared promise is not achievable. This is not a sustainable development
4.2	PS994	1156883	Theatres Trust	Yes	Yes	Yes					No	To enhance the consistency and strength of the plan in relation to enhancing Chelmsford's cultural offer, and to better align with Strategic Priority 9 and the seventh bullet point below the Vision, the Trust recommends a minor amendment to the second paragraph to include "cultural" to state "This positive change will optimise the opportunities for new and upgraded infrastructure including cultural, leisure and recreation facilities..." The Trust also support the revitalisation of South Woodham Ferrers by enhancing its retail, leisure and cultural offer.
4.2	PS1103	1157068	Croudace Homes	Yes	Yes	No		•			Yes	Vision does not explicitly promote the growth of other established settlements in the area. Opportunity missed to unlock the delivery of new infrastructure, services and facilities which could benefit existing communities beyond Chelmsford (City). Growth of some "Service Settlements" could be complementary to the new communities planned around the fringes of the City, and could help to address population and housing sub-market needs across the whole local authority area. In order to be the most appropriate strategy when considered against the reasonable alternatives, and therefore "justified" in accordance with paragraph 182 of the NPPF, the Vision for Chelmsford should refer to the potential that exists to grow other sustainable settlements. Third sentence in the Vision should be amended to read 'This also means maximising development opportunities: within a compact and vibrant City Centre; near South Woodham Ferrers; and, at other sustainable settlements'.
4.2	PS1324	1157251	Chelmsford Civic Society			No	•		•		Yes	Vision fails to point out in clear terms what that actually means and how it translates into Planning Policies. Explanation that follows Vision doesn't feature anything that is specifically identifiable or leading to a stronger role as Capital of Essex. Strategic Priority 9 is quite generic and could be strengthened by additional detail and more specific references to what the City aspires to achieve in terms of arts and culture, it is also quite clear that none of the (already weak) references of Strategic Priority 9 are translated into the VISION for the 'Capital of Essex'. Strengthen Vision by including specific reference to 'significant expansion' of the art, culture and leisure offer particularly in the Town Centre and explicit reference to a commitment to prepare a City-wide Cultural Development Strategy and a West End Integrated Plan Strategy aiming to create a new focal point for art, culture and leisure.



Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
4.2	PS1259	872955	Hammonds Estates LLP	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	Plan is not legally compliant, not positively prepared, not consistent with national policy and is unsound and will fail to deliver the objectively assessed need and associated infrastructure, is not flexible to adapt to change, and does not reflect the aspirations of the local community. SA is procedurally flawed and fails to comply with relevant legal requirements and guidance. Assessment of alternatives is incorrect and misrepresents the facts, lack of consultation, failure to consider information provided. Issues with the delivery of key sites and the continued reliance on urban extensions. Plan is not an appropriate strategy to deliver development, when considered against reasonable alternatives. North East Chelmsford - strategy places significant over-reliance on delivering development at North East Chelmsford - limiting choice to one major location. Sites at West Chelmsford, Great Leighs, Broomfield and North of South Woodham Ferrers do not fully meet the spatial principles and have suitability and constraint issues that affect the ability of the site to deliver the quantum of development proposed in the timescale identified. OAN figure should be higher. Should CCC be required to use the standard methodology, flexibility and resilience must be retained. Inconsistently applied in regard to landscape capacity analysis that underpins the spatial strategy. Hammonds Farm has been incorrectly assessed. Objects to the proposed the boundaries of the green corridor extending east from Chelmsford as these are ill-considered and not supported by the evidence. Boundary should be amended. Allocating Hammonds Farm to provide a new community would enable CCC to significantly boost housing choice and supply (with a broad range of housebuilders) in accordance with the NPPF. Policy wording proposed. Development at Hammonds Farm represents sustainable development in accordance with the NPPF providing opportunity to create a new sustainable village for around 5,000 new homes, of which 3,000 would be delivered in the plan period in a sustainable location, with good links to the city centre by all modes of transport. No significant constraints to the delivery of the site. Single landownership providing control and certainty to deliver all of the housing and associated infrastructure required. HEst supports the Vision for Chelmsford however, the vision will not be fully realised as a consequence of CCC's failure to plan properly for development and heavy reliance on one urban extension at North East Chelmsford to meet a significant proportion of its housing need.
4.2	PS1444	1156704	South Woodham Ferrers Town Council	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•	•		There is no evidence provided to substantiate the statements in para 3.10 and 4.2 about South Woodham Ferrers town centre or the proposed enhancement of this and other Neighbourhood areas. There is also no evidence provided on how the current lack of parking provision will be addressed. This contravenes NPPF, Section 2 Enhancing the Vitality of Town Centres.
4.2	PS1590	962430	Mr R Marchal			No		•	•			There should be a new development at Hammonds Farm. More affordable housing is needed and developers have too much power over when housing gets built.
4.2	PS1620	1159743	Gladman Developments Ltd	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	Supportive of the Vision.
4.2	PS1609	312374	Granville Developments		Yes	No			•	•	Yes	Vision and Spatial Principles do not provide clear indications of the direction of change. Vision should reflect the following:- ~ Managing growth to ensure that the Plan area as a whole becomes more self-contained and self-sufficient ~ Distributing growth appropriately and proportionally between urban and rural settlements according to their respective needs.
4.2	PS1740	1160014	Historic England	Yes	Yes							We welcome explicit reference to the historic environment in the Vision and the inclusion of bullet point 9 which ensures a strong strategic level focus on the need to protect and enhance the historic environment.
4.2	PS1821	1160052	North West Parishes Group									Vision is sound. Concern over how aspirational the Vision is in terms of the future of Chelmsford. Vision focusses heavily on the city, doesn't really acknowledge the integration with the countryside or rural parishes. Would be better if it related to development of new infrastructure and the relationship with rural parishes and settlements. Uses traffic report to support this argument.
4.3	PS577	961749	Mr Keith Francis									S1 includes 'use development to secure new infrastructure' which should read 'use development to help secure ...' Wider funding mechanisms/support will inevitably be required to secure fundamental needs.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
STRATEGIC POLICY S1 – SPATIAL PRINCIPLES	PS1213	1097127	Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd	Yes	Yes	No			•		Yes	Policy S1 needs to make clear whether or not the list of principles applies collectively, or whether some of the locational principles should be separated out from those principles that are applicable to all development. The sixth bullet point to be reworded to ensure that it more accurately reflects the likely consequences of development and the means by which such assets are to be taken in to account.
STRATEGIC POLICY S1 – SPATIAL PRINCIPLES	PS1197	1097080	Ms Shyy Sachdev	Yes	Yes	No		•	•		Yes	The Plan fails to include sufficient smaller sites; the Council has not planned for the correct type of land for housing and the removal of land at Rembrandt House from the Green Wedge should be considered. . The Green Wedges and Green Corridors Review Report is unsound as it was not subject to public consultation to test changes to boundaries. Land at Rembrandt House, Broomfield does not perform the functions of the Green Wedge and should be allocated for development. Including it means the Plan is not justified or effective.
STRATEGIC POLICY S1 – SPATIAL PRINCIPLES	PS1104	1157068	Croudace Homes	Yes	Yes	No		•			Yes	Objects to the seventh Spatial Principle. Growth should not be restricted to only certain tiers of settlements – leaving some areas to decline; miss opportunities to secure new infrastructure, delivery of the much-needed housing heavily dependent upon large sites and does not consider the extent to which unmet needs from authorities could be located in these areas. A more flexible approach should be encouraged in Spatial Principles, which “has regard” to the pattern and hierarchy of settlements alongside a wider consideration of the planning merits of directing growth to particular locations. Requests that the seventh Spatial Principle is amended to read ‘have regard to the pattern and hierarchy of existing settlements’.
STRATEGIC POLICY S1 – SPATIAL PRINCIPLES	PS1114	1097139	Mr J Hart & Mr G Moss	Yes	Yes	No				•	Yes	Broad support is given to the Spatial Principles which includes the protection of the Green Belt. However, the retention of existing Metropolitan Green Belt boundaries should not preclude development which complies with paragraph 89 NPPF which includes the construction of ‘limited affordable housing for local community needs under policies set out in the Local Plan’, as an exception to normal Green Belt policy. Proposed changes to the National Planning Policy Framework, March 2018 (Paragraph 72) include policy changes in respect of exception sites. Object to Strategic Policy S1 as it is not consistent with emerging national policy. Strategic Policy S1 – Spatial Principles should be amended to read: “Protect the Green Belt, unless exception policies apply”.
STRATEGIC POLICY S1 – SPATIAL PRINCIPLES	PS1146	1157030	Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	The plan is not sound because the Council has not correctly assessed the borough's true housing needs. There are “Very Special Circumstances” that would warrant the release of a Green Belt site being a sustainable urban extension. Fifth bullet point to be expanded to say 'Refuse inappropriate development within the Green Belt unless “very special circumstances” indicate otherwise'. There are a number of flaws in the Council’s current approach towards the calculation of OAN. See also attachment )Representations to the Chelmsford Local Plan Submission Draft by RPS which support the promoted site 'Land at Galleywood Road, Great Baddow..
STRATEGIC POLICY S1 – SPATIAL PRINCIPLES	PS1290	1157108	Campden Hill Limited	Yes	Yes	No		•		•	Yes	Amend the fifth bullet in Policy S1 to read: "Protect the Green Belt, subject to the exceptions set out in Policy CO2." Five Tree Works, Great Baddow can also be defined as ‘previously developed land’ and could be intensified for employment uses and new housing.
STRATEGIC POLICY S1 – SPATIAL PRINCIPLES	PS1255	1157165	Rosehart Properties LTd	Yes	Yes	No		•		•	Yes	Our client broadly agrees with the Spatial Principles set out in the Policy S1. However, two of these principles warrant further comment. - Maximise the use of suitable previously developed land for development - Support the proposal to make the maximum use of suitable previously developed land for development. This will ensure that the best use is made of available land and that new development is provided in sustainable locations. - Protect the Green Belt - The Plan also proposes to protect the Green Belt. The fundamental aim of green belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. The NPPF states that the construction of new buildings should be regarded as “inappropriate” in the Green Belt, with some exceptions, which are listed - reinforced by paragraph 17 that planning should “encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed (brownfield land), provided that it is not of high environmental value.” Therefore the Spatial Principle to protect the Green Belt should be amended to acknowledge that not all new buildings are inappropriate in the Green Belt and that certain exceptions apply (as listed in Policy CO2). The fifth bullet in Policy S1 should be amended to read: • Protect the Green Belt, subject to the exceptions set out in Policy CO2
STRATEGIC POLICY S1 – SPATIAL PRINCIPLES	PS1263	1157185	Bressole Ltd	Yes	Yes	No		•		•	Yes	Amend fifth bullet in Policy S1 to ensure consistency with NPPF: • Protect the Green Belt, subject to the exceptions set out in Policy CO2

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
STRATEGIC POLICY S1 – SPATIAL PRINCIPLES	PS1325	1157251	Chelmsford Civic Society			No	•		•		Yes	The omission of any reference to further development of art, culture and leisure opportunities is in direct contradiction with the VISION and STRATEGIC PRIORITY 9. See rep for suggested text amendments to paragraph 4.8
STRATEGIC POLICY S1 – SPATIAL PRINCIPLES	PS1261	872955	Hammonds Estates LLP	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	Broadly supports Policy S1 and considers to be a sound basis on which to plan for development in Chelmsford. However, a number of the strategic allocations proposed do not support the vision and do not comply with key spatial principles. Hammonds Farm is able to fully meet relevant spatial principles.
STRATEGIC POLICY S1 – SPATIAL PRINCIPLES	PS1375	1102437	The Russell Family	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•		Yes	Fully support the objectives of locating development at well connected sustainable locations, respecting the pattern and hierarchy of settlements and planning for the long term. However, the blanket protection of the Green Belt conflicts with these principles. The approach to the distribution of development in the emerging Plan fails to properly reflect the overarching Spatial Principles. The development strategy of the emerging Plan should be revisited in the context of the objectives of policy S1.
STRATEGIC POLICY S1 – SPATIAL PRINCIPLES	PS1446	1156704	South Woodham Ferrers Town Council	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•	•		The closeness of the site to a variety of designated sites, the condition of the Crouch and Roach Estuaries which is also a core area of biodiversity and ecological importance contravenes Policy S1, bullet points 4 and 6. The closeness of the site to 6 Grade II listed buildings within 500 m of the site contravenes Policy S1 bullet point 6.
STRATEGIC POLICY S1 – SPATIAL PRINCIPLES	PS1404	377147	RWH Properties Ltd	Yes	Yes	Yes					No	RWH properties Limited supports strategic policy S1 - Spatial Principles. In particular, where the spatial principles seek to deliver new housing development at sustainable locations within existing urban areas making best use of previously developed (brownfield) land, reflects and mirrors a key theme within the national planning policy framework (NPPF) to support sustainable development. Site 1s strongly complies with strategic policy S1
STRATEGIC POLICY S1 – SPATIAL PRINCIPLES	PS1462	1101449	Ms Linda Beard	No		No	•	•	•	•	Yes	The Spatial Principles have not been followed when allocating land for development, particularly in relation to Strategic Growth Site 7 North of South Woodham Ferrers.
STRATEGIC POLICY S1 – SPATIAL PRINCIPLES	PS1621	1159743	Gladman Developments Ltd	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	Support Strategic Policy S1. Recommend that bullet point 3 needs amending to make clear that development should be located in areas which are or can be made sustainable.
STRATEGIC POLICY S1 – SPATIAL PRINCIPLES	PS1622	1159753	Mr N Halls			No	•	•		•	Yes	Support Policy S1. Promoted site north of Peartree Lane, Bicknacre is a sustainable site and should be allocated for development.
STRATEGIC POLICY S1 – SPATIAL PRINCIPLES	PS1655	1153866	Mr James Revell	Yes	Yes	Yes					Yes	Support Policy S1 with regard to locating development at well-connected sustainable locations to integrate into the existing settlements.
STRATEGIC POLICY S1 – SPATIAL PRINCIPLES	PS1676	309174	Mr Graham Pooley									Support the principle of using brownfield land before greenfield and Green Belt but some Green Belt land has less amenity or farming value than some non-Green Belt land. Some City Centre locations must be retained for community uses and provide other social benefits.
STRATEGIC POLICY S1 – SPATIAL PRINCIPLES	PS1690	1159923	Police, Fire & Crime Commissioner for Essex	Yes	Yes	Yes		•	•	•	Yes	Supports S1. Consider policy to be sound. The policy supports the identification of the EPHQ as suitable for development due to the fact that it is substantial previously developed land with excellent connection to local neighbourhoods and the city centre.
STRATEGIC POLICY S1 – SPATIAL PRINCIPLES	PS1695	1101771	Mr Paul Hopkins	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	Service Settlements should also be provided with development to meet local needs.
STRATEGIC POLICY S1 – SPATIAL PRINCIPLES	PS1704	866622	Stonebond Properties Ltd			No	•	•	•	•	Yes	Support SP1. Promoted site (CFS154) should be allocated for development as it is consistent with these principles.
STRATEGIC POLICY S1 – SPATIAL PRINCIPLES	PS1741	1160014	Historic England	Yes	Yes							Request that the term heritage in bullet point 6 of the policy is replaced with the term historic environment. The historic environment is considered the most appropriate term to use as a topic heading as it encompasses all aspects of heritage, for example the tangible heritage assets and less tangible cultural heritage. This applies throughout the plan; the supporting text on page 40 should also be amended to reflect this.
STRATEGIC POLICY S1 – SPATIAL PRINCIPLES	PS1774	489452	Writtle University College	Yes	Yes	Yes					Yes	There should be flexibility in respect of the SPA associated with Writtle University College. This will allow development of facilities to come forward in a way that will support the economic and social benefits of the institution for the long term. See also attachments for background/introduction and additional land holdings.
STRATEGIC POLICY S1 – SPATIAL PRINCIPLES	PS1803	376006	Boxford (Suffolk) Holdings Ltd			No		•	•	•	Yes	Policy S1 is considered sound and supports the allocation of the promoted site (CFS197) for development.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
STRATEGIC POLICY S1 – SPATIAL PRINCIPLES	PS1822	1160052	North West Parishes Group									Spatial Principles are sound. Concern for delivery of infrastructure. "Locate development at well-connected sustainable locations" - risks in achieving this in the current growth strategy. "Ensure development is deliverable" and "Ensure development is served by necessary infrastructure" - fear mixed ownership land will cause this to fail, alternative sites should be considered. "Protect the Green Belt" - a green belt review is needed. "Protect and enhance the character of valued landscapes" - not clear that this principle can be met
STRATEGIC POLICY S1 – SPATIAL PRINCIPLES	PS1842	476873	Little Waltham Parish Council			No					Yes	Do not believe that sites 2, 4 and 6 are sustainable and therefore are contrary to Policy S1. (For breakdown of North West Parishes Group response see PS1808 - PS1832 and PS SA45 - PS SA49)
STRATEGIC POLICY S1 – SPATIAL PRINCIPLES	PS1862	873321	Eastern Approaches Investments Ltd			No	•	•	•		Yes	Support Policy S1. Promoted site (CFS137) is a sustainable location and should be allocated.
STRATEGIC POLICY S1 – SPATIAL PRINCIPLES	PS1875	976073	Bellway Homes			No	•	•	•	•	Yes	Support S1.
STRATEGIC POLICY S1 – SPATIAL PRINCIPLES	PS1928	873301	Cliffords Ltd			No		•	•	•	Yes	Policy S1 is supported. Locating development at well-connected sustainable locations is justified and consistent with national policy. Land at Saxon Way, Broomfield (CFS212) is well-related to existing services, facilities and employment opportunities and performs well in the SLAA assessment. See also attachments including a concept plan for the above site (873301PS-B) and an appeal statement concerning a housing site on farmland in Tendring allowed on appeal (873301PS-A).
STRATEGIC POLICY S1 – SPATIAL PRINCIPLES	PS1942	927695	Redrow Homes								Yes	As per our previous representations, one principle considered absent from the list concerns 'delivering a wide choice of high quality homes' as addressed at para's 47 – 52 of the NPPF. Pre-Submission fails to take land east of 3c into account. Feel therefore S1 is unsound.
STRATEGIC POLICY S1 – SPATIAL PRINCIPLES	PS1892	1101627	Gateway 120, Cirrus Land LLP, and L & Q Homes	Yes	No	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	As currently drafted, the plan fails to deliver on its Strategic Priorities, nor Strategic Policy S1 which forms the basis on which the plan is founded. Land east of Braintree offers an opportunity to meet the strategic objectives of both CCC and the north Essex region as a whole, delivering a comprehensively planned urban extension to Braintree with appropriate supporting infrastructure provided on-site in combination with housing delivery. Rather than representing an isolated development with a reliance on private vehicle movements, the site represents the best opportunity to utilise both an existing principle service centre, as well as linking in to the planned spatial growth strategy for the region. In order to be considered effective in delivering its strategic objectives, the plan should be amended to consider more appropriate ways the objectively assessed needs of the region can be accommodated. A suitable alternative exists. With the Braintree District Council Section 2 Local Plan yet to undergo its Examination in Public, the Councils should take the opportunity to reassess whether the strategic development sites of both plans will effectively deliver the objectives of allocating them.
STRATEGIC POLICY S1 – SPATIAL PRINCIPLES	PS1967	865003	Larmar Engineering			No	•	•	•		Yes	Promoted site is in a sustainable location. May no longer be suitable for employment use so should be considered for residential. Site does not accord with Green Belt principles.
STRATEGIC POLICY S1 – SPATIAL PRINCIPLES	PS1987	873301	Cliffords Ltd	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•		Yes	Taken with the changes brought about by the planning permission for a Mill and Traveller Sites along with the existing business areas in this location, it is considered that the employment opportunities offered by the site would be entirely appropriate between Drakes Lane and Cranham Road. An employment development would also have the opportunity to link to the wider proposals for North East Chelmsford Garden Village and contribute to the growth of the area.
STRATEGIC POLICY S1 – SPATIAL PRINCIPLES	PS2036	1097203	Bovis Homes Ltd	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	The representations finds the strategic priorities, spatial principles and vision are all undermined by Chelmsford City Council (CCC)'s failure to undertake a detailed Green Belt Assessment to determine the most appropriate means to meeting future development needs. Promoted site at Writtle would promote sustainable travel via a Green Wedge, and is close to City Centre and its facilities, therefore a highly sustainable location. Site could be removed from the Green Belt with little harm to the integrity of the GB. In view of the above, Policy S1 should be underpinned by a Green Belt Review, demonstrating that the Spatial Strategy is based upon the most sustainable options for meeting Chelmsford's long-term development needs.
4.7	PS754	1149637	CPREssex	Yes	Yes	No		•	•		Yes	Scale of development, especially residential, both under construction and also planned for the next 20 years in and around Chelmsford is unprecedented. Infrastructure must be delivered first in the Plan. Concern that smaller rural settlements will be subsumed by urban sprawl or into larger settlements. Growth proposed outside of the urban areas and in greenfield locations that are poorly connected to centres of employment should be reviewed

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
4.9	PS753	1149637	CPREssex	Yes	Yes	No			•	•	Yes	There is an infrastructure deficit, poor connectivity and slim chances of encouraging non-car modes of transport in Great Leighs. The scale of further mass housing development at Great Leighs is inconsistent with the NPPF and runs counter to the ethos of reducing the need to travel.
4.10	PS578	961749	Mr Keith Francis									Order of priorities should be changed to demonstrate required emphasis ie 1. Public Transport, 2. Walking, 3. Cycling
4.10	PS646	960850	Dr Reza Hossain									The council states that it wishes to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and congestion in the Chelmsford Local Plan. But this will be very difficult in the centre of Chelmsford. Perth imposed very high car parking charges in the centre of Perth . People who resided in the centre of Perth didn't have to pay the charge, but anyone coming to work or shop or visit had very high car parking charges. We would like to encourage to try to use a Perth model of transportation to really reduce congestion, and increase public transport and cycling/walking .
4.11	PS604	1155857	Environment Agency	Yes	Yes	Yes	•	•	•	•	No	4.11 could be enhanced with further explanation as to what is meant by a development being 'safe for its lifetime'
4.11	PS797	961966	Mr Alan Brunning	No		No	•	•	•	•		The actions proposed do not meet the declared intent CCC state that they will discourage development in areas that increase the risk of flooding. Area 7 SWF may not flood itself but the run off will cause other areas to flood in SWF. CCC are not providing the infrastructure but relying on developers to deliver a solution. This is not a sustainable development
4.12	PS1153	1157030	Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	Consideration of alternative/additional sites to accommodate the additional housing required has not been addressed. Paragraph 4.12 to be deleted and replaced with a paragraph referring to amendments of the Green Belt boundary at the southern edge due to 'exceptional circumstances'. This is in accordance with the NPPG and the Housing White Paper. See also attachment (Representations to the Chelmsford Local Plan Submission Draft by RPS) in support of the promoted site Land at Galleywood Road, Great Baddow.
4.13	PS734	952361	Mrs Laura Dunne	Yes		Yes						Support the extension of green wedges and green corridors.
4.13	PS1473	1158309	Mr Nigel Brown									In paragraph 4.13 insert between current sentence ending '... wildlife can flourish' and the one beginning 'Opportunities for greater...' new sentence:- 'Chelmsford has a major literary landscape in the Chelmer Valley, inspiration for the works of J.A. Baker, opportunities will be promoted for the conservation and celebration of this landscape'
4.14	PS1605	312374	Granville Developments		Yes	No			•	•	Yes	Reference to small settlements is notable by its absence. Having regard to the fact that National Policy Guidance recognises that all settlements are able to contribute to sustainable development, we consider that this should be recognised in the text. That said, we object elsewhere to the undue constraint being placed on small settlements which we refer to in responding to paragraph 6.34.
4.15	PS798	961966	Mr Alan Brunning	No		No	•	•	•			Misleading statement: Area 7 SWF is far larger than that needed for 1000 homes. It can be expected that eventually it will be used for 2000+ homes expecting that the 2018 infrastructure will cope. This is not responsible development.
4.16	PS799	961966	Mr Alan Brunning	No		No	•	•	•			The CIL levy will be grossly below that needed to deliver the infrastructure required for the increase in housing e.g. roads, train, schools ,flooding and sewage. This is not a sustainable development
4.16	PS1442	1156704	South Woodham Ferrers Town Council	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•	•		Collingwood School is quite some distance from the development and there are potential safety issues in young children getting to and from school from the new development. A primary school should be provided on site.
4.17	PS800	961966	Mr Alan Brunning	No		No	•	•	•			The CIL levy will be grossly below that needed to deliver the infrastructure required for the increase in housing e.g. roads, train, schools ,flooding and sewage. This is not a sustainable development
4.17	PS801	961966	Mr Alan Brunning	No		No	•	•	•			The CIL levy will be grossly below that needed to deliver the infrastructure required for the increase in housing e.g. roads, train, schools ,flooding and sewage. This is not a sustainable development
5.2	PS802	961966	Mr Alan Brunning	No		No	•	•	•			In SWF, without the necessary significant infrastructure improvements this development cannot be considered sustainable. It is irresponsible to declare this will be OK in the full knowledge that there is no cash and the data says it will be a problem

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
STRATEGIC POLICY S2 – SECURING SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT	PS1215	1097127	Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd	Yes	Yes	No		•	•		Yes	The second paragraph of Policy S2 would be unduly onerous if used for Development Management purposes, and unnecessary, as proposals that comply with Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plan policies should not have to additionally demonstrate compliance with the Vision and Spatial Principles, as the Policies are themselves the mechanism by which the Vision and Spatial Principles are implemented. If the purpose of the second paragraph is to provide a more detailed explanation of what sustainable development means in the context of the Chelmsford area, then it does not do this, as it simply says that development that accords with the Development Plan is sustainable development. For both reasons, the second paragraph should be deleted or otherwise amended to remove reference to demonstrable compliance.
STRATEGIC POLICY S2 – SECURING SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT	PS1623	1159753	Mr N Halls			No	•	•		•	Yes	Support Policy S2. Promoted site north of Peartree Lane, Bicknacre is a sustainable site and should be allocated for development.
STRATEGIC POLICY S2 – SECURING SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT	PS1627	1159743	Gladman Developments Ltd	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	Support Strategic Policy S2 but note that it may need updating following revisions to the NPPF.
STRATEGIC POLICY S2 – SECURING SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT	PS1608	312374	Granville Developments		Yes	No			•	•	Yes	Text does not provide clear guidance on the broader background strategy aimed at securing sustainable development. Lack of any clear definition of sustainable development remains. Creation of sustainable development is rightly recognised as crucial. Absence of any clear vision as to how sustainable development will be achieved at the macro scale
STRATEGIC POLICY S2 – SECURING SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT	PS1706	866622	Stonebond Properties Ltd			No	•	•	•	•	Yes	Support presumption in favour of sustainable development. Promoted site (CFS154) is a sustainable site so should be allocated.
STRATEGIC POLICY S2 – SECURING SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT	PS1743	1160014	Historic England	Yes	Yes							We welcome the inclusion of a strategic level policy which links with the NPPF's definition of sustainable development.
STRATEGIC POLICY S2 – SECURING SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT	PS1805	376006	Boxford (Suffolk) Holdings Ltd			No		•	•	•	Yes	Galleywood should accommodate additional housing such as promoted site (CFS197).
STRATEGIC POLICY S2 – SECURING SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT	PS1863	873321	Eastern Approaches Investments Ltd			No	•	•	•		Yes	Support Chelmsford City Council's position of supporting a presumption in favour of sustainable development. The Land to the west of Farrow Road, Widford is a sustainable site and should be allocated.
STRATEGIC POLICY S2 – SECURING SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT	PS1934	873301	Cliffords Ltd			No		•	•	•	Yes	The City Council's position of supporting a presumption in favour of sustainable development is supported. The land south of Saxon Way, Broomfield is a sustainable location centrally within a Key Service Settlement regards access to services, non-reliance upon the car, pedestrian connectivity, investment in shops and amenities. There are substantial economic and social benefits. See also attachments including a concept plan for the above site (873301PS-B) and an appeal statement concerning a housing site on farmland in Tendring allowed on appeal (873301PS-A).
STRATEGIC POLICY S2 – SECURING SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT	PS1944	927695	Redrow Homes								Yes	Policy is largely generic and consistent with national policy. Changes in the revised NPPF should be reflected in the LP
STRATEGIC POLICY S2 – SECURING SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT	PS1969	865003	Larmar Engineering			No	•	•	•		Yes	Support presumption in favour of sustainable development. Promoted site would constitute sustainable development and should be removed from the Green Belt.
5.6	PS803	961966	Mr Alan Brunning	No		No	•	•	•			the flood risk assessment in SWF will not be controlled by CCC. They have declared that it will be left to the individual developers. This is not a sustainable development.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
5.6	PS804	961966	Mr Alan Brunning	No		No	•	•	•			flood risk assessment inn SWF will not be controlled by CCC. They have declared that it will be left to the individual developers. This is not a sustainable development.
STRATEGIC POLICY S3 – ADDRESSING CLIMATE CHANGE AND FLOOD RISK	PS806	961966	Mr Alan Brunning			No	•	•	•	•		Declared policy not met. Flooding reports do not consider fluvial flooding. flood risk assessment in SWF will not be controlled by CCC. They have declared that it will be left to the individual developers. This is not a sustainable development.
STRATEGIC POLICY S3 – ADDRESSING CLIMATE CHANGE AND FLOOD RISK	PS1447	1156704	South Woodham Ferrers Town Council	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•	•		The closeness of the site to a variety of designated sites, the condition of the Crouch and Roach Estuaries which is also a core area of biodiversity and ecological importance contravenes Policy S13.
STRATEGIC POLICY S3 – ADDRESSING CLIMATE CHANGE AND FLOOD RISK	PS1945	927695	Redrow Homes								Yes	Fully “consistent with National policy”, and our Client’s land interests at East of Great Baddow accord fully with these policy objectives.
5.11	PS807	961966	Mr Alan Brunning	No		No	•	•	•	•		flood risk assessments in SWF will not be controlled by CCC. They have declared that it will be left to the individual developers. This is not a sustainable development.
5.11	PS781	961966	Mr Alan Brunning	No		No	•	•	•	•		the flood risk assessment in SWF will not be controlled by CCC. They have declared that it will be left to the individual developers. No plans exist in the proposal to resolve the issue at council level. Leave it to the developers This is not a sustainable development.
5.14	PS742	966249	Mr Stephen Hook	Yes	Yes	No			•			Concern that the existing flood defences in SWF will not accommodate the proposed growth in the area
5.14	PS739	966249	Mr Stephen Hook	Yes	Yes	No			•			Concern that the existing flood defences in SWF will not accommodate the proposed growth in the area
STRATEGIC POLICY S4 – PROMOTING COMMUNITY INCLUSION AND NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANNING	PS1557	1099220	Broomfield Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group									Support policy S4. LP would be more positively prepared if it included a commitment to implement the proposal in the DCLG consultation document ‘Planning for the Right Homes in the Right Places’ that planning authorities should make a clear statement of the amount of development proposed for each parish or NP area. NP should be able to determine the boundaries of green wedges and green corridors.
STRATEGIC POLICY S4 – PROMOTING COMMUNITY INCLUSION AND NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANNING	PS1823	1160052	North West Parishes Group									NP is welcomed. LP should be clear in setting out the expectations of Neighbourhood Plan groups or Parishes in terms of the delivery of development. NP groups and parishes may best plan for their neighbourhood area. LP should be amended to reflect this.
STRATEGIC POLICY S4 – PROMOTING COMMUNITY INCLUSION AND NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANNING	PS1946	927695	Redrow Homes								Yes	This policy is “consistent with National policy”, and also reflects the recent Neighbourhood Planning Bill. Supportive of the inclusion of the local community in helping to shape and evolve the emerging development proposals.
STRATEGIC POLICY S4 – PROMOTING COMMUNITY INCLUSION AND NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANNING	PS1929	1160458	Hill	Yes	Yes	No			•			Support the allocation of development in Danbury through the Neighbourhood Plan. A mechanism should be built into the Local Plan to enable the housing requirement of 100 dwellings to be delivered in the event that a neighbourhood plan has not been brought forward within 18 months of the Local Plan being adopted. Allocations should be for larger sites to ensure affordable housing needs are met.
5.16	PS520	664147	Sport England	Yes	Yes	Yes						Support is made to the reference to Sport England’s Active Design as an example of how more healthy lifestyles can be achieved through design. This is consistent with current Government policy in section 8 of the NPPF.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
STRATEGIC POLICY S5 – CONSERVING AND ENHANCING THE HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT	PS1326	1157251	Chelmsford Civic Society			No	•		•		Yes	While we support these measures, we do not believe that the policy goes far enough to support the VISION for a stronger 'Capital of Essex' and investment in arts, culture and leisure or how CCC will enhance the heritage of the city. See rep for text amendment to policy. Recommend setting out a pro-active strategy
STRATEGIC POLICY S5 – CONSERVING AND ENHANCING THE HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT	PS1264	872955	Hammonds Estates LLP	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	Strategic Policy S5 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment fails to recognise the hierarchy of different designated sites, as required by paragraph 113 of the NPPF and this policy is also unsound.
STRATEGIC POLICY S5 – CONSERVING AND ENHANCING THE HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT	PS1453	1156704	South Woodham Ferrers Town Council	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•	•		The closeness of the site to 6 Grade II listed buildings within 500 m of the site contravenes Policy S5 and the NPPF para 132.
STRATEGIC POLICY S5 – CONSERVING AND ENHANCING THE HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT	PS1628	1159743	Gladman Developments Ltd	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	This policy does not reflect the guidance given in paragraphs 126-141 of the Framework. Specifically national policy does not provide for a presumption in favour of the preservation and enhancement of heritage assets and their setting.
STRATEGIC POLICY S5 – CONSERVING AND ENHANCING THE HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT	PS1744	1160014	Historic England	Yes	Yes							Welcome the inclusion of a Strategic Policy for the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment. The policy helpfully refers to Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, Registered Parks and Gardens and Scheduled Monuments together with non-designated assets. Pleased to see that conservation areas will be kept under review and that it makes appropriate reference to setting.
STRATEGIC POLICY S5 – CONSERVING AND ENHANCING THE HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT	PS1947	927695	Redrow Homes								Yes	The policy has been revised and appears to have regard to our previous representations insofar as there is no “presumption” in favour of protecting non-designated heritage assets at para 135 of the NPPF. We therefore now support this policy in terms of soundness.
5.18	PS968	311148	Essex County Council	Yes	Yes	No				•	No	To refer to ‘scheduled monuments’ in paragraph 5.18 rather than Ancient Monuments.
STRATEGIC POLICY S6 – CONSERVING AND ENHANCING THE NATURAL ENVIRONMENT	PS605	1155857	Environment Agency	Yes	Yes	Yes						Policy could be enhanced to improve water-related biodiversity taking account of Water Framework Directive objectives and River Basin Management Plan actions.
STRATEGIC POLICY S6 – CONSERVING AND ENHANCING THE NATURAL ENVIRONMENT	PS861	908048	Essex Bridleways Association	Yes	Yes	No	•				Yes	Access for all user groups where possible is embedded within this Strategic Policy.
STRATEGIC POLICY S6 – CONSERVING AND ENHANCING THE NATURAL ENVIRONMENT	PS1267	872955	Hammonds Estates LLP	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	Strategic Policy S6 - Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment fails to recognise the hierarchy of different designated sites, as required by paragraph 113 of the NPPF and this policy is also unsound.
STRATEGIC POLICY S6 – CONSERVING AND ENHANCING THE NATURAL ENVIRONMENT	PS1454	1156704	South Woodham Ferrers Town Council	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•	•		The closeness of the site to 6 Grade II listed buildings within 500 m of the site contravenes Policy S6.



Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
STRATEGIC POLICY S6 – CONSERVING AND ENHANCING THE NATURAL ENVIRONMENT	PS1824	1160052	North West Parishes Group									Supported. Concern for land between these corridors outside the designated green spaces that may have value as an environmental resource. LP should allow for options to consider the environmental resource outside these boundaries. Policy should also reference strategic priority 13 for completeness.
STRATEGIC POLICY S6 – CONSERVING AND ENHANCING THE NATURAL ENVIRONMENT	PS1948	927695	Redrow Homes								Yes	This policy is considered to be consistent with the NPPF and the proposed development would incorporate features capable of creating networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure.
STRATEGIC POLICY S6 – CONSERVING AND ENHANCING THE NATURAL ENVIRONMENT	PS2078	1161039	Natural England		Yes	No					No	As currently worded Policy SP6 is not compliant with the Habitats Regulations and is unsound due to non compliance with paras 114 and 118 of the NPPF. The reference and commitment to the RAMS is currently in supporting text only and as such it is our view that the Plan would fail legal and procedural compliance. The policy to be amended to specify needs for contributions from developments towards RAMS. A change of wording is suggested to include consideration of water resources, to ensure compliance with paragraph 118 of the NPPF. Light pollution can have a negative impact on local amenity and nature conservation yet there is no policy statement describing light pollution. The plan has no dedicated policy for the protection and enhancement of soils and does therefore not comply with paras 109 and 112 of the NPPF. This is particularly necessary given the significant negative effects on land use due to the loss of 446ha of Grade 3 agricultural land and 252ha of Grade 2 agricultural land. The entire rep has been attached for completeness (1161039PS-A).
5.33	PS1469	1101449	Ms Linda Beard	No		No	•	•	•	•	Yes	Essex-wide Recreational Disturbance Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy (RAMS) This document should have been made available with the current Local Plan consultation.
5.33	PS1531	976647	Tendring District Council									The Council are pleased to see paragraph 4.33 that the City Council makes reference to the Recreational Avoidance Mitigation Strategy (RAMS) as a contributing partner to the Essex RAMS.
5.33	PS1566	1158815	Maldon District Council	Yes	Yes	Yes					No	The reference to RAMS for each of the residential allocations is welcomed. However, there is concern that the final comment on paragraph 5.33 regarding ‘the implementation of bespoke measures’ may represent a loophole in the RAMS requirement, that will weaken the efficacy of the policy, by allowing novel, un-tested measures, local to Chelmsford, to be implemented rather than those as set out in any future RAMS SPD.
STRATEGIC POLICY S7 – PROTECTING AND ENHANCING COMMUNITY ASSETS	PS518	664147	Sport England	Yes	Yes	Yes						Support is offered for policy S7 as it recognises the importance of sports and leisure facilities in new development and the need to secure new provision through planning obligations or CIL.
STRATEGIC POLICY S7 – PROTECTING AND ENHANCING COMMUNITY ASSETS	PS995	1156883	Theatres Trust	Yes	Yes	Yes						The Trust supports this Strategic Policy and welcomes the explicit inclusion of arts and cultural facilities as infrastructure that can be supported through planning obligations, CIL and other such funding streams.
STRATEGIC POLICY S7 – PROTECTING AND ENHANCING COMMUNITY ASSETS	PS1061	1039843	Mr. Robert Barnard	No	No	No	•	•	•		Yes	Needs to be investment in the provision of community gardens and allotments for residents as there is a lack of growing space in modern developments. Needs to be more football pitches and other sports facilities and freshwater angling facilities available to the local residents to encourage more physical exercise and benefits of the outdoor environment.
STRATEGIC POLICY S7 – PROTECTING AND ENHANCING COMMUNITY ASSETS	PS1328	1157251	Chelmsford Civic Society			No	•		•		Yes	STRATEGIC POLICY 7 fails to make a sufficient distinction between localised facilities and the facilities of the 'Capital of Essex' identified in the VISION and the need for renaissance in the City Centre Area. We suggest that a new policy is included: STRATEGIC POLICY 7b - SUPPORTING CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT AND CREATIVE INDUSTRIES. See rep for text amendment to policy. We consider paragraphs 5.34 and 5.35 are so general that they might be applied in any town or city.
STRATEGIC POLICY S7 – PROTECTING AND ENHANCING COMMUNITY ASSETS	PS1729	973829	Scott Properties			No				•	Yes	Policy S7 could be amended to more explicitly weigh the enhancement of education establishments as a significant benefit to a community, in accordance with paragraph 72 of the NPPF.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
STRATEGIC POLICY S7 – PROTECTING AND ENHANCING COMMUNITY ASSETS	PS1738	1160010	David Lloyd Leisure and Aquila Holdings			Yes						Supportive of Strategic Policy S7
STRATEGIC POLICY S7 – PROTECTING AND ENHANCING COMMUNITY ASSETS	PS1885	1101348	Education & Skills Funding Agency									The ESFA strongly supports strategic policy S7 (protecting and enhancing community assets). The ESFA supports the approach to developer contributions set out in the Council’s Planning Obligations SPD. The ESFA recommends that the Planning Obligations SPD be updated alongside the Local Plan to ensure the wording on schools is consistent with the new site allocations and to bring together these key points into one document.
STRATEGIC POLICY S7 – PROTECTING AND ENHANCING COMMUNITY ASSETS	PS1949	927695	Redrow Homes								Yes	This policy is largely “consistent with National policy”, save and except the last sentence, insofar as the NPPF does not provide for such “protection” unless robustly justified and evidenced. Notwithstanding the above point, our Client’s emerging proposals accord fully with the wider Policy S7 objectives.
5.35	PS996	1156883	Theatres Trust	Yes	Yes	Yes					No	To increase the robustness of this policy and to remove doubt as to the types of facilities to which the policy applies, the Trust would recommend the addition of D2 and Sui Generis alongside D1.
5.36	PS997	1156883	Theatres Trust	Yes	Yes	Yes					No	The Trust welcomes and supports the protection of facilities.
STRATEGIC POLICY S8 – HOUSING AND EMPLOYMENT REQUIREMENTS	PS510	1146480	Aquila Developments Ltd	Yes	Yes	No	•	•		•	Yes	The Local Plan’s provision for new business employment floorspace is insufficient to deliver the 725 jobs per annum target and allocations are not flexible enough. The plan fails to plan sufficiently proactively to meet the development needs of business in accordance with the NPPF and is inconsistent with the Council’s own Economic Development Strategy.
STRATEGIC POLICY S8 – HOUSING AND EMPLOYMENT REQUIREMENTS	PS585	1096002	Basildon Borough Council									BBC welcomes removal of 20% supply buffer limited to CCC housing needs. BBC withdraws its previous objection in relation to this matter and it is satisfied that CCC has taken a more robust and sound approach to ensuring housing needs can be met within the area, BBC supports the approach CCC are taking in seeking to provide 1 additional Gypsy and Traveller pitch above their identified need. BBC have established that the identified need (for G&T sites) can be met within the Basildon Borough and are no longer seeking any help from neighbouring authorities. In terms of employment, BBC remains supportive of the approach CCC has taken to identifying its employment land needs and job requirements and its proposed spatial strategy for accommodating them.
STRATEGIC POLICY S8 – HOUSING AND EMPLOYMENT REQUIREMENTS	PS668	347754	Castle Point Council									CPBC welcomes the City Council’s commitment to an early review of its plan, having regard to the housing needs of the wider area under the “duty to cooperate”. The CPBC supports the approach which City Council is taking in seeking to provide 1 additional Gypsy and Traveller pitch above identified need. The CPBC raises no objections in relation to the proposed strategy for meeting employment land needs and job requirements and its proposed spatial strategy for accommodating them. See also PS669, PS670, PSSA12, PSHRA8.
STRATEGIC POLICY S8 – HOUSING AND EMPLOYMENT REQUIREMENTS	PS991	1156838	Uttlesford District Council	Yes	Yes	Yes					No	UDC supports the pre-submission version of the Plan. UDC agrees with and supports strategic priority 2 and strategic policy S8, which together set out how Chelmsford will meet the full objectively assessed housing need (OAHN) for the period 2013-2036. These set out the OAHN for Chelmsford as being 18,515 new homes, and then set out a housing supply of 21,893 homes to meet the need. The commitment in paragraph 6.6, to keep new housing numbers under review and to have regard to the Duty to Co-operate is also supported.
STRATEGIC POLICY S8 – HOUSING AND EMPLOYMENT REQUIREMENTS	PS1106	1157068	Croudace Homes	Yes	Yes	No		•	•	•	Yes	The total housing supply identified in Strategic Policy S8, which equates to 21,893 dwellings for 2013-2036 or 19,805 dwellings for 2016-2036, is insufficient. In turn, this renders Strategic Policy S8 unsound, on the basis that it is not justified (i.e. the most appropriate strategy when considered against the reasonable alternatives), effective (i.e. deliverable over the plan period) or consistent with national policy generally. Requests that the “New Local Plan Allocations” and “Total” figures in Strategic Policy S8 are each increased by 625 dwellings. This will future proof the Local Plan and ensure that it can address both the current OAHN requirement for 2013-2036 and the potential future housing needs arising from the new standardised methodology for 2016-2036 (including any shortfall in delivery for 2013-2016 and an up to 5% uplift in housing need for 2026-2036). The plan should also explicitly consider meeting unmet needs from other authorities, notably to the south of Chelmsford.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
STRATEGIC POLICY S8 – HOUSING AND EMPLOYMENT REQUIREMENTS	PS1099	973857	Persimmon Homes Essex	Yes		No	•				Yes	Chelmsford City Council considers its housing requirement for the plan period to be 18,515 net new dwellings and are planning for 21,893 new homes. The inclusion of a 20% buffer on housing need is welcomed but the OAN ‘starting point’ should be higher. The draft ‘Standard Methodology’ indicates that Chelmsford should accommodate 980 homes per annum as its starting point. See also attachment which contains all the representations from this consultee.
STRATEGIC POLICY S8 – HOUSING AND EMPLOYMENT REQUIREMENTS	PS1100	973857	Persimmon Homes Essex	Yes		No		•			Yes	To ensure the plan is effective it must be deliverable over the plan period. The very high delivery rates on strategic sites need to be justified by the Council as these levels do not appear to be borne out by past experience and delivery may be delayed. Undersupply can be offset with the allocation of additional sites that will be deliverable within the plan period including former EC3 ‘Land South and West of Broomfield Place and Broomfield Primary School’. See also attachment which contains all the representations from this consultee.
STRATEGIC POLICY S8 – HOUSING AND EMPLOYMENT REQUIREMENTS	PS1149	1157118	Rochford District Council	Yes	Yes	Yes						Rochford District Council supports the approach to meeting housing need, provisions for an additional 20% buffer and the commitment to an early review of the plan. The Council makes no objection in principle to the proposed spatial strategy, but it would like to reiterate the need to consider the wider impacts of the planned growth on neighbouring authority areas, including Rochford District, and that Chelmsford City Council should satisfy itself and a Planning Inspector that it has considered all reasonable alternative options, including the Green Belt. Rochford District Council raises no objections to Chelmsford City Council’s assertion that its Duty to Co-operate has been fulfilled, and would like to reiterate the need to continue the close working relationship between neighbouring authorities to allow for effective strategic planning to continue into the future.
STRATEGIC POLICY S8 – HOUSING AND EMPLOYMENT REQUIREMENTS	PS1150	1157118	Rochford District Council	Yes	Yes	Yes						Rochford District Council supports the approach to meeting identified needs for additional Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople accommodation and highlights the need for continued close and effective working on Gypsy and Traveller accommodation across Essex, through the Essex Planning Officers’ Association and other strategic planning groups. Rochford District Council raises no objections to Chelmsford City Council’s assertion that its Duty to Co-operate has been fulfilled, and would like to reiterate the need to continue the close working relationship between neighbouring authorities to allow for effective strategic planning to continue into the future.
STRATEGIC POLICY S8 – HOUSING AND EMPLOYMENT REQUIREMENTS	PS1151	1157118	Rochford District Council		Yes	Yes						Rochford District Council supports Chelmsford City Council’s proposed approach to planning for employment and jobs, particularly the priority given to the use of previously developed land in more sustainable locations and the focus given to siting employment areas in locations with higher standard infrastructure and public transport. Rochford District Council raises no objections to Chelmsford City Council’s assertion that its Duty to Co-operate has been fulfilled, and would like to reiterate the need to continue the close working relationship between neighbouring authorities to allow for effective strategic planning to continue into the future.
STRATEGIC POLICY S8 – HOUSING AND EMPLOYMENT REQUIREMENTS	PS1155	1157118	Rochford District Council	Yes	Yes	Yes						Rochford District Council raises no objection to Chelmsford City Council’s approach to houseboats and liveaboards, provided that it fully considers and satisfies itself and a Government Inspector that its strategy and policy approach is justified. Rochford District Council raises no objections to Chelmsford City Council’s assertion that its Duty to Co-operate has been fulfilled, and would like to reiterate the need to continue the close working relationship between neighbouring authorities to allow for effective strategic planning to continue into the future.
STRATEGIC POLICY S8 – HOUSING AND EMPLOYMENT REQUIREMENTS	PS1157	1157030	Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	The plan is not sound because the Council underestimates housing need. The 2016 OAHN is not a robust source of evidence and the proposed figure of 805dpa should not be used as the OAN for the district. The Council should use the standardised methodology and the housing need figure of 980dpa equating to a minimum of 22,540 net new home over the plan period. This is further supported by Appendix 7 of the attachment (Representations to the Chelmsford Local Plan Submission Draft) by RPS. The Table in Part 7 of Policy S8 to be replaced with Table 7.1 in Appendix 6 of the attachment.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
STRATEGIC POLICY S8 – HOUSING AND EMPLOYMENT REQUIREMENTS	PS1269	872955	Hammonds Estates LLP	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	Plan does not comply fully with the requirements of paragraph 14, 17, 47 and 182 of the NPPF, and related paragraphs in the consultation draft NPPF, in that it does not meet the full, objectively assessed needs (OAN) of the plan area. HEst objects to the identified OAN, which should be higher for the following reasons - Uncertainty regarding the level of employment growth that CCC is planning for and the implications of this for housing need - Disparities in the employment evidence as to the forecast job growth figures - Clarification is required in respect of the reduction in the level of employment growth between the Issues and Options consultation and that contained in the Preferred Options Consultation Draft (POCD) and PSD - The level of commuting containment in relation to the housing market area is unsound - The potential for future headship rates in younger age groups to change in a different way to that suggested by the DCLG projections, since it is accepted that recent socio-economic factors have constrained household formation and the projections may be carrying forward these constraints - The implications of outward migration from London in future - Exclusion of single under 35-year olds from the affordable housing need assumptions, - A need to increase the level of housing supply now in order to meet the proposed annual requirement. HEst supports the need for additional employment space in Chelmsford. Although Plan need to provide sufficient housing, that is available, affordable and attractive to employees and provides a genuine choice in terms of the types of housing provided to support economic growth. Should be recognition of the opportunity to co-locate housing and employment around commuter hubs to enable workers to reduce their reliance upon the private motor car and encourage greater use of walking, cycling, buses and trains, reducing commuter miles. A higher OAN figure is required.
STRATEGIC POLICY S8 – HOUSING AND EMPLOYMENT REQUIREMENTS	PS1377	1102437	The Russell Family	Yes	Yes	No			•	•	Yes	The starting point for housing requirement in Policy S8 should be 19,600 dwellings as per the standard methodology outlined in the Sep 2017 White Paper. This should be increased to 23,176 through the application of the 18% flexibility allowance.
STRATEGIC POLICY S8 – HOUSING AND EMPLOYMENT REQUIREMENTS	PS1485	972052	Mr John Whitlock			No	•	•	•	•	Yes	NPPF requires LPA's to deliver the OAHN figure and pushes them further for (excessive) 20% plussage. Para 6.10 is not based on OAHN. Object to soundness of SGS2. Excessive proposals are overwhelming for rural areas & villages. The policy allowance of 100hpy is an under provision, adjusting the windfall quota would eliminate the case for SGS2 See rep for text amendment suggestions.
STRATEGIC POLICY S8 – HOUSING AND EMPLOYMENT REQUIREMENTS	PS1548	1158676	Crest Strategic Projects Ltd	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•	•		The Crest objection relates to - the evidence base justifying the need to allocate 24 TSP plots in the period to 2036 - the number of TSP plots allocated to each strategic site - the spatial distribution of TSP plots across the City Council area - whether a plot within a strategic allocation meets the aspirations of those looking for a TSP plot.
STRATEGIC POLICY S8 – HOUSING AND EMPLOYMENT REQUIREMENTS	PS1526	308172	Braintree District Council									BDC consider the LP to be legally compliant, agrees that the requirements of the DTC have been met and considers the LP to be sound. BDC supports Chelmsford's commitment through the Local Plan to meet its objectively assessed housing need in full and supports the proposed settlement strategy which seeks to locate development in the most sustainable locations. BDC looks forward to continued joint work and cooperation under the DTC (See also PS1527, PS1528)
STRATEGIC POLICY S8 – HOUSING AND EMPLOYMENT REQUIREMENTS	PS1532	976647	Tendring District Council									Policy S8 of the Chelmsford City Publication Draft Local Plan sets out how the City Council will deliver the full identified need for housing, traveller sites and employment land. The District Council supports this principle and its accompanying policy.
STRATEGIC POLICY S8 – HOUSING AND EMPLOYMENT REQUIREMENTS	PS1629	1159743	Gladman Developments Ltd	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	Based on the findings of the Barton Willmore Critique (appendix 1 of the attached report 1159743PS-A, believe the OAN and housing target of 805dpa provides an underestimate of the full OAN.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
STRATEGIC POLICY S8 – HOUSING AND EMPLOYMENT REQUIREMENTS	PS1659	1159875	Home Builders Federation			No					Yes	Agree with approach taken to establishing OAN. Government’s consultation “Planning for the Right Homes in the Right Places” has now provided LPAs with an indication as to what it considers a reasonable uplift. In addition there is likely to be pressure on authorities in the wider south east, such as Chelmsford, due to London’s failure to meet its housing targets. Suggest that an uplift of 20% is insufficient. The Council should consider a higher uplift more in line with the Government’s expectations of what can be considered a reasonable response to market signals. This would enable both demographic needs to be met as well as stabilising markets in order to improve affordability. Timescales for the delivery of sites be regularly reviewed with the option of bringing forward other sites which would be deliverable within the plan period. Travelling Show People sites should not be provided on strategic residential development sites and alternative sites should be found.
STRATEGIC POLICY S8 – HOUSING AND EMPLOYMENT REQUIREMENTS	PS1647	1159803	Mr James Whitlock			No	•	•	•	•	No	Housing target is too high. 20% buffer should not be applied, should be 6% Rural areas and villages have to deliver Chelmsford's expansion ambitions.
STRATEGIC POLICY S8 – HOUSING AND EMPLOYMENT REQUIREMENTS	PS1658	1159886	Mr Oliver Whitlock			No	•	•	•	•	No	The housing target figures are excessive for Chelmsford against the NPPF objectives and policies. Policy S8 adds nearly 20% more homes than the objectively assessed need - this excess is too much for the rural areas & villages that surround Chelmsford. The windfall allowance would deliver another 700 homes over the plan period which would not require allocations. Policy should be amended so the housing target and buffer against the OAHN is lower. Windfall allowances should be increased.
STRATEGIC POLICY S8 – HOUSING AND EMPLOYMENT REQUIREMENTS	PS1707	866622	Stonebond Properties Ltd			No	•	•	•	•	Yes	Strategic Policy S8 is supported. Local Plan should allocate sufficient smaller sites that can be delivered in the short-term, such as the promoted site (CFS154).
STRATEGIC POLICY S8 – HOUSING AND EMPLOYMENT REQUIREMENTS	PS1772	1160028	Seven Capital Plc	No		No	•			•	Yes	Objection is raised to Draft Policy 8 on the basis that it has neither been positively prepared, nor is it consistent with national policy due the LPA’s failure to apply the housing figures from the Government’s standard methodology.
STRATEGIC POLICY S8 – HOUSING AND EMPLOYMENT REQUIREMENTS	PS1813	1160052	North West Parishes Group									Concern regarding OAHN figures. Plan should identify further sites that will assist in meeting the revised target due to the change in national calculation of housing needs. CCC need to identify sustainable means of achieving OAHN and feel this will rely on delivery on infrastructure. Concern for meeting OAHN in areas that will be affected by increased congestion - they refer to their traffic report for support. Suggest HF, Boreham, Rettendon and Howe Green for development
STRATEGIC POLICY S8 – HOUSING AND EMPLOYMENT REQUIREMENTS	PS1806	376006	Boxford (Suffolk) Holdings Ltd			No		•	•	•	Yes	Support Policy S8. More development should be allocated to Galleywood.
STRATEGIC POLICY S8 – HOUSING AND EMPLOYMENT REQUIREMENTS	PS1825	1160052	North West Parishes Group									20% buffer could be a risk as, if the plan cannot adapt to a new housing figure there could be unsuitable patterns of growth. LP should identify additional land that can help meet targets - eg. land around the A12.
STRATEGIC POLICY S8 – HOUSING AND EMPLOYMENT REQUIREMENTS	PS1853	1160357	Brentwood Borough Council	Yes	Yes	Yes						Support spatial strategy and strategic policies. Supports addressing the need for flexible planning with 20% uplift and allocation of G&T pitches. Support plan reviews within 3 years of adoption. Welcomes opportunity to continue working with CCC. Supports LP, considers it compliant and sound.
STRATEGIC POLICY S8 – HOUSING AND EMPLOYMENT REQUIREMENTS	PS1856	927684	Hopkins Homes			Yes					Yes	Imperative that LP meets OAN. NPPF development needs are to met with sufficient flexibility to adapt to change - particularly the change to NPPF housing calculations. Plan should contain flexibility to allow for fewer homes coming forward through as windfall than estimated

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
STRATEGIC POLICY S8 – HOUSING AND EMPLOYMENT REQUIREMENTS	PS1864	873321	Eastern Approaches Investments Ltd			No	•	•	•		Yes	Although in support of Policy S8 and the future provision of employment space, our clients also agree that the employment needs expressed by Chelmsford City Council should be a minimum and further sites should be allocated if such sites are sustainable and deliverable. The allocation of the site at Farrow Road, Widford would provide a further 1.6ha of developable employment space which would in turn provide a considerable number of jobs.
STRATEGIC POLICY S8 – HOUSING AND EMPLOYMENT REQUIREMENTS	PS1871	1160380	Mrs Barbara Blouet			No	•	•	•	•	No	Housing target is excessive. Green Belt, Green Wedges, flood plains etc should moderate housing growth. 20% uplift not necessary and should be removed. Too many houses for the available infrastructure.
STRATEGIC POLICY S8 – HOUSING AND EMPLOYMENT REQUIREMENTS	PS1866	1160377	Sue Whitlock			No	•	•	•	•	No	The housing target figures are excessive for Chelmsford. Reduce figure by deducting windfall number, to reduce allocations on greenfield sites - 700 over the plan period.
STRATEGIC POLICY S8 – HOUSING AND EMPLOYMENT REQUIREMENTS	PS1924	927695	Redrow Homes								Yes	CCC should seek to increase buffer on OAN to 20%, land for 325 more dwellings would need to be identified.
STRATEGIC POLICY S8 – HOUSING AND EMPLOYMENT REQUIREMENTS	PS1937	873301	Cliffords Ltd			No		•	•	•	Yes	Policy S8 is supported, housing needs should be expressed as a minimum. Timing of delivery is also relevant and it is important to ensure a five year housing land supply is always in place. The emerging revised NPPF emphasises the importance of small sites which should be at least 20% of allocated sites. Many of the allocated sites are large strategic developments which will take a long time to deliver. Land at Saxon Way is a smaller site which can be delivered relatively quickly. See also attachments including a concept plan for the above site (873301PS-B) and an appeal statement concerning a housing site on farmland in Tendring allowed on appeal (873301PS-A).
STRATEGIC POLICY S8 – HOUSING AND EMPLOYMENT REQUIREMENTS	PS1950	927695	Redrow Homes								Yes	Residential OAHN figure of 805 dpa does not fully meets the Council's housing needs. It is considered that this is more reflected by the figure set out in the Government's proposed standardised methodology for assessing housing needs (i.e. 980 dpa). Do not necessarily object to this figure in the light of the Council's proactive and positive steps taken to add a further 20% supply figure above its OAHN position for allocation purposes.
STRATEGIC POLICY S8 – HOUSING AND EMPLOYMENT REQUIREMENTS	PS1899	1097460	Legal & General			No		•		•	Yes	In summary, the proposed designation of the site within an Employment Area does not provide flexibility to adapt to change and is not consistent with Paragraph 22 of the NPPF which seeks to avoid the unnecessary blanket protection of sites. In addition, the Council's assessment of local housing need is not justified and results in a housing target which is not positively prepared. Overall the Plan is not considered to be consistent with national policy and is therefore considered to be unsound. We consider that additional housing supply will need to be identified and, in this regard, consider that the site at Bilton Road Industrial Estate could make a significant contribution to meeting local housing needs and should therefore be identified accordingly within the Plan. Whilst it is considered that, in light of the above, the Plan should not proceed to Examination in its current form, should the examination proceed, we reserve the right to appear at the Examination in Public should we wish to do so.
STRATEGIC POLICY S8 – HOUSING AND EMPLOYMENT REQUIREMENTS	PS1970	865003	Larmar Engineering			No	•	•	•		Yes	Support Policy S8. Local Plan should allocate sufficient smaller sites, such as the promoted site, which can be delivered in the short term.
STRATEGIC POLICY S8 – HOUSING AND EMPLOYMENT REQUIREMENTS	PS1974	1160532	Mr Michael Kirkham	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	There is a shortfall and need for student accommodation. Strategic Policy S8 should be amended to include identifying the requirements for Student Housing during the plan period and recognise that sustainable sites like the Rivermead Industrial Estate represent an appropriate location.
STRATEGIC POLICY S8 – HOUSING AND EMPLOYMENT REQUIREMENTS	PS1979	669941	Lloyds Bank SF Nominees Ltd	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	It is considered that the wording of Strategic Policy S8 should be updated as identified in CAPS: "Provision is made to meet the need for additional convenience retail floorspace of 11,500sqm either within the City Centre or Designated Centres OR ACCESSIBLE LOCATIONS within Chelmsford's Urban Area and additional convenience retail floorspace of 1,900sqm at South Woodham Ferrers."

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
STRATEGIC POLICY S8 – HOUSING AND EMPLOYMENT REQUIREMENTS	PS2038	1097203	Bovis Homes Ltd	Yes	Yes	No		•	•		Yes	OAHN in particular identified a failure to incorporate necessary adjustments to take account of the following factors: · Migration patterns; · Suppressed housing formation rates; · Insufficient market signals uplift; · Housing and employment growth alignment; and · Affordable housing need. CCC's Housing Trajectory places an over-reliance on delivery from sites located at North East Chelmsford, and contains unrealistic assumptions regarding the quantity and timing of completions that will be achievable. To maintain a 20% buffer in housing supply, meet national formula for assessing housing need, provision should be identified a further 2,000 dwellings. It is important that CCC starts planning for this now given its dependence on large strategic sites that are not likely to be delivering on a significant scale until well in to the Plan period. Therefore, it is vital that CCC now undertakes a full Green Belt Review to identify how future growth and increased housing needs can be accommodated sustainably and in a balanced manner. Policy S8 is not sound because it is not “justified”, nor is it “effective” because it does not offer a strategy that will deliver the overall amount of housing provision required in the Local Plan, nor will it be capable of delivery at the timescales envisaged due to an overreliance on housing delivery in North East Chelmsford. Proposed amendments to Policy S8: i) A higher housing provision figure is identified to take account of the adjustments necessary to the identified OAHN; ii) Reductions are made to identified housing delivery rates and timescales for allocations at North East Chelmsford; and iii) A 20% housing delivery buffer is retained, and housing provision made elsewhere in the Borough to bridge the gap in supply.
STRATEGIC POLICY S8 – HOUSING AND EMPLOYMENT REQUIREMENTS	PS2048	312318	Cogent Land	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	The Council's housing need evidence continues to underestimate the resultant additional need arising from London. Council needs to explore the Government's transitional arrangements in the NPPF for housing delivery and the potential impact on the Local Plan strategic site delivery.
STRATEGIC POLICY S8 – HOUSING AND EMPLOYMENT REQUIREMENTS	PS2073	965497	New Hall Properties (Eastern) Ltd			No	•	•			Yes	To maximise flexibility in delivery and to significantly boost housing supply over the Plan period, NHP would endorse CCC requiring its Plan to have regard to the Government's proposed standard methodology housing figures. If CCC were to pursue this course of action, it is considered that in this scenario the allocation of this Site for residential development would make a valuable and sustainable contribution towards meeting this housing requirement.
6.2	PS1158	1157030	Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	There are a number of flaws in the Council's current approach towards the calculation of OAN. A housing need figure of 980dpa should be used which leads to the need for additional housing being allocated within the plan. The proposed Galleywood Road site is a sustainable urban extension for up to 200 homes. Refer to the attachment (Representations to the Chelmsford Local Plan Submission Draft) by RPS which details the flaws in the Council's approach to the calculation of OAN and the case for the proposed site. The supporting paragraphs to New Homes needs to state that there are “exceptional circumstances” warranting the amendment to the Green Belt boundary to meet the identified need and to comply with the NPPF.
6.2	PS1159	1157030	Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	There are a number of flaws in the Council's current approach towards the calculation of OAN. Our assessment concludes that a housing need figure of 980dpa should be used as opposed to the proposed figure of 805dpa which leads to the need for additional housing being allocated within the plan. The proposed Galleywood Road site is a sustainable urban extension which would provide up to 200 homes. Refer to the attachment (Representations to the Chelmsford Local Plan Submission Draft) by RPS which details the flaws in the Council's approach to the calculation of OAN and the case for the proposed site.
6.2	PS1673	309174	Mr Graham Pooley									Support additional housing provision over the requirement. The necessary infrastructure must be in place to support developments. There needs to be more smaller family homes and bedsits with shared facilities provided. Too often affordable homes are sacrificed due to viability issues.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
6.3	PS1270	872955	Hammonds Estates LLP	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	Plan does not comply fully with the requirements of paragraph 14, 17, 47 and 182 of the NPPF, and related paragraphs in the consultation draft NPPF, in that it does not meet the full, objectively assessed needs (OAN) of the plan area. HEst objects to the identified OAN, which should be higher for the following reasons - Uncertainty regarding the level of employment growth that CCC is planning for and the implications of this for housing need - Disparities in the employment evidence as to the forecast job growth figures - Clarification is required in respect of the reduction in the level of employment growth between the Issues and Options consultation and that contained in the Preferred Options Consultation Draft (POCD) and PSD - The level of commuting containment in relation to the housing market area is unsound - The potential for future headship rates in younger age groups to change in a different way to that suggested by the DCLG projections, since it is accepted that recent socio-economic factors have constrained household formation and the projections may be carrying forward these constraints - The implications of outward migration from London in future - Exclusion of single under 35-year olds from the affordable housing need assumptions, - A need to increase the level of housing supply now in order to meet the proposed annual requirement. HEst supports the need for additional employment space in Chelmsford. Although Plan need to provide sufficient housing, that is available, affordable and attractive to employees and provides a genuine choice in terms of the types of housing provided to support economic growth. Should be recognition of the opportunity to co-locate housing and employment around commuter hubs to enable workers to reduce their reliance upon the private motor car and encourage greater use of walking, cycling, buses and trains, reducing commuter miles. A higher OAN figure is required.
6.4	PS1160	1157030	Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	Although there is broad agreement regarding the methodology for the calculation of affordable housing need, RPS would expect the Council to update its evidence to align with the latest population and household projections. Refer to the attachment (Representations to the Chelmsford Local Plan Submission Draft by RPS, paras 4.27-4.28 and 5.25-5.26 and 6.3).
6.5	PS1162	1157030	Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	The plan is not sound because the Council underestimates housing need. The 2016 OAHN is not a robust source of evidence and the proposed figure of 805dpa should not be used as the OAN for the district. The Council should use the standardised methodology and the housing need figure of 980dpa. This is further supported by Appendix 7 of the attachment (Representations to the Chelmsford Local Plan Submission Draft) by RPS.
6.5	PS1271	872955	Hammonds Estates LLP	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	Plan does not comply fully with the requirements of paragraph 14, 17, 47 and 182 of the NPPF, and related paragraphs in the consultation draft NPPF, in that it does not meet the full, objectively assessed needs (OAN) of the plan area. HEst objects to the identified OAN, which should be higher for the following reasons - Uncertainty regarding the level of employment growth that CCC is planning for and the implications of this for housing need - Disparities in the employment evidence as to the forecast job growth figures - Clarification is required in respect of the reduction in the level of employment growth between the Issues and Options consultation and that contained in the Preferred Options Consultation Draft (POCD) and PSD - The level of commuting containment in relation to the housing market area is unsound - The potential for future headship rates in younger age groups to change in a different way to that suggested by the DCLG projections, since it is accepted that recent socio-economic factors have constrained household formation and the projections may be carrying forward these constraints - The implications of outward migration from London in future - Exclusion of single under 35-year olds from the affordable housing need assumptions, - A need to increase the level of housing supply now in order to meet the proposed annual requirement. HEst supports the need for additional employment space in Chelmsford. Although Plan needs to provide sufficient housing, that is available, affordable and attractive to employees and provides a genuine choice in terms of the types of housing provided to support economic growth. Should be recognition of the opportunity to co-locate housing and employment around commuter hubs to enable workers to reduce their reliance upon the private motor car and encourage greater use of walking, cycling, buses and trains, reducing commuter miles. A higher OAN figure is required.



Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
6.6	PS1163	1157030	Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	The plan is not sound because the Council have not correctly assessed the true housing needs of the borough. Consideration should be given to accommodating unmet housing need from London, which should be evidenced and quantified. Refer also to para 3.18 and 4.29-4.30 of the attachment (Representations to the Chelmsford Local Plan Submission Draft) by RPS.
6.6	PS1881	656512	Greater London Authority									Points to information source for London's housing need, for info. Attachment - PO reps for info (from PO1649)
6.7	PS1164	1157030	Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	The plan is not sound because the Council have not correctly assessed the true housing needs of the borough. RPS supports the Council's view that the standardised methodology should be used, but does not agree with how this is translated into the plan and when the Council should be planning for the new figures. See Appendix 7 of the attachment (Representations to the Chelmsford Local Plan Submission Draft by RPS). The supporting paragraphs to the Housing Need section should state that there are "exceptional circumstances" warranting the amendment to the Green Belt boundaries to meet the identified need and to comply with the NPPF.
6.8	PS1165	1157030	Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	The plan is not sound because the Council have not correctly assessed the true housing needs of the borough. The paragraphs need to be amended so as to reflect a more realistic assessment of • housing need over the plan period 6-10 and 11-15 years • housing supply over the plan period 6-10; and 11-15 years supply as given in section 3 of the attachment (Representations to the Chelmsford Local Plan Submission Draft by RPS).
6.8	PS1272	872955	Hammonds Estates LLP	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	The government has confirmed that it is bringing forward a standard methodology for housing need assessment in the NPPF consultation and associated guidance. Both the current and draft NPPFs identifies a need for plans to be "sufficiently flexible to adapt to rapid change". Should CCC be required to use the standard methodology, flexibility and resilience must be retained in the plan in order to plan for change and significantly boost housing supply. Accordingly, the council's intention to provide 20% more homes that the OAN must not be lost.
6.8	PS1925	927695	Redrow Homes								Yes	New government standard methodology should be being used. CCC should seek to increase OAN buffer to 20%. Additional land ought to be identified by CCC to ensure flexibility in terms of meeting housing needs.
6.9	PS1166	1157030	Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	The plan is not sound because the Council have not correctly assessed the true housing needs of the borough. RPS supports the Council's view that the standardised methodology should be used, but does not agree with how this is translated into the plan and when the Council should be planning for the new figures. See Appendix 7 of the Representations to the Chelmsford Local Plan Submission Draft by RPS.
6.10	PS1167	1157030	Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	The plan is not sound because the Council have not correctly assessed the true housing needs of the borough. The 2016 OAHN is not a robust source of evidence and the proposed figure of 805dpa should not be used as the OAN for the district. The Council should use the standardised methodology and the housing need figure of 980dpa. This is further supported by Appendix 7 of the attachment (Representations to the Chelmsford Local Plan Submission Draft) by RPS. The supporting paragraphs to Housing Supply needs to state that there are "exceptional circumstances" warranting the amendment to the Green Belt boundaries to meet the identified need and to comply with the NPPF.
6.11	PS1168	1157030	Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	The plan is not sound because the Council have not correctly assessed the true housing needs of the borough. This is further supported by Appendix 7 of the attachment (Representations to the Chelmsford Local Plan Submission Draft) by RPS.
6.12	PS1169	1157030	Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	The plan is not sound because the Council have not correctly assessed the true housing needs of the borough. This is further supported by Appendix 7 of the attachment (Representations to the Chelmsford Local Plan Submission Draft) by RPS.
6.13	PS1170	1157030	Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	The plan is not sound because the Council have not correctly assessed the true housing needs of the borough. This is further supported by Appendix 7 of the attachment (Representations to the Chelmsford Local Plan Submission Draft) by RPS.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
6.14	PS1171	1157030	Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	The plan is not sound because the Council have not correctly assessed the true housing needs of the borough. This is further supported by Appendix 7 of the attachment (Representations to the Chelmsford Local Plan Submission Draft) by RPS. It is evident that there have been significant shortfalls in the delivery of housing in the Borough. It is acknowledged that in 2016/17 the Council exceeded its housing requirement but there is some way to go in order to demonstrate consistent performance above the targets and there is uncertainty in relation to the future provision (see Appendix 6 of the attachment).
6.15	PS1173	1157030	Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	The Council has included a number of sites within the Housing Trajectory with the delivery period 2013 – 2036. Delivery dates have not been consistently provided, and there is only a vague indication of first completions. This casts doubt over reliability. There is inconsistency between the IDP and the Local Plan regards Site 2. Based on national data and local evidence in Chelmsford, RPS considers the housing trajectory to be overly optimistic e.g. for sites 2, 5 and 5a. Refer to Appendix 6 of the Representations to the Chelmsford Local Plan Submission Draft by RPS.
6.16	PS1174	1157030	Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	The plan is not sound because the Council have not correctly assessed the true housing needs of the borough. RPS supports the Council's view that the standardised methodology should be used, but does not agree with how this is translated into the plan and when the Council should be planning for the new figures. See Appendix 7 of the Representations to the Chelmsford Local Plan Submission Draft by RPS.
6.17	PS1992	961966	Mr Alan Brunning			No	•	•	•			Area 7 SWF a travellers site will be allocated but no detail of location given. Include additional details, in terms living standards, within terms of occupancy.
6.20	PS600	1155000	Mrs Claire Thorogood		No	No	•	•	•			South Woodham Ferrers cannot be described as a 'suitable large strategic development' in which to accommodate Travelling Showpeople plots both visually or view a view to providing good transport links. This proposal should be removed from the Plan or details made public and put out for consultation.
6.27	PS813	961966	Mr Alan Brunning	No		No	•	•	•			The declared objective does not match the declared development Since 2015 retail floor space has been added, M&S simply food and COOP plus home delivery has become a way of life. The additional 4180 sqm floor space is not now required.
6.28	PS34	667417	Little Baddow Parish Council	Yes	Yes	Yes	•	•	•	•		The spatial strategy rightly concentrates development as increments to existing towns, cities and Key Service Settlements. This ensures adequate infrastructure while minimising the impact on rural areas. The approach is supported.
6.28	PS1180	1157030	Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	Insert new policy: Growth Area 1 Strategic Growth Site 4 Land at Galleywood Road, Great Baddow, Chelmsford. To provide: • Up to 200 homes (including affordable housing) • A community hub • Public Open Space, to include landscaping and ecological enhancements • A single vehicular access onto Galleywood Road • Links to existing cycle and footpath network and a new link to the adjacent open space See sections 2 & 3 of the attachment (Representations to the Chelmsford Local Plan Submission Draft by RPS)
6.28	PS1273	872955	Hammonds Estates LLP	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	Spatial strategy is unsound. Key concern is the suitability and deliverability of a number of the key strategic sites, which will not come forward in the timescales envisaged by the council. Insufficient development and choice of new homes in a range of locations. Failure to deliver is further evidenced by the historic under-performance of Beaulieu Park, and continuing uncertainty over the delivery of key infrastructure such as Beaulieu station and the North East Chelmsford Bypass. The Strategy places substantial over-reliance on development at one geographical location, delivered by one developer. South Woodham Ferrers is not suitable for major development due to its poor sustainable transport links. Focusing significant, strategic growth at Great Leighs and Broomfield (lower tier settlements, with limited facilities), is not justified nor compliant with national policy regarding sustainable development.
6.28	PS2055	1098405	The North East Chelmsford Garden Village Consortium	Yes	Yes	Yes					Yes	To be consistent with Policy S8, it should be made clear that the new homes set out within the Policy are expressed as a minimum. This could be referred to in supporting paragraph 6.28.
STRATEGIC POLICY S9 – THE SPATIAL STRATEGY	PS1222	1097127	Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd	Yes	Yes	No		•	•		Yes	The second to last paragraph of Policy S9 should be amended to remove reference to phasing, on the basis that there is no justification for a generic phasing policy linked to an arbitrary criteria of "identified need".

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
STRATEGIC POLICY S9 – THE SPATIAL STRATEGY	PS511	1146480	Aquila Developments Ltd	Yes	Yes	No	•	•		•	Yes	The Local Plan's provision for new business employment floorspace is insufficient to deliver the 725 jobs per annum target and allocations are not flexible enough. The objective of the Council's own Economic Development Strategy to identify a variety and range of sizes is not met. Employment allocations should include land at Generals Farm Boreham for B1 floorspace.
STRATEGIC POLICY S9 – THE SPATIAL STRATEGY	PS580	949517	Mrs Claire Birks (641)									Petition against development on Hammonds Farm to protect the wildlife. Hammonds Farm has been discounted twice already due to exceptional wildlife. Development should not be at the expense of ancient woodlands. Note, the webpage link features additional comments from petitioners as to why Hammonds Farm should be saved.
STRATEGIC POLICY S9 – THE SPATIAL STRATEGY	PS647	1102391	Mrs Sheena Ager			No		•				Hammonds Farm is an ideal location and should be included in the Local Plan.
STRATEGIC POLICY S9 – THE SPATIAL STRATEGY	PS684	830229	Mrs Helen Sadler									Alternative locations have not been considered or fully investigated. Hammonds Farm is better suited for existing road infrastructure, general location and proximity to the existing park and ride. Any further development to the main and connecting roads in this area is not only achievable but also beneficial to the wider public. As such this location should be considered as viable alternative location.
STRATEGIC POLICY S9 – THE SPATIAL STRATEGY	PS810	961966	Mr Alan Brunning	No		No	•	•	•			SWF is defined as a priority 1 city or town. However there will not be any funds to provide the necessary transport infrastructure to deliver this objective for SWF. Residents will be in danger of becoming 'locked in' and local unemployment will rise. The plan shows only 2 proposals for SWF. The proposed bridge across the B1012 cant be built due to the presence of the gas main water main and pylons. This is not a sustainable development
STRATEGIC POLICY S9 – THE SPATIAL STRATEGY	PS929	1155273	Leon Lallyette			No	•		•			Concern that 450 homes as an extension to Broomfield will mean the Village will become part of Chelmsford.
STRATEGIC POLICY S9 – THE SPATIAL STRATEGY	PS982	311148	Essex County Council	Yes	Yes	Yes		•			No	ECC supports the spatial strategy with regards to the implications on the highway network and overall the Pre-Submission Local Plan is compatible with sustainable movement objectives.ECC, as Highways Authority, has undertaken modelling at all stages of plan preparation, to identify the implications of the proposed strategy for the local, strategic (wide-area) road network and the likely impact at key junctions in the plan area. ECC is satisfied that modelling undertaken of the spatial strategy in the Pre Submission Plan indicates that the impacts of growth on the Chelmsford transport network can be mitigated so as not to result in any severe cumulative impact on the network.
STRATEGIC POLICY S9 – THE SPATIAL STRATEGY	PS1202	1097080	Ms Shyy Sachdev	Yes	Yes	No		•	•		Yes	The Plan as currently drafted is not justified as it as it is not considered to be the most appropriate strategy, having an over-reliance on large sites. A strategy which includes some small / medium sized sites would ensure more responsive delivery. For these reasons, the plan is not effective in terms of housing delivery over the Plan period. The Plan as currently drafted is neither justified or effective as it includes sites within the Green Wedge designation that do not perform the functions of the Green Wedge and should be allocated for residential development. The Plan should include the representation site at Rembrandt House for residential development.
STRATEGIC POLICY S9 – THE SPATIAL STRATEGY	PS1018	308038	Mr Paul Grundy	Yes	Yes	No		•	•		No	Concerns relating to overall housing numbers, but specifically in relation to the strategy chosen and locations for growth in this context. There are alternative growth approaches to those proposed that have not been given adequate consideration.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
STRATEGIC POLICY S9 – THE SPATIAL STRATEGY	PS1107	1157068	Croudace Homes	No	Yes	No		•			Yes	The SA prepared in January 2018 fails to assess all reasonable alternatives and therefore an adequate SA has not been prepared in accordance with Section 19 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and Regulation 3 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. In order to make the Local Plan legally compliant, the local authority must prepare a new SA which addresses the failures identified above and thoroughly assesses the land to the north and east of Rettendon Place. Furthermore, Strategic Policy S9 directs all major new growth to Chelmsford (City), South Woodham Ferrers (Town) and the Key Service Settlements, preventing any opportunity to renew and grow the Tier 3 “Service Settlements”. In some cases the Service Settlements could benefit from well-planned growth which could support greater critical mass, make these settlements sustainable locations in their own right and secure new infrastructure, services and facilities which are currently deficient in the local area. There is genuine planning merit in allocating land in the Chelmsford Local Plan Submission Document for a sustainable development to the north and east of Rettendon Place. This will make Strategic Policy S9 “justified” – i.e. the most appropriate strategy when considered against the reasonable alternatives – in accordance with paragraph 182 of the NPPF.
STRATEGIC POLICY S9 – THE SPATIAL STRATEGY	PS1101	973857	Persimmon Homes Essex	Yes	Yes	No	•	•			Yes	Between the PO Local Plan and the PS Local Plan, the Council has excluded a site, formerly EC3 'Land South and West of Broomfield Place and Broomfield Primary School' due to concern about ‘deliverability’. This is not supported by the evidence and the site remains deliverable. The decision-making that led to the exclusion of this site is unsound and not justified. See also attachment which contains all the representations from this consultee.
STRATEGIC POLICY S9 – THE SPATIAL STRATEGY	PS1115	1097139	Mr J Hart & Mr G Moss	Yes	Yes	Yes						Support Policy S9. Land at Newells (refer 14031_01 Site Location Plan.pdf) is highly sustainable for development of predominately affordable housing, in accordance with Green Belt exception criteria at paragraph 89 of the NPPF and Policy S9 of the Pre-Submission document, together with a proportion of starter/market homes to accord with paragraph 54 of the NPPF. The site could deliver approximately 4-6 new ‘starter homes’. The site is within a 5 minute walk of the nearest school, within half a mile of a Post Office and convenience stores, approximately 3 miles from Chelmsford Station and is well served by a frequent bus service linking the site to the City Centre and Broomfield Hospital. Land at Newells does not fulfil the Green Belt purposes as outlined in paragraph 80 of the NPPF. The character of the surrounding area is urbanised, existing built development extends beyond the site boundaries in all directions and the land does not contribute to the prevention of urban sprawl, nor does it assist in safeguarding the countryside.
STRATEGIC POLICY S9 – THE SPATIAL STRATEGY	PS1293	1157108	Campden Hill Limited	Yes	Yes	No			•	•	Yes	Modify policy SP9 by adding the following bullet point after the table: "Previously developed land within the Green Belt, located in a sustainable location, redeveloped in accordance with the NPPF, is expected to be a reliable source of housing supply during the period of the Local Plan." Five Tree Works, Great Baddow can be defined as ‘previously developed land within the green belt’.
STRATEGIC POLICY S9 – THE SPATIAL STRATEGY	PS1300	1157108	Campden Hill Limited	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•		Yes	Allocate Five Tree Works, Great Baddow as a new 'Opportunity Site' - OS1 c. This could provide for new housing and employment development on previously developed land that would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt.
STRATEGIC POLICY S9 – THE SPATIAL STRATEGY	PS1177	1157030	Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	There is a failure to adequately consider additional or alternative allocations within the Green Belt via selective release. For reasons given in sections 2 & 3 of the attachment (Representations to the Chelmsford Local Plan Submission Draft by RPS) there are exceptional circumstances to amend the Green Belt boundary to the south of the urban edge of Chelmsford for a residential mixed use development. Amend the first paragraph of the policy to make a reference to the release of land from the Green Belt to the south of Chelmsford. Sites which fall under class C2 (Site 5b) should not be included within the supply of housing land. A separate calculation of housing need is required and this has not been undertaken. See also paras 6.42-6.47 in the attachment.
STRATEGIC POLICY S9 – THE SPATIAL STRATEGY	PS1178	1157030	Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	For Growth Area 1 – Central and Urban Chelmsford add in a new location plan allocation as: Strategic Growth Site 4: Land to the south of Galleywood Road, Chelmsford. Up to 200 New Homes. For reasons given in sections 2 & 3 of the attachment (Representations to the Chelmsford Local Plan Submission Draft by RPS) there are exceptional circumstances to amend the Green Belt boundary to the south of the urban edge of Chelmsford for a residential mixed use development.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
STRATEGIC POLICY S9 – THE SPATIAL STRATEGY	PS1256	1157165	Rosehart Properties Ltd	Yes	Yes	No			•	•	Yes	BAE Site is partly within the defined Urban Area and an allocated Employment Area, and partly within the MGB. Part of the employment floorspace (i.e. 21%) and hardstanding (i.e. 39%) is located in the MGB. The main office, research and development buildings in the allocated Employment Area. Testing, laboratory and storage buildings and car parking / hardstanding areas to the west and south, and linked recreation facilities, are within the MGB. Close to Great Baddow and well-connected. In its heyday, when Marconi was fully active, the site supported up to 1,800 jobs. 42% of all floorspace is currently vacant and unused. Existing vacant floorspace on-site is not suitable or to the required standard for modern business use or what occupiers are currently looking for. Rosehart Properties and BAE Systems have a joint desire to pursue plans for a new state of the art employment building - a new high quality and purpose built facility for BAE Systems on land south of the main employment buildings. Help to retain BAE Systems in Great Baddow, beyond the end of the current leases (due to expire in 2030. In addition, wish to bring forward a comprehensive development proposal at the site, comprising: • new research, development and office facilities, including a new state of the art and high quality building for BAE Systems, as well as a potential new seedbed business centre, on land immediately south of the main employment buildings; • new residential development on the existing 'Employment Area', making use of permitted development rights where appropriate; and • local facilities, comprising a local convenience retail unit and publicly accessible open space to support the development as a whole. (See Proposed Concept Plan) For these reasons, Policy S9 should be amended to recognise the important role that brownfield sites within the Green Belt can play in meeting housing and employment needs.
STRATEGIC POLICY S9 – THE SPATIAL STRATEGY	PS1380	1102437	The Russell Family	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•		Yes	Key Service Settlements and Service Settlements within the Green Belt are sustainable locations and require new development to support schools and services. Green Belt Review should be undertaken to review land around these settlements.
STRATEGIC POLICY S9 – THE SPATIAL STRATEGY	PS1385	1102437	The Russell Family	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•		Yes	Land North of Main Road, Margaretting is suitable for development and should be allocated through the Local Plan
STRATEGIC POLICY S9 – THE SPATIAL STRATEGY	PS1463	1101449	Ms Linda Beard	No		No	•	•	•	•	Yes	I object to the use of greenfield sites for development. This will have negative impacts on mitigating climate change, flood risk, biodiversity, public access to the countryside and sustainable travel modes due to poor transport links.
STRATEGIC POLICY S9 – THE SPATIAL STRATEGY	PS1480	964426	Mrs Wendy Daden									Arguments against building near A12 are weak. Hammonds Farm should be considered as it has links to A12 and A414, focussed on walkways/cycleways taking priority, is an infrastructure led community. Development at Hammonds Farm would reduce vehicles. Hammonds Farm P&R would alleviate traffic. A12 bypass needs to be addressed. A landowner next to the A12, willing to develop and offering to work with CCC to help with the provision of the A12, should be considered.
STRATEGIC POLICY S9 – THE SPATIAL STRATEGY	PS1487	972052	Mr John Whitlock			No	•	•	•	•	Yes	SGS2 does not comply with S9. SGS2, Writtle and telephone exchange are not in Central & Urban Chelmsford. Delete SGS2 on page 60 and delete West Chelmsford allocation from this policy.
STRATEGIC POLICY S9 – THE SPATIAL STRATEGY	PS1543	1158676	Crest Strategic Projects Ltd	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	The number and distribution of TSP plots in the 5th column of the policy should be reassessed in the light of further evidence to be provided by the City Council The final sentence in the penultimate paragraph of Policy S9 should be changed to "Strategic Growth Sites will be delivered in accordance with master plans to be approved by the Council. Master plans can be agreed as part of the planning application process".
STRATEGIC POLICY S9 – THE SPATIAL STRATEGY	PS1624	1159753	Mr N Halls			No	•	•		•	Yes	Supportive of broad principles of Spatial Strategy. Object to the small number of homes that have been allocated at Bicknacre. Bicknacre is a highly sustainable location, where residents have access to a good level of services and public transport links. It is considered that the village is capable of accommodating a higher level of growth than 30 dwellings. Promoted site north of Peartree Lane should be allocated for development.
STRATEGIC POLICY S9 – THE SPATIAL STRATEGY	PS1630	1159743	Gladman Developments Ltd	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	Greater levels of growth need to be directed towards the Key Service Centres and Service settlements. Concerns regarding the deliverability of the scale of development allocated for the Chelmsford urban area. There appears to be no justification for the phasing of allocations within the plan. Object to the use of development boundaries as they are too restrictive and do not allow flexibility should there be a need to deliver additional housing.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
STRATEGIC POLICY S9 – THE SPATIAL STRATEGY	PS1603	312374	Granville Developments		Yes	No			•	•	Yes	Support S9. CCC to ensure adequate housing provision is made for rural areas. Approach in 6.34 will not meet housing needs in small settlements or provide growth. Village houses in some areas (little baddow) lie outside the defined settlement boundary. If boundaries were altered this would incorporate village housing and promote the release of small infilling. Seek inclusion of MON/00155/14 within development boundaries.
STRATEGIC POLICY S9 – THE SPATIAL STRATEGY	PS1649	1159803	Mr James Whitlock			No	•	•	•	•	No	SGS2 is within Writtle Parish, which is within the Green Belt. It is therefore not in compliance with the Spatial Strategy. SGS2 should be removed from this policy.
STRATEGIC POLICY S9 – THE SPATIAL STRATEGY	PS1689	1159923	Police, Fire & Crime Commissioner for Essex	Yes	Yes	Yes		•	•	•	Yes	Supports S9. The policy supports the identification of land at the EPHQ as suitable for development due to the fact that it is s EPHQ is substantial previously developed land with excellent connection to local neighbourhoods and the city centre.
STRATEGIC POLICY S9 – THE SPATIAL STRATEGY	PS1692	1101771	Mr Paul Hopkins	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	Service Settlements outside the Green Belt should also be provided with housing to meet local needs. Site CFS272 should be allocated for development.
STRATEGIC POLICY S9 – THE SPATIAL STRATEGY	PS1660	1159886	Mr Oliver Whitlock			No	•	•	•	•	No	The first paragraph of this policy outlines the settlement hierarchy and that development will be in the Key Service Settlements outside the Green Belt and Writtle is identified as a settlement within the Green Belt. Yet SGS 2 - West Chelmsford is wholly located within the Writtle Parish. West Chelmsford is listed under Central & Urban Chelmsford, but Writtle is not central or urban but in rural West Chelmsford. This allocation is not in compliance with the Spatial Strategy and should be deleted.
STRATEGIC POLICY S9 – THE SPATIAL STRATEGY	PS1680	964426	Mrs Wendy Daden (1316)									Petition supporting development at Hammonds Farm. Feel the site will provide better transport infrastructure and community facilities (like schools) compared with other allocations.
STRATEGIC POLICY S9 – THE SPATIAL STRATEGY	PS1702	1096679	Mrs Ann Weymouth			No						No Green Belt review has been undertaken. Locations such as Howe Green, Danbury and Rettendon have not been allocated proportionate numbers of new homes. Sites to the east of Chelmsford have been ruled out.
STRATEGIC POLICY S9 – THE SPATIAL STRATEGY	PS1708	866622	Stonebond Properties Ltd			No	•	•	•	•	Yes	Supports Strategic Policy S9 and the allocation of Broomfield as a Key Service Settlement. Promoted site (CFS154) should be allocated for development.
STRATEGIC POLICY S9 – THE SPATIAL STRATEGY	PS1709	961998	Essex County Council			No						Former 'Existing Commitment 3' as detailed in the Preferred Options Local Plan (2017) (Existing Commitment EC3 'Land South and West of Broomfield Place and Broomfield Primary School') should be reinstated into the Plan.
STRATEGIC POLICY S9 – THE SPATIAL STRATEGY	PS1771	1160030	Carter Jonas	Yes	No	No	•		•	•	Yes	CCC should consider sites CFS107 and CFS103 to deliver up to 40 dwellings. Amend S9 to make specific allocation of small sites within rural settlements. These sites should then also be reflected in the policies maps.
STRATEGIC POLICY S9 – THE SPATIAL STRATEGY	PS1725	973829	Scott Properties			No	•	•	•	•	Yes	The Plan concerns delivering improvements within serviced settlements, particularly in relation to primary schools, it does not accord with National Policy and that greater weight should be given to enhancements to education facilities. Policies should be strengthened to meet the predicted need for accommodation suitable for elderly residents in serviced settlements, through exception sites. To achieve this, suggests changes to the definition of Specialist Residential Accommodation to include the provision for age-restricted housing and; inclusion within Policy S9 – The Spatial Strategy - to reference Specialist Residential Accommodation as being an acceptable form of development to meet identified local need, alongside rural exception sites.
STRATEGIC POLICY S9 – THE SPATIAL STRATEGY	PS1809	1160052	North West Parishes Group									Consider other locations which could more suitably accommodate growth, situated around existing infrastructure and infrastructure hubs, such as around the A12 corridor (specifically Hammonds Farm, Boreham, Howe Green and Rettendon). LP to reference and reflect the demand which will result from the location of Crossrail and the potential for this to be supported by further development to the south of the City area, which would respond to this and the ongoing pressure of commuting patterns from London.
STRATEGIC POLICY S9 – THE SPATIAL STRATEGY	PS1807	376006	Boxford (Suffolk) Holdings Ltd			No		•	•	•	Yes	Our client supports Strategic Policy S9 and the allocation of Galleywood as a Key Service Centre. Promoted site (CFS197) is suitable for development.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
STRATEGIC POLICY S9 – THE SPATIAL STRATEGY	PS1826	1160052	North West Parishes Group									Concern about growth of North of Broomfield but welcomes scale down of development. Plan identifies limited development around Boreham. Concern for development in Writtle and impact on infrastructure and traffic. Considered traffic has not been adequately tested.
STRATEGIC POLICY S9 – THE SPATIAL STRATEGY	PS1844	476873	Little Waltham Parish Council			No					Yes	LP is flawed by planning excessive development in Little Waltham. Evidence in traffic report suggests it would be more beneficial to locate development closer to the A12. Concern that the lack of green belt review will result in the loss of good agricultural land. Consider Hammonds Farm, Boreham, Rettendon, Howe Green. (For breakdown of North West Parishes Group response see PS1808 - PS1832 and PS SA45 - PS SA49)
STRATEGIC POLICY S9 – THE SPATIAL STRATEGY	PS1851	873348	CJH Farming			No				•	Yes	Hamlets such as Boyton Cross should be included within the Spatial Strategy to allow for some development in these areas, such as promoted site CFS152.
STRATEGIC POLICY S9 – THE SPATIAL STRATEGY	PS1858	927684	Hopkins Homes			Yes					Yes	Identification and use of settlement hierarchy is supported. The approach will assist in directing the greatest number of dwellings to the largest settlements – settlements with the greatest number of facilities, services, employment opportunities and public transport links. The approach also helps ensure a modest level of growth is directed to smaller settlements, ensuring these communities are supported, and assisting in sustaining their vitality. The identification of Location 3a as a location for growth is supported and is considered sound.
STRATEGIC POLICY S9 – THE SPATIAL STRATEGY	PS1872	1160380	Mrs Barbara Blouet			No	•	•	•	•	No	Query Writtle allocation in relation to Policy S9 which says development will be directed to key service settlements outside the green belt - Writtle is within the Green Belt. Consider Writtle to be rural west Chelmsford, not Central & Urban Chelmsford.
STRATEGIC POLICY S9 – THE SPATIAL STRATEGY	PS1876	976073	Bellway Homes			No	•	•	•	•	Yes	Supportive of broad principles of S9. Support proportion of homes to be allocated in Gt. Leighs. Do not support the significant portion allocated to 5a - large amount in an unsustainable location, not a justified decision. Expectation that primary school will be delivered in early phases of 5a is unachievable and unrealistic. Critical that homes elsewhere in the village are constrained to the delivery of the primary school. LP fails to set out a robust strategy. Consider expanding existing primary school and developing on land north of Boreham Road and Tritton land.
STRATEGIC POLICY S9 – THE SPATIAL STRATEGY	PS1884	1101627	Gateway 120, Cirrus Land LLP, and L & Q Homes	Yes	No	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	These representations support the decision of CCC to carry out a new Local Plan and commends the Council's stated ambition to develop a Plan that aligns to the strategic objectives of other north Essex authorities. As currently drafted, the plan fails to deliver on its Strategic Priorities, nor Strategic Policy S1 which forms the basis on which the plan is founded. Land east of Braintree offers an opportunity to meet the strategic objectives of both CCC and the north Essex region as a whole, delivering a comprehensively planned urban extension to Braintree with appropriate supporting infrastructure provided on-site in combination with housing delivery. Rather than representing an isolated development with a reliance on private vehicle movements, the site represents the best opportunity to utilise both an existing principle service centre, as well as linking in to the planned spatial growth strategy for the region. In order to be considered effective in delivering its strategic objectives, the plan should be amended to consider more appropriate ways the objectively assessed needs of the region can be accommodated. A suitable alternative exists. With the Braintree District Council Section 2 Local Plan yet to undergo its Examination in Public, the Councils should take the opportunity to reassess whether the strategic development sites of both plans will effectively deliver the objectives of allocating them.
STRATEGIC POLICY S9 – THE SPATIAL STRATEGY	PS1848	377147	RWH Properties Ltd	Yes	Yes	Yes					No	Strategic Policy S9 - The Spatial Strategy, is supported, in particular to focus new housing growth in accordance with the settlement hierarchy and therefore in the first instance to the most sustainable locations within Chelmsford City. Focusing new housing development within Chelmsford City Centre, to regenerate previously developed (brownfield) land such as land to the rear of 17 to 37 Beachs Drive, accords with the approach set out within National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), and recent proposed updates to the NPPF. It is submitted that strategic policy S9, and supporting paragraph 6.37 could be strengthened through inclusion of additional words that emphasise the need to ensure that sites delivering new housing within Chelmsford City Council should maximise densities wherever possible taking into account site context and surroundings.
STRATEGIC POLICY S9 – THE SPATIAL STRATEGY	PS1868	1160377	Sue Whitlock			No	•	•	•	•	No	Questions whether allocation of SGS 2 is compliant with SP9 - Writtle is key service settlement in the green belt, policy says development will be allocated outside green belt.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
STRATEGIC POLICY S9 – THE SPATIAL STRATEGY	PS1903	312377	Miscoe Enterprises Ltd			No	•	•	•		Yes	Our principal concerns relate to the unjustified retention and protection of land within the Green Wedge, and the methodology used for the selection of Rural Employment Areas for allocation. On behalf of our client, we propose that the removal of land north of Brooklands from the Green Wedge, and designation as a Rural Employment Area, would help to ensure a ‘sound’ Chelmsford City Council Local Plan.
STRATEGIC POLICY S9 – THE SPATIAL STRATEGY	PS1915	1097127	Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd			Yes						Promoting “Garden Village Phase 2” at St Luke's Park. The delivery of Phase 2 will ensure the delivery of more new homes that Chelmsford and its residents need.
STRATEGIC POLICY S9 – THE SPATIAL STRATEGY	PS1941	873301	Cliffords Ltd			No		•	•	•	Yes	The overall approach proposed through Strategic Policy S9 and the allocation of Broomfield as a Key Service Settlement is supported and is considered sound. Land at Saxon Way, Broomfield has however been excluded. The site is adjacent to Broomfield DSB. As a small extension to the existing settlement, it has strong potential to integrate with the existing community. It is within walking distance of local facilities and with regular public transport access to the city centre. See also attachments including a concept plan for the above site (873301PS-B) and an appeal statement concerning a housing site on farmland in Tendring allowed on appeal (873301PS-A).
STRATEGIC POLICY S9 – THE SPATIAL STRATEGY	PS1951	927695	Redrow Homes								Yes	Largely consistent with National policy. Express caution at the inclusion of the suggested 1,400 dwellings from “windfalls” from 2021-2036. We support the delayed “start” of this contribution from 2021 onwards, but consider it necessary to closely monitor the actual completions from this source of supply. Support the identification of land to the East of Chelmsford as being relatively unconstrained.
STRATEGIC POLICY S9 – THE SPATIAL STRATEGY	PS1968	1160476	Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd									Chelmsford City Council have decided not to undertake a Green Belt review for this Local Plan as they consider that they will be able to provide the growth needed in non-green belt areas of the City limits, however at the first review of the Local Plan following adoption a Green Belt Review should take place. Lathcoats Farm site is a sustainable site and would be a low impact urban extension to the south of the settlement of Chelmsford. It benefits from close proximity to a number of schools, existing neighbourhood centres and community infrastructure in the immediate area as well as public transport routes and therefore should be strongly considered for residential development.
STRATEGIC POLICY S9 – THE SPATIAL STRATEGY	PS1972	865003	Larmar Engineering			No	•	•	•		Yes	Support designation of Margaretting as a Service Settlement. Green Belt should not threaten future of such settlements. Should continue to consider opportunities for amendments to the development boundaries of settlements outside of the main rural areas to prevent the stagnation of communities.
STRATEGIC POLICY S9 – THE SPATIAL STRATEGY	PS1936	1160458	Hill	Yes	Yes	No			•			The designation of Danbury as a Key Service Centre is supported. Hill supports the role of the local community in having the opportunity to determine local site selection and has been engaging with Danbury Parish Council, and the Danbury Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group since October 2016. However, it is considered appropriate that there should be some mechanism in place in the event that the production of a neighbourhood plan is delayed or aborted. In this way, the Local Plan can be efficient in dealing with the housing requirement for Danbury in all eventualities.
STRATEGIC POLICY S9 – THE SPATIAL STRATEGY	PS1980	669941	Lloyds Bank SF Nominees Ltd	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	Not considered that the need for convenience floorspace has been met through the proposed allocations. There should also be a recognition in Strategic Policy S9 that the 11,500sqm floorspace need can be met at accessible locations which are well connected to the town centre as identified in CAPS: “Previously developed sites AND ACCESSIBLE LOCATIONS in Chelmsford Urban Area”.
STRATEGIC POLICY S9 – THE SPATIAL STRATEGY	PS2022	1105298	Mrs Claire Benbrook			No				•		In order for a positively prepared approach to housing delivery to be undertaken, allocations particularly in smaller villages and hamlets should also be explored. Additional sites need to be brought forward and the proposed development on land to the north of Mill Road is considered to be a suitable development opportunity
STRATEGIC POLICY S9 – THE SPATIAL STRATEGY	PS2023	1105298	Mrs Claire Benbrook			No				•		Our client’s site is located in a sustainable location, there are no constraints on the developable area of the site and it would logically follow on from the existing development surrounding the site. In conclusion, it is considered that there is no principle reason for land north of Mill Road, North End to not be included as an allocation for housing in the emerging local plan as it would provide an appropriate and defensible boundary to the urban edge in this location. In order to enable its allocation, it is considered that the site should be removed from the proposed Green Corridor as it doesn’t meet the requirements for inclusion.



Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
STRATEGIC POLICY S9 – THE SPATIAL STRATEGY	PS2030	1160633	Genesis Housing Association	Yes	Yes	No		•				Few sites within the City Council's jurisdiction can be as sustainable as City Park West Phase 3. It has the capacity to deliver a significant volume of dwellings alongside reconfigured and enhanced open space and a significantly improved pedestrian and cycle link between Old Moulsham, Central Park and Chelmsford Station. An existing access from Parkway exists. See complete rep by Bidwells including extracts from Chelmsford TCAAP in App 3(1160633PS-A) and Development Appraisal (1160633PS-B).
STRATEGIC POLICY S9 – THE SPATIAL STRATEGY	PS2039	1097203	Bovis Homes Ltd	Yes	Yes	No		•		•	Yes	A Green Belt review should be carried out. Land could be removed from the Green Belt without harming the integrity of it. Policy S9 limits the ability of Neighbourhood Plan groups to prepare plans based on local choice - 'general conformity' does not mean they should strictly accord with LP policies. Development proposal is submitted to illustrate comments. This could deliver a new riverside park, connections to existing parks and city centre, green link to Hylands Park, land for schools, health, park & ride etc. Transport review attached also. Demonstrates access can be achieved with no major constraints, good bus access, new school drop-off to alleviate local traffic. Suggested amendments: Policy S9: “...In addition, at any of the Settlement categories, new growth sites which are in (delete: accordance) general conformity with the Local Plan Spatial Principles and Strategic Policies can be allocated through relevant Neighbourhood Plans...” The spatial strategy should be reviewed to ensure it delivers sustainable development. In this respect, land to the West of Chelmsford and South of Writtle should be included as a site allocation.
STRATEGIC POLICY S9 – THE SPATIAL STRATEGY	PS2071	965497	New Hall Properties (Eastern) Ltd			No	•	•			Yes	NHP's Site at land to the west of Seven Ash Green should be allocated for development. The Site does not currently meaningfully contribute to the Green Wedge but development of the site could improve the wider Green Wedge and its roles. The miscategorisation of the Site as 'Accessible Natural Green Space' by CCC may have resulted in an incorrect Green Wedge boundary.
Figure 8: Key Diagram	PS811	961966	Mr Alan Brunning	No		No	•	•	•	•		The road improvements to A132 and B1012 shown in appendix H are only those proposed for the Sainsburys development 14/00830. These have been shown to be infeasible no other plans are included. No plans are shown for the rail link This is not a sustainable development
Figure 8: Key Diagram	PS930	1155273	Leon Lallyette			No			•			Reconsider more development West of Chelmsford. Questions the need for the NE Bypass and suggests A414 and A1060 have more capacity to accommodate more growth than allocated. Supports the new Train Station.
Figure 8: Key Diagram	PS1182	1157030	Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	Amend the key diagram to include land south of Galleywood Road, Chelmsford - Site 4. See sections 2 & 3 of the attachment (Representations to the Chelmsford Local Plan Submission Draft by RPS)
Figure 8: Key Diagram	PS2056	1098405	The North East Chelmsford Garden Village Consortium	Yes	Yes	Yes					Yes	Figure 8 (Key Diagram) is potentially confusing and difficult to interpret through its overlapping symbols and notations. It fails to show with sufficient clarity the scope, scale and extent of the North East Chelmsford allocation, and that it also extends to the east of the Proposed Chelmsford NE Bypass alignment. It is suggested that this should be reviewed and updated to have regard to the Consortium's masterplan.
6.30	PS1550	1158676	Crest Strategic Projects Ltd	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	Crest Strategic supports the upper case text in Policy S9 'The Spatial Strategy' in relation to the allocation of 800 homes at West Chelmsford. However, it is considered that the text in paragraph 6.30 is misleading and inconsistent with Policy S9. Modify the second sentence of paragraph 6.30 to say "It does this through making the best use of previously developed land within Chelmsford Urban Area".
6.31	PS1828	1160052	North West Parishes Group									Concern for development on areas of higher graded agricultural land. Further suggest that a green belt review is needed for a more justified plan.
6.32	PS814	961966	Mr Alan Brunning	No		No	•	•	•			Area 7 SWF are at the top of the spatial hierarchy for this plan yet there will be no funding from CCC for the essential road and rail improvements
6.32	PS1274	872955	Hammonds Estates LLP	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	Spatial Strategy establishes the settlement hierarchy considering the city of Chelmsford and town of South Woodham Ferrers to be the most sustainable locations. However, South Woodham Ferrers is not suitable for major development due to its poor sustainable transport links. Focusing significant, strategic growth at Great Leighs and Broomfield (lower tier settlements, with limited facilities), is not justified nor compliant with national policy regarding sustainable development.
6.33	PS815	961966	Mr Alan Brunning			No	•	•	•	•		Area 7 SWF there is only a precautionary primary school proposed for 1000 houses. This statement is misleading and factually incorrect.
6.33	PS1396	1096887	Marie Wallis			No	•	•	•	•		The Local Plan uses language which is not easily accessible, the wording used is not clear and the document is too long.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
6.33	PS2049	312318	Cogent Land	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	The Council's overarching spatial strategy to deliver growth across all Key Service Settlements is not consistent. The Council has not considered how a more balanced approach to meeting the proposed housing need can be progressed which would also represent the best example of sustainable development.
6.34	PS1275	872955	Hammonds Estates LLP	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	Spatial Strategy establishes the settlement hierarchy considering the city of Chelmsford and town of South Woodham Ferrers to be the most sustainable locations. However, South Woodham Ferrers is not suitable for major development due to its poor sustainable transport links. Focusing significant, strategic growth at Great Leighs and Broomfield (lower tier settlements, with limited facilities), is not justified nor compliant with national policy regarding sustainable development.
6.35	PS1481	958103	Mr D Bishop	No	Yes	No		•		•	Yes	Plan 25 'Rettendon Common' should be amended to include the land to the north of Bell Court within the Defined Settlement Boundary, as is the case on the extant Plan 24 of the 2012 Site Allocation Document.
6.37	PS998	1156883	Theatres Trust	Yes	Yes	Yes					No	Recognition of Chelmsford as an important centre for leisure and cultural facilities is welcomed.
6.37	PS1276	872955	Hammonds Estates LLP	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	Strategy overly relies on the redevelopment of brownfield sites in the urban area. Can be difficult to bring forward. Concern raised on highway connectivity (see appendix 4 - Transport Representation), site assembly, marketability (not everyone wants to live in the centre) and the loss of car parking which may need to be replaced (applicable to some of the sites). Strategic Growth Site 1a - Chelmer Waterside - is reliant on third party defences that do not remove the housing from the flood risk area. No specific proposals for additional school places and healthcare capacity in the urban area as identified by the IDP. Plan is unsound and inappropriate as pursuing significant levels of development without planning for the required infrastructure to be in place as required by Policies S11 and S12. Number of sites were previously identified or part identified in the Chelmsford Town Centre Area Action Plan and will be reallocated. The AAP was adopted in 2008, given the length of time that has elapsed since these sites were allocated HEst questions how deliverable these sites are. Reallocation of these sites is not in accordance with the government's stated draft policy to ensure that housing developments are implemented in a timely manner (paragraph 78, draft NPPF). Additional development should be allocated on sustainable, deliverable greenfield land at Hammonds Farm.
6.39	PS2068	1098405	The North East Chelmsford Garden Village Consortium	Yes	Yes	Yes					Yes	Query the status and purpose of Appendix D - whether it is appropriate to include the significant extracts from a Plan that will be superseded by the new Plan and will cease to be part of the statutory development plan. Certain elements remain to be fully implemented in the period after 2021, but Appendix D contains material which is contrary, and potentially in conflict, with the approach now being proposed for the North East Chelmsford allocation. For example, Figures 17 (Landscape structure) (page 290) and 19 (North East Chelmsford Masterplanning Principles) (page 301) portray planning notations affecting land within the North East Chelmsford allocation, which are contrary to the intended masterplanning approach. The greater part of Appendix D should be removed from the PSLP.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
6.40	PS1277	872955	Hammonds Estates LLP	No	No	No	.	.	.	.	Yes	Strategy places an over reliance on delivering development at North East Chelmsford. Urban extension that has failed to deliver housing in significant numbers to date. One third of all new housing allocations to be provided in a single location - approach to delivery of development is neither justified or effective. Limits choice for home buyers and renters. North East Chelmsford has various landowners, complex negotiations both within and outside the consortium, poses significant risk to delivery of the site in the timescales suggested. There is no evidence of a collaborative agreement. Difficult to deliver and are often delayed due to landowner disputes and lack of agreement. North East Chelmsford would comprise an extension to Beaulieu Park and Channels, neither of which have yet delivered either significant levels of housing or the infrastructure required to support it. Allocating development at Hammonds Farm would reduce risk, by distributing development around the city at a location that requires significantly less infrastructure to enable it to be delivered. Beaulieu Park and Channels – delays in completion rates, development is significantly behind schedule and as a consequence development at Beaulieu Park and Channels will overlap with development at North East Chelmsford for a considerable period of time. Timescales for planning applications are optimistic particularly given the complexities associated with large-scale sites in multiple and fragmented ownership. No planning application to rephase minerals extraction at the site has been submitted. Build out rates identified are unrealistic and undeliverable given that all of this housing would be delivered in the same area and is likely to saturate the market. In contrast Hammonds Farm would be brought forward at more realistic annual delivery rates, with a maximum of 200 units per year, delivered by a number of housebuilders, including small and medium size companies, as well as volume housebuilders. Significant concerns that a number of sites in the Plan are promoted by the same developer - does not provide choice in the market, as required by the NPPF. HEst has reviewed completions on sites in Chelmsford, from information provided by CCC and ECC. This confirms that with the exception of sites at the University Campus and former Marconi Works, annual delivery rates have generally been significantly lower. Development of North East Chelmsford is reliant on proposed upgrades to junction 19 of the A12. No planning application submitted for these works. Any delays to delivery of these junction improvements will impact on the ability of North East Chelmsford to be delivered. The scale of infrastructure to be provided is considerable and is reliant, in part, on providing links to development to the south at Beaulieu Park
6.41	PS745	308795	Mr Dennis Watts	No								Suggested improvements in infrastructure is unlikely to be delivered before the huge population increase leading to more frequent severe congestion and traffic gridlock than at present. If infrastructure cannot be funded and built in time, the quantity of new housing should be greatly reduced. Hammonds Farm is likely to be far more suitable for over 3000 houses along with improvements to the A12. It is unrealistic sufficient numbers of people will choose sustainable modes of transport.
6.41	PS1829	1160052	North West Parishes Group									Concern for delivery of CNEB and the impact on the strategic site allocations. Essex Highways PO Addendum only includes the delivery of a partial scheme for the CNEB. Concern for the achievable level of growth in NE Chelmsford depending on the delivery of the CNEB.
6.42	PS1108	1157068	Croudace Homes	Yes	Yes	Yes					No	The vision for growth in South and East Chelmsford is for sites which will support and strengthen South Woodham Ferrers' important local role, help to deliver improvements to the A132 corridor and help to support village services and facilities in Bicknacre and Danbury. Supports this rationale, which could apply equally to a new growth allocation at Rettendon Place. As set out in separate representations to Strategic Policy S9, the land to the north and east of Rettendon Place could: (i) deliver a variety of new and enhanced services and facilities for the village; (ii) provide planning contributions towards improvements to the A132 corridor and the Rettendon Turnpike Junction; and, (iii) look to South Woodham Ferrers for higher order services and facilities, thereby reinforcing its important local role.
6.46	PS7	310830	Mr Stephen Parker	Yes	Yes	No				.	Yes	The proposed Gypsy site in Drakes Lane is unsuitably being remote from amenities with no public transport. It would be very dangerous especially for children and horse riders to use the narrow, unlit roads used by speeding traffic and HGVs. The Cranham Gypsy & Traveller Site is only 1 km away, there is a strong likelihood of friction especially in an area with low population but a high concentration of Gypsies. Find a site nearer amenities e.g. on Essex Regiment Way proposed in the previous Local Plan.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
STRATEGIC POLICY S10 – DELIVERING ECONOMIC GROWTH	PS607	1155857	Environment Agency	Yes	Yes	Yes						Policy could be enhanced for green infrastructure to contribute towards a multifunctional network of green infrastructure, enhance biodiversity, help wildlife adapt to climate change and contribute to protecting and enhancing water bodies. Justified reason to include further suggested wording relating to flood risk management.
STRATEGIC POLICY S10 – DELIVERING ECONOMIC GROWTH	PS1773	489452	Writtle University College	Yes	Yes	Yes					Yes	The boundary of SPA6 should be redrawn to a wider area and also cover further land holdings within Writtle University College's ownership. See attachment See also attachments for background/introduction and additional land holdings.
STRATEGIC POLICY S10 – DELIVERING ECONOMIC GROWTH	PS1852	873348	CJH Farming			No	•		•	•	Yes	Supportive of Little Boyton Hall as a Rural Employment Area, however boundaries have been drawn too tightly around existing buildings. The lack of flexibility applied to the allocation of Rural EAs demonstrates that the Local Plan has not been positively prepared and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework.
STRATEGIC POLICY S10 – DELIVERING ECONOMIC GROWTH	PS1860	312409	Strutt & Parker (Farms) Ltd			No	•	•	•		Yes	Supportive of the Council's recognition that a number of sectors contribute to the Chelmsford economy. We support the consideration of Rural Employment Areas in respect of their ability to support a number of the Strategic Objectives of the Pre-submission Local Plan. However, it is considered that the Council should not rely on the current weak methodology to exclude other existing and successful sites from allocation. Propose that there should be greater flexibility afforded to Rural Employment Areas such as Old Park Farm, through the relaxation of the proposed allocation boundaries and inclusion of potential areas for future expansion, such as a small parcel of land to the north east of the current office buildings.
STRATEGIC POLICY S10 – DELIVERING ECONOMIC GROWTH	PS1865	873321	Eastern Approaches Investments Ltd			No	•	•	•		Yes	Our client is in agreement with Policy S10 and the protection of existing employment areas being designated as Employment Areas. Although in support, our client is of the view that the Land west of Farrow Road, Widford should be considered within the existing employment area designation which is located immediately adjacent to the site at Widford Industrial Estate. The partial development of the site would round off the existing industrial area.
STRATEGIC POLICY S10 – DELIVERING ECONOMIC GROWTH	PS1880	312409	Strutt & Parker (Farms) Ltd			No	•	•	•		Yes	We are supportive of the Council's recognition that a number of sectors contribute to the Chelmsford economy. On behalf of our client, we propose that there should be greater flexibility afforded to Rural Employment Areas such as Whitbread's Business Centre, through the relaxation of the proposed allocation boundaries and inclusion of potential areas for future expansion, such as a small parcel of land to the north east of the current office buildings.
STRATEGIC POLICY S10 – DELIVERING ECONOMIC GROWTH	PS1921	312377	Miscoe Enterprises Ltd			No	•	•	•		Yes	We are supportive of the Council's recognition that a number of sectors contribute to the Chelmsford economy. Rural Employment Areas should not rely on current weak methodology to exclude other existing and successful sites from allocation. There should be further support to ensure opportunities for expansion at rural employment areas are maximised.
STRATEGIC POLICY S10 – DELIVERING ECONOMIC GROWTH	PS1926	1101991	Hill Farm Chelmsford Ltd			No	•	•	•		Yes	The assessment criteria for Rural Employment Area allocations needs to be more flexible to ensure that it is effective in supporting Chelmsford's Strategic Policies. Sites should only be allocated as Green Wedge where it can be evidenced that they positively contribute to the Green Wedge and fully perform in respect of the Green Wedge characteristics that are set out within the Green Wedges and Green Corridors: Defining Chelmsford's River Valleys Review Report February 2017. Propose the removal of land at Hill Farm, Essex Regiment Way from the Green Wedge, and the formal designation of the land, and the adjacent Old Coal Yard Rural Business Centre as a Rural Employment Area.
STRATEGIC POLICY S10 – DELIVERING ECONOMIC GROWTH	PS1935	1101991	Hill Farm Chelmsford Ltd			No	•	•	•		Yes	The Council should not rely on the current weak methodology to exclude other existing and successful sites from Rural Employment Area allocations. The draft local plan must recognise that a flexible approach should be taken to rural employment areas to ensure the local plan is effective. The lack of flexibility applied to the allocation of Rural EAs demonstrates that the Local Plan has not been positively prepared and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework.
STRATEGIC POLICY S10 – DELIVERING ECONOMIC GROWTH	PS1952	927695	Redrow Homes								Yes	This policy is considered consistent with the NPPF and our Client supports the provision for flexible and market-response allocations of employment land
STRATEGIC POLICY S10 – DELIVERING ECONOMIC GROWTH	PS2057	1098405	The North East Chelmsford Garden Village Consortium	Yes	Yes	Yes					Yes	Strategic policy S10 should contain a clear reference to the employment opportunities within the new Garden Community. Disappointment that the Plan does not promote economic development and the future needs of new and growing businesses in Chelmsford to a much greater extent.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
STRATEGIC POLICY S10 – DELIVERING ECONOMIC GROWTH	PS2088	1161039	Natural England		Yes	No					No	The principle of using previously developed (brownfield) land is welcomed but to be fully compliant with the NPPF there should be a reference to brownfield land not of high environmental value. The entire rep has been attached for completeness (1161039PS-A).
STRATEGIC POLICY S11 – INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIREMENTS	PS1223	1097127	Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd	Yes	Yes	No		•			Yes	In order to be CIL Regulation compliant, s106 requirements relating to the timing of highway improvements will need to be linked to the impact of the development, and will therefore be delivered in tandem with the build out of the development, potentially on a phased basis. The precise timing will be determined through the usual mechanism arising from more detailed highway modelling at the application stage. Request amendment of the 9th bullet point under Transport and Highways to remove the wording "as early as possible" and replace with "in tandem with the delivery of the development". A bridge is one of many options explored with ECC Highways. At this stage, it is not appropriate to specify the precise nature of any crossings to the B1012 Burnham Road, and the various options can be properly explored as part of the wider Masterplanning and/or planning application process. Request amendment of the 10th bullet point to remove the specific reference to a bridge in favour of a more rounded comment to deal with the provision of safe and convenient crossing points to the B1012.
STRATEGIC POLICY S11 – INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIREMENTS	PS342	361537	Mr Mike Otter	No		No				•	No	A multi-user bridge or traffic light controlled multi-user crossing is required over B1012 between Willow Grove and B1418 (or positioned across B1418) to make the development sustainable.
STRATEGIC POLICY S11 – INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIREMENTS	PS462	972314	Mid-Essex Business Group									Current plan has not taken sufficient note of previous comments and suggestions. Concern for lack of infrastructure, congestion. Suggest NE bypass needs to be dual carriageway; a greater orbital road joining A12/A414 should be considered; A12/A130 junction needs to be replaced; put plans in place to reduce impact on increased use of B1008; a monorail; study of how to ease congestion; improve train service; adopt a clear policy on no building on any floodplain; promote development and business growth by facilitating construction of industrial units; restrict office to residential conversions.
STRATEGIC POLICY S11 – INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIREMENTS	PS501	964859	Mr Keith Bryant			No	•	•	•			Broomfield or Chelmsford as a whole (unclear which area he is referring to) is already congested. Roads, Hospitals and Schools cannot cope as it is.
STRATEGIC POLICY S11 – INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIREMENTS	PS519	664147	Sport England	Yes	Yes	Yes						The policy is welcomed in that it includes sport, leisure and recreational facilities in the list of key infrastructure needed to support new development.
STRATEGIC POLICY S11 – INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIREMENTS	PS586	1096002	Basildon Borough Council									BBC continues to raise an objection as mitigation options have not yet been tested. BBC seek assurance from CCC that any impacts arising from growth in the Chelmsford City area, on the A130, or on the A132 as it passes through Wickford will be fully mitigated.
STRATEGIC POLICY S11 – INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIREMENTS	PS676	970996	Highways England									CCC to be mindful of the Road Infrastructure Strategy, cross border impacts and strategic rerouting. Consider noise and air quality problems. It is important that all sites are well connected to public transport. Supporting text recognises that planned growth allocated in LP will provides the opportunity to address future transport infrastructure needs.
STRATEGIC POLICY S11 – INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIREMENTS	PS669	347754	Castle Point Council									CPBC previously supported the City Council's proposed improvements to strategic transport infrastructure. In particular, support was highlighted for improvements to the A130 especially at the Fairglan Interchange with the A127/A1245. Further detail in relation to the improvements of the Fairglan Interchange have now been published by the County Council, and the Borough Council asks that the Draft Local Plan and supporting evidence base highlight this important investment.
STRATEGIC POLICY S11 – INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIREMENTS	PS683	830229	Mrs Helen Sadler									The proposed infrastructure does not support the proposed developments. Additional proposed developments will increase any road use so that it not only impacts on quality of life but is unsafe for emergency vehicles with regards to response times and journey times. With regards to Great Leighs, the CNEB not considered as part of this LP and it has been stated that it will not be delivered until after 2036. LP should be infrastructure led ECC found the roads are currently at 96% capacity and any increase to this would have a serious negative impact with regards to air quality.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
STRATEGIC POLICY S11 – INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIREMENTS	PS999	1156883	Theatres Trust	Yes	Yes	Yes					No	The Trust supports and welcomes the inclusion of cultural facilities as necessary infrastructure.
STRATEGIC POLICY S11 – INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIREMENTS	PS1154	1157118	Rochford District Council	Yes	Yes	Yes						Rochford District Council raises no objections in principle to the infrastructure improvements contained within the plan, but it would like to highlight the need to keep under consideration the impacts of the growth and infrastructure on neighbouring authority areas, including Rochford. It would particularly like to reiterate that the impacts of the proposed growth in South Woodham Ferrers, on the A130, A132 and Rettendon Turnpike, but also beyond into the Rochford District, all need to be given due consideration, and that Rochford District Council officers would like this information to be shared with them prior to works being agreed. Rochford District Council raises no objections to Chelmsford City Council's assertion that its Duty to Co-operate has been fulfilled, and would like to reiterate the need to continue the close working relationship between neighbouring authorities to allow for effective strategic planning to continue into the future.
STRATEGIC POLICY S11 – INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIREMENTS	PS1232	1100910	Anglian Water Services Ltd	Yes	Yes	Yes					No	Anglian Water is supportive of Strategic Policy S11 as it states that new development must be supported by the provision of infrastructure (including water recycling infrastructure) to serves its needs.
STRATEGIC POLICY S11 – INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIREMENTS	PS1278	872955	Hammonds Estates LLP	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	Whilst sites such as North East Chelmsford have extensive infrastructure requirements, other smaller sites are not required to provide, nor indeed could they support, due to their scale, extensive infrastructure. They do not, therefore, comply with policies S11 and S12. The Plan and evidence base acknowledges that existing infrastructure, particularly transport, education and health, has capacity issues and considerable investment is required to ensure that appropriate infrastructure is provided to meet plan needs. Given the potential issues associated with delivering the required infrastructure, the strategy is not sound. In contrast Hammonds Farm is able to deliver the infrastructure it requires, and would benefit Chelmsford and surrounding villages (see Transport representation appendix 4, Flood risk and drainage report, appendix 5, Hammonds Farm Utilities Summary Report, appendix 7 and A Vision for Hammonds Farm, appendix 8 for details).
STRATEGIC POLICY S11 – INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIREMENTS	PS1241	1157190	Claire Jones			No		•	•			LP doesn't seem to have looked into other possibilities. It is also very woolly as to how any road improvement is going to be achieved. Concern for congestion at Broomfield hospital and White Hart Lane. No "hardcore" plans for the A12. NE Bypass is nowhere near being completed.
STRATEGIC POLICY S11 – INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIREMENTS	PS1253	1157071	Bloor Homes Eastern	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•		Yes	Local Plan and IDP need to take account of CIL Regulations. The access road to the Hospital is not necessitated by the development at site 6. The education strategy should plan positively for future growth and site 6 should be reserved for a new primary school. The number of homes on site should not be constrained by educational requirements.
STRATEGIC POLICY S11 – INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIREMENTS	PS1412	308626	Mr & Mrs B & M Wood									Consider having future consultations at Springfield Library. Chelmsford does not have the infrastructure to support more homes. Hospital is struggling, roads are gridlocked. Upset that there is no tree policy within the plan. Members of Civic Society (not clear if some or all are tree wardens?) willing to help CCC devise a tree policy. Planting trees will improve air quality. Solar panels should be compulsory to all non-residential properties. Concern for lack of affordable housing. Concern public transport will never be preferred due to cost and lack of services.
STRATEGIC POLICY S11 – INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIREMENTS	PS1450	1156704	South Woodham Ferrers Town Council	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•	•		The closeness of the site to a variety of designated sites, the condition of the Crouch and Roach Estuaries which is also a core area of biodiversity and ecological importance contravenes Policy S11.
STRATEGIC POLICY S11 – INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIREMENTS	PS1464	1101449	Ms Linda Beard	No		No	•	•	•	•	Yes	I object to the priority given to road schemes over pubic transport provision. New highway infrastructure will not reduce congestion where new development is mainly reliant on car travel.
STRATEGIC POLICY S11 – INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIREMENTS	PS1479	964426	Mrs Wendy Daden									Secure funding for CNEB before considering Great Leighs. Widening the A12 from junction 19-25 proposes a bottleneck at Boreham. Make A12 a priority.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
STRATEGIC POLICY S11 – INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIREMENTS	PS1527	308172	Braintree District Council									BDC support the commitment to the provision of infrastructure in policy S11. BDC is notes that contributions from developments in Chelmsford City may be required to support schemes in BDC if this is where the impact is assessed to be. BDC would a be very supportive of improvements to ensure a joined up network of footpaths, cycle ways and bridleways and on the provision of public transport routes (See also PS1526, PS1528)
STRATEGIC POLICY S11 – INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIREMENTS	PS1567	1158815	Maldon District Council	Yes	Yes	Yes					No	Connectivity to the new Beaulieu Park rail station should be designed in such a way that it provides good access for Maldon District residents, businesses and visitors to the District. A circuitous route to the station from the A12 should be avoided.
STRATEGIC POLICY S11 – INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIREMENTS	PS1560	1158767	Transport for London									consider extending some of the Mayor’s strategic transport policy objectives to the district including the promotion of Healthy Streets, rebalancing the transport system towards walking, cycling and public transport, improving air quality and reducing road danger.
STRATEGIC POLICY S11 – INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIREMENTS	PS1631	1159743	Gladman Developments Ltd	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	The Council must ensure that these infrastructure requirements when set alongside the other requirements in the plan do not jeopardise the delivery of the local plan in terms of viability.
STRATEGIC POLICY S11 – INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIREMENTS	PS1685	1159923	Police, Fire & Crime Commissioner for Essex	Yes	Yes	Yes		•	•	•	Yes	Support the broad principle and soundness of the policy, which seeks to identify priorities for infrastructure provision, and requires new development to be supported by the provision of infrastructure, services and facilities that are identified as necessary to serve its needs. Suggest including reference to CIL regulations 122(2).
STRATEGIC POLICY S11 – INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIREMENTS	PS1687	1159923	Police, Fire & Crime Commissioner for Essex	Yes	Yes	No		•	•	•	Yes	Support the broad principle and soundness of the policy, which seeks to identify priorities for infrastructure provision, and requires new development to be supported by the provision of infrastructure, services and facilities that are identified as necessary to serve its needs. Suggest including reference to CIL regulations 122(2).
STRATEGIC POLICY S11 – INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIREMENTS	PS1745	1160014	Historic England	Yes	Yes	No						We are concerned that neither this policy nor the supporting text identifies, references or secures the conservation or enhancement of heritage assets and their settings. We request that this policy is amended to include reference to the historic environment. At present this policy is not consistent with national policy in terms of demonstrating that the infrastructure projects it endorses can be delivered sustainably, nor is the policy positively prepared in terms outlining a clear strategy for the conservation of the historic environment. The policy is therefore unsound.
STRATEGIC POLICY S11 – INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIREMENTS	PS1724	1160003	Ms Geraldine Southwood									NE Bypass needs to go ahead before any development but funds are not available. Beaulieu train station now expected 2025, the infrastructure for the current Chelmsford station needs to be taken into consideration.
STRATEGIC POLICY S11 – INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIREMENTS	PS1816	1160052	North West Parishes Group			No						LP should meet objectively assessed housing need and infrastructure requirements. North and West Parishes Group has reservations as to whether the extent of infrastructure required to support the level and location of growth envisaged by this Plan can be achieved in the Plan period. Consider Hammonds Farm, Rettendon, Howe Green and Boreham. LP should be able to adapt to policy which may be implemented throughout adoption of the plan.
STRATEGIC POLICY S11 – INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIREMENTS	PS1841	476873	Little Waltham Parish Council			No					Yes	Concern that CNEB will have limited capacity and encourage rat-running. Many roads will not be able to accommodate bus/cycle lanes and there is no guarantee that people will switch to walking/cycling - refer to transport report to support this point. Current methods to promote public transport (eg. free bus passes with property) are not successful in the long term. (For breakdown of North West Parishes Group response see PS1808 - PS1832 and PS SA45 - PS SA49)
STRATEGIC POLICY S11 – INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIREMENTS	PS1886	1101348	Education & Skills Funding Agency									The ESFA strongly supports strategic policy S11 (infrastructure requirements).
STRATEGIC POLICY S11 – INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIREMENTS	PS1830	1160052	North West Parishes Group									Refers to traffic report to support views on S11. General support S11. However, wording is not robust enough to reflect the need for this infrastructure to support the development in the Plan. Policy should be more strongly worded. New access road in Broomfield is imperative. Plan does not make reference to Crossrail which will influence and improve accessibility in the plan period and should be included.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
STRATEGIC POLICY S11 – INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIREMENTS	PS1953	927695	Redrow Homes								Yes	S11 recognises the role of new/extended P&R facilities to help reduce congestion in the City, and to provide meaningful (and reliable) alternatives to the private motor car. We fully support such objectives. The policy also generally conforms with the NPPF.
STRATEGIC POLICY S11 – INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIREMENTS	PS2080	1161039	Natural England		Yes	No					No	Supportive of elements of Policy S11 but suggests amended to secure contributions towards measures identified in RAMS The entire rep has been attached for completeness (1161039PS-A).
6.53	PS1279	872955	Hammonds Estates LLP	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	Plan and evidence base acknowledges that existing infrastructure, particularly transport, education and health, has capacity issues and considerable investment is required to ensure that appropriate infrastructure is provided to meet plan needs. Given the potential issues associated with delivering the required infrastructure, the strategy is not sound. In contrast Hammonds Farm is able to deliver the infrastructure it requires, and would benefit Chelmsford and surrounding villages (see Transport representation appendix 4, Flood risk and drainage report, appendix 5, Hammonds Farm Utilities Summary Report, appendix 7 and A Vision for Hammonds Farm, appendix 8 for details). In addition, sites at West Chelmsford, Great Leighs, Broomfield and North of South Woodham Ferrers do not fully meet the PSD spatial principles. Each site has site suitability and constraints issues that affect the ability of the site to deliver the quantum of development proposed in the timescale identified. In each case there are considerable issues associated with delivering essential infrastructure that is required to support these allocations. Key issues affecting these sites are set out in Table 2 in Hammonds Farm representation (also see section 3 – Response to Pre-Submission Document).
6.57	PS816	961966	Mr Alan Brunning	No		No	•	•	•			This focuses on Chelmsford. Little or no formal proposal are made for the other cat 1 area; SWF. The defined 'capacity improvements ' promised are only those included in 14/00830 which will reduce traffic flow to westbound traffic flow and increase congestion Other key issues are ignored with only lip service made to the many significant issues the large development will bring to area 7 SWF This is not sustainable development and the proposals cannot deliver the declared objective
6.57	PS818	961966	Mr Alan Brunning	No		No	•	•	•			The capacity improvements included in appendix H are trivial and will in one case slow down the traffic on the B1012. The traffic survey shows the road at capacity and well about the max quoted in DMRB standards. These are the only 2 'improvements for SWF. In addition the proposal is to feed traffic from the new estate into the B1012 at the old Wickford roundabout. The fact that this traffic will have priority at the roundabout and will increase congestion on the B1012 is totally ignored. This is not a sustainable development
6.57	PS1280	872955	Hammonds Estates LLP	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	Development of North East Chelmsford is reliant on proposed upgrades to junction 19 of the A12. No planning application submitted for these works. Any delays to delivery of these junction improvements will impact on the ability of North East Chelmsford to be delivered. The scale of infrastructure to be provided is considerable and is reliant, in part, on providing links to development to the south at Beaulieu Park and Channels, which is still at an early stage of construction and is likely to continue throughout much of the local plan period. Providing good accessibility to the site is therefore enormously difficult. The provision of the North East Chelmsford Bypass has unresolved delivery issues. The delivery of Phase 3 of North East Chelmsford, comprising 1,350 homes and 5,000sqm of employment, is partially dependent on delivery of the northern section of the bypass. Beaulieu station delayed – significant issues affecting delivery: funding, GRIP, securing land. Reliance on the delivery of Beaulieu station to provide sustainable transport options for residents - current funding gap - funding is expected to come through the development of sites although only North East Chelmsford is required to make a contribution in the plan. No certainty provided in the plan that the station will be delivered.
6.57	PS2011	1156808	Tritton Family Partnership LLP	Yes		No	•	•	•		Yes	The updated and enlarged safeguarded corridor and subsequent changes in design have changed in the Local Plan, without consultation with landowners. These changes have not been discussed with Tritton Farming Partnership LLP, who will be severely affected. The changes to the updated and enlarged safety corridor should not be consulted in the Local Plan especially near Derres roundabout Chelmsford North East bypass, wherever it is located, must be a dual carriageway as originally proposed, with cuttings. The Updated and Enlarged Safeguarded Corridor Plan is ineffective and unsound and not prepared correctly.



Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
6.57	PS2058	1098405	The North East Chelmsford Garden Village Consortium	Yes	Yes	Yes						Paragraph 6.57, setting out the reasoned justification, contains site-specific material. This should be within the Policy itself. The Policy also refers to 'Natural Infrastructure', which is not a term in common planning usage. Without further definition and clarification in the PSLP this is open to possible misinterpretation.
6.58	PS817	961966	Mr Alan Brunning	No			•	•	•			The capacity improvements included in appendix H are trivial and will in one case slow down the traffic on the B1012. The traffic survey shows the road at capacity and well about the max quoted in DMRB standards. These are the only 2 'improvements for SWF. In addition the proposal is to feed traffic from the new estate into the B1012 at the old Wickford roundabout. The fact that this traffic will have priority at the roundabout and will increase congestion on the B1012 is totally ignored. This is not a sustainable development
6.60	PS1281	872955	Hammonds Estates LLP	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	North East Chelmsford relies, in part, of the delivery of Beaulieu station, noted that this has been delayed – significant issues affecting delivery: funding, GRIP, securing land. Reliance on the delivery of Beaulieu station to provide sustainable transport options for residents - current funding gap - funding is expected to come through the development of sites although only North East Chelmsford is required to make a contribution in the plan. No certainty provided in the plan that the station will be delivered.
6.61	PS819	961966	Mr Alan Brunning			No	•	•	•	•		No proposal is made to help fund increase in capacity on the rail link to London. Lengthen the Battlesbridge platform. Lengthening this platform would increase train capacity by 50% for minimal cost
6.62	PS1283	872955	Hammonds Estates LLP	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	Development of North East Chelmsford is reliant on proposed upgrades to junction 19 of the A12. No planning application submitted for these works. Any delays to delivery of these junction improvements will impact on the ability of North East Chelmsford to be delivered. The scale of infrastructure to be provided is considerable and is reliant, in part, on providing links to development to the south at Beaulieu Park and Channels, which is still at an early stage of construction and is likely to continue throughout much of the local plan period. Providing good accessibility to the site is therefore enormously difficult. The provision of the North East Chelmsford Bypass has unresolved delivery issues. The delivery of Phase 3 of North East Chelmsford, comprising 1,350 homes and 5,000sqm of employment, is partially dependent on delivery of the northern section of the bypass.
6.62	PS2013	1156808	Tritton Family Partnership LLP	Yes		No	•	•	•		Yes	The updated and enlarged safeguarded corridor and subsequent changes in design have changed in the Local Plan, without consultation with landowners. These changes have not been discussed with Tritton Farming Partnership LLP, who will be severely affected. The changes to the updated and enlarged safety corridor should not be consulted in the Local Plan especially near Derres roundabout Chelmsford North East bypass, wherever it is located, must be a dual carriageway as originally proposed, with cuttings. The Updated and Enlarged Safeguarded Corridor Plan is ineffective and unsound and not prepared correctly.
6.63	PS222	1154256	Mr Roy Fentiman									Supportive of additional Park and Rides. The widening of the A120 beyond Galleys Corner should be a priority over the North East Bypass.
6.63	PS2014	1156808	Tritton Family Partnership LLP	Yes		No	•	•	•		Yes	The updated and enlarged safeguarded corridor and subsequent changes in design have changed in the Local Plan, without consultation with landowners. These changes have not been discussed with Tritton Farming Partnership LLP, who will be severely affected. The changes to the updated and enlarged safety corridor should not be consulted in the Local Plan especially near Derres roundabout Chelmsford North East bypass, wherever it is located, must be a dual carriageway as originally proposed, with cuttings. The Updated and Enlarged Safeguarded Corridor Plan is ineffective and unsound and not prepared correctly.
6.65	PS969	311148	Essex County Council	Yes	Yes	No			•		No	Amend paragraph 6.65 to clarify the role of the Chelmsford City Growth Package as part of the 'Strategic Zonal Focus' in Table 2 in delivering short term measures by March 2021.
STRATEGIC POLICY S12 – SECURING INFRASTRUCTURE AND IMPACT MITIGATION	PS860	908048	Essex Bridleways Association	Yes	Yes	No	•				Yes	Paragraph 6.67 should include Public Rights of Way as they are an element of infrastructure which should be included within any new development.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
STRATEGIC POLICY S12 – SECURING INFRASTRUCTURE AND IMPACT MITIGATION	PS971	311148	Essex County Council	Yes	Yes	Yes			•		No	Change Policy S12 to include the following for consistency: 'Exceptions to this policy will only be considered whereby; It is proven that the benefit of the development proceeding without full mitigation outweighs the collective harm A fully transparent open book viability assessment has proven that full mitigation cannot be afforded, allowing only for the minimum level of developer profit and land owner receipt necessary for the development to proceed.'
STRATEGIC POLICY S12 – SECURING INFRASTRUCTURE AND IMPACT MITIGATION	PS1233	1100910	Anglian Water Services Ltd	Yes	Yes	Yes					No	Anglian Water is supportive of Strategic Policy S12 as it states that planning permission will only be granted if it can be demonstrated that there is, or the development will deliver sufficient infrastructure capacity for the proposed development.
STRATEGIC POLICY S12 – SECURING INFRASTRUCTURE AND IMPACT MITIGATION	PS1284	872955	Hammonds Estates LLP	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	The Plan and evidence base acknowledges that existing infrastructure, particularly transport, education and health, has capacity issues and considerable investment is required to ensure that appropriate infrastructure is provided to meet plan needs. Given the potential issues associated with delivering the required infrastructure, the strategy is not sound. In contrast Hammonds Farm is able to deliver the infrastructure it requires, and would benefit Chelmsford and surrounding villages (see Transport representation appendix 4, Flood risk and drainage report, appendix 5, Hammonds Farm Utilities Summary Report, appendix 7 and A Vision for Hammonds Farm, appendix 8 for details).
STRATEGIC POLICY S12 – SECURING INFRASTRUCTURE AND IMPACT MITIGATION	PS1465	1101449	Ms Linda Beard	No		No	•	•	•	•	Yes	Public transport services must be in place BEFORE occupation to ensure it is used in preference to private cars. Mitigation to prevent harm to biodiversity must be in place before occupation.
STRATEGIC POLICY S12 – SECURING INFRASTRUCTURE AND IMPACT MITIGATION	PS1470	1101449	Ms Linda Beard	No		No	•	•	•	•	Yes	Strategic sites and viability In general there are many assumptions that sufficient mitigation will be provided. However, mitigation will have to be negotiated with developers for each development site, and it is likely that developers will claim that such mitigation will make the development unviable.
STRATEGIC POLICY S12 – SECURING INFRASTRUCTURE AND IMPACT MITIGATION	PS1474	964426	Mrs Wendy Daden			No	•	•	•			S12 The Plan states Permission will only be granted if it can be demonstrated that there is sufficient appropriate infrastructure capacity to support the development or that such capacity will be delivered by the proposal. I don't believe this plan meets S12 criteria.
STRATEGIC POLICY S12 – SECURING INFRASTRUCTURE AND IMPACT MITIGATION	PS1632	1159743	Gladman Developments Ltd	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	Support the ability to phase the provision of infrastructure. Reiterate that it is vital the Council properly considers the financial viability of schemes on a case by case basis in line with paragraphs 173-174 of the Framework.
STRATEGIC POLICY S12 – SECURING INFRASTRUCTURE AND IMPACT MITIGATION	PS1836	972826	Chignal Parish Council	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•		Yes	North and West Parishes Group response and traffic report attached. Chignal have made additional comments on S12. Doubts on soundness of S12. Given that it is extremely unlikely that the major infrastructure, especially roads, will be in place before or even towards the end of the proposed major developments, it is difficult to envisage how the City Council would be able to grant Planning Permission if they adhere to the Policy S12.
STRATEGIC POLICY S12 – SECURING INFRASTRUCTURE AND IMPACT MITIGATION	PS1954	927695	Redrow Homes								Yes	Supports the recognition given to IDP and CIL in the consideration of securing appropriate developer contributions and/or infrastructure
STRATEGIC POLICY S12 – SECURING INFRASTRUCTURE AND IMPACT MITIGATION	PS2089	1161039	Natural England		Yes	No					No	Where new or enhanced infrastructure is needed to ensure no adverse effect to designated sites for biodiversity or geodiversity, it must be secured through timely specific requirements in the relevant allocation policies. The entire rep has been attached for completeness (1161039PS-A).

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
6.66	PS1066	966017	Mrs Cecilia Ireland			No	•	•	•		No	Traffic congestion on A1060 has not been given appropriate weight, unreasonable assumption that residents will walk instead of driving into town. Not enough room for public transport improvements on existing road. Flooding on site is already a problem and destruction of water absorbing land can only exacerbate matters. Sites near the new station at Boreham with access to A12 should have been given higher priority. An increase in volume on A12 is inevitable and will have to be dealt with. Complex consultation process and previous comments have been discarded and not addressed in the last stage of consultation.
6.72	PS2059	1098405	The North East Chelmsford Garden Village Consortium	Yes	Yes	Yes					Yes	Strategic Policy S12 contains potentially different, and conflicting, interpretations regarding site-specific infrastructure requirements. There is greater clarity within the reasoned justification. The content of paragraphs 6.72-6.74 contains material that is more appropriate to being within the Policy itself.
STRATEGIC POLICY S13 – THE ROLE OF THE COUNTRYSIDE	PS1455	1156704	South Woodham Ferrers Town Council	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•	•		The closeness of the site to 6 Grade II listed buildings within 500 m of the site, a variety of designated sites, the condition of the Crouch and Roach Estuaries which is also a core area of biodiversity and ecological importance contravenes Policy S13.
STRATEGIC POLICY S13 – THE ROLE OF THE COUNTRYSIDE	PS1466	1101449	Ms Linda Beard	No		No	•	•	•	•	Yes	This policy ignores the contradiction of new development in the countryside. The proposed STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 North of South Woodham Ferrers should not proceed, and this land should be designated as Green Belt.
STRATEGIC POLICY S13 – THE ROLE OF THE COUNTRYSIDE	PS1482	958103	Mr D Bishop	No	Yes	No		•		•	Yes	Plan 25 'Rettendon Common' should be amended to include the land to the north of Bell Court within the Defined Settlement Boundary, as is the case on the extant Plan 24 of the 2012 Site Allocation Document.
STRATEGIC POLICY S13 – THE ROLE OF THE COUNTRYSIDE	PS1633	1159743	Gladman Developments Ltd	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	Reiterate concerns with the terminology used in Policy S13 as this refers to landscapes that are locally recognised and valued for their intrinsic character and beauty. Gladman refer the Council to the Framework paragraphs 109 and 113 in this regard as it is only valued landscapes which should be protected and enhanced, particularly as the bullet point within paragraph 17 merely states that the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside should be recognised as part of the planning balance exercise.
STRATEGIC POLICY S13 – THE ROLE OF THE COUNTRYSIDE	PS1831	1160052	North West Parishes Group									Green belt review should take place. River Can Green Wedge should be extended upstream. There is no boundary to prevent further development to Warren Farm in the future - this should be clear in policy. Retaining the green belt and creating a series of green wedges and green corridors has narrowed the potential development areas in the plan.
STRATEGIC POLICY S13 – THE ROLE OF THE COUNTRYSIDE	PS1930	1101991	Hill Farm Chelmsford Ltd			No	•	•	•		Yes	The assessment criteria for Rural Employment Area allocations needs to be more flexible to ensure that it is effective in supporting Chelmsford's Strategic Policies. Sites should only be allocated as Green Wedge where it can be evidenced that they positively contribute to the Green Wedge and fully perform in respect of the Green Wedge characteristics that are set out within the Green Wedges and Green Corridors: Defining Chelmsford's River Valleys Review Report February 2017. Propose the removal of land at Hill Farm, Essex Regiment Way from the Green Wedge, and the formal designation of the land, and the adjacent Old Coal Yard Rural Business Centre as a Rural Employment Area.
STRATEGIC POLICY S13 – THE ROLE OF THE COUNTRYSIDE	PS1955	927695	Redrow Homes								Yes	Not wholly consistent with National policy, insofar as "inappropriate development" is referred to in Green Belt terms (within the NPPF) where this policy appears to apply it to other areas of countryside. As presently worded, we therefore object to Policy S13. Also object on the basis that (as presently proposed) the Pre-Submission Plan fails to make the most efficient use of our Client's land interests.
STRATEGIC POLICY S14 – ROLE OF CITY, TOWN AND NEIGHBOURHOOD CENTRES	PS644	312436	Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd									Policy does not clearly set out when a retail impact assessment is required and therefore does not accord with the NPPF. Consider that an impact threshold for new retail development in out of centre locations of 500sqm is set across the district. This is in accordance with the evidence base of the Local Plan.
STRATEGIC POLICY S14 – ROLE OF CITY, TOWN AND NEIGHBOURHOOD CENTRES	PS1000	1156883	Theatres Trust	Yes	Yes	Yes					No	The role of Chelmsford as a focus for arts and culture, and for new facilities to be directed there, is supported.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
STRATEGIC POLICY S14 – ROLE OF CITY, TOWN AND NEIGHBOURHOOD CENTRES	PS1467	1101449	Ms Linda Beard	No		No	•	•	•	•	Yes	South Woodham Ferrers town centre should be redeveloped to provide new housing at an increased density, new retail offer and a well designed high street. This would be a sustainable alternative to the proposed STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 North of South Woodham Ferrers which is outside the town boundary and on greenfield land.
STRATEGIC POLICY S14 – ROLE OF CITY, TOWN AND NEIGHBOURHOOD CENTRES	PS1956	927695	Redrow Homes								Yes	Support the policy.
STRATEGIC POLICY S14 – ROLE OF CITY, TOWN AND NEIGHBOURHOOD CENTRES	PS1981	669941	Lloyds Bank SF Nominees Ltd	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	The wording of Strategic Policy S15 (Role of City, Town and Neighbourhood Centres) should be updated as identified in CAPS: “The Council will promote through its planning policies and proposals, the continued strengthening of the following Designated Centres in their varied roles and functions to positively contribute towards the viability, vitality, character and structure of these centres. New Main Town Centre Uses and development will be directed to the appropriate Designated Centres AND ACCESSIBLE LOCATIONS WELL CONNECTED TO THESE CENTRES”
STRATEGIC POLICY S15 – MONITORING AND REVIEW	PS1634	1159743	Gladman Developments Ltd	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	Whilst Gladman support the inclusion of a policy in relation to monitoring and review, amendments are required to ensure that this is effective. The policy needs to be clear, easily understandable and effective by setting achievable targets for the completion of the review. The policy should also include consequences for failing to meet the target dates.
STRATEGIC POLICY S15 – MONITORING AND REVIEW	PS1912	1097127	Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd			Yes						Endorses an early review of the Plan and would welcome the Council’s commitment to undertake a comprehensive review of its Green Belt boundaries to accommodate its longer term development needs.
6.89	PS1109	1157068	Croudace Homes	Yes	Yes	No			•		Yes	Welcomes the commitment in the Local Plan to a formal review, but considers the suggested timescales to be unrealistic and undeliverable. Paragraph 6.89 should be amended to read: “The Council will review the Local Plan every five years. On the basis that it takes around four years to complete this process, a formal review will commence one year after adoption of the Local Plan. This is envisaged to be in 2020.”
7.1	PS663	970231	Mrs Sarah Findlay			No	•					The roads are already at capacity at peak times so the proposed development at Site 2 is not sustainable. Writtle may be used as a rat run. Sustainable transport alternatives are flawed because most destinations are too far to walk to and bus services are extremely limited. The east of Chelmsford would be a far preferable and more sustainable location for new development with better transport links and planned new facilities.
7.1	PS944	1156657	Mr John Parling			No	•				No	Strategic Growth Site 2 - West Chelmsford will increase existing traffic and congestion to the area. A highway scheme should be prepared and constructed which firsts alleviates the current congestion and danger prior to the development being approved. The allocation should be deleted from the Plan.
7.1	PS945	961966	Mr Alan Brunning	No		No	•					The proposals for South Woodham Ferrer are 'buried' in this document in a sub section below Growth Area 3. As this is a primary development location at a level with Chelmsford it should have equal prominence. The proposal as presented skews the assessment in favour of CCC. Give the same level of prominence and detail as the other category 1 development area Chelmsford.
7.1	PS1383	1102437	The Russell Family	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•		Yes	Concern over delivery rates of large strategic sites. Smaller sites, including those in the Green Belt, should be allocated which can be delivered in the short term.
7.1	PS1832	1160052	North West Parishes Group									Spatial strategy does not reflect the most sustainable focus of growth to meet future needs and protecting and enhancing the existing character. Concern for lack of green belt review, burden on NE Chelmsford, potential untimely delivery of necessary infrastructure, deliverability of sites, sustainability of sites chosen, and the protection of areas of landscape value. Consider an alternative nearer the A12, eg. Hammonds Farm.
Table 3: Types of Site Allocations	PS2060	1098405	The North East Chelmsford Garden Village Consortium	Yes	Yes	Yes					Yes	The Consortium considers that the types of Site Allocations being proposed in Table 3 is an appropriate mix of sites for addressing the growth requirements across the Plan period. North East Chelmsford has the potential to define and shape a new Garden Village that will set the highest standards for place-making in Chelmsford.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
7.5	PS1746	1160014	Historic England	Yes	Yes							We recommend the following minor changes are made (see sites); these changes will improve it by better reflecting national legislation. Site allocation maps no longer sit within the body of the text in the documents - now difficult to find the relevant map which reduces accessibility of information and ease of reference. Note on Conservation Areas: Many of the site specific policies will affect the setting of conservation areas - either located along or immediately adjacent to conservation area boundaries. Technically the requirement to conserve or enhance the character or appearance of a conservation area applies to development within the conservation area; development beyond the boundary should consider the setting of the conservation area, as a designated heritage asset. It is not clear from the plans given their scale but it is possible that some development would realistically encroach within the conservation area boundary or be located along any boundaries themselves. It would also be helpful to make specific reference to setting of the conservation area to ensure that development further away from the conservation area i.e. not along the boundaries of any therefore potentially within the conservation area also considers the setting.
7.8	PS926	376266	Mr & Mrs Carter			No			•		No	West Chelmsford, as located in the Parish of Writtle will effectively merge Writtle into Chelmsford. Significant traffic congestion with 'rat runs' through Writtle. Health and educational facilities will be stretched to breaking point. There are better located sites available for development, to the East of Chelmsford which will reduce congestion, create self contained sustainable communities and avoid the destruction of the identity of villages and smaller communities.
7.8	PS1331	1157251	Chelmsford Civic Society								Yes	While Shire Hall is not a large site, it plays a strategic role in the city centre and has very strong significance for all local residents. Its OMISSION from the Local Plan Policies is not justified. Shire Hall should be a Growth Site.
7.10	PS1285	872955	Hammonds Estates LLP	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	Strategy overly relies on the redevelopment of brownfield sites in the urban area. Can be difficult to bring forward. Concern raised on highway connectivity (see appendix 4 - Transport Representation), site assembly, marketability (not everyone wants to live in the centre) and the loss of car parking which may need to be replaced (applicable to some of the sites). Strategic Growth Site 1a - Chelmer Waterside - is reliant on third party defences that do not remove the housing from the flood risk area. No specific proposals for additional school places and healthcare capacity in the urban area as identified by the IDP. Plan is unsound and inappropriate as pursuing significant levels of development without planning for the required infrastructure to be in place as required by Policies S11 and S12. Number of sites were previously identified or part identified in the Chelmsford Town Centre Area Action Plan and will be reallocated. The AAP was adopted in 2008, given the length of time that has elapsed since these sites were allocated HEst questions how deliverable these sites are. Reallocation of these sites is not in accordance with the government's stated draft policy to ensure that housing developments are implemented in a timely manner (paragraph 78, draft NPPF). Additional development should be allocated on sustainable, deliverable greenfield land at Hammonds Farm.
7.10	PS1900	1097460	Legal & General			No		•		•	Yes	In summary, the proposed designation of the site within an Employment Area does not provide flexibility to adapt to change and is not consistent with Paragraph 22 of the NPPF which seeks to avoid the unnecessary blanket protection of sites. In addition, the Council's assessment of local housing need is not justified and results in a housing target which is not positively prepared. Overall the Plan is not considered to be consistent with national policy and is therefore considered to be unsound. We consider that additional housing supply will need to be identified and, in this regard, consider that the site at Bilton Road Industrial Estate could make a significant contribution to meeting local housing needs and should therefore be identified accordingly within the Plan. Whilst it is considered that, in light of the above, the Plan should not proceed to Examination in its current form, should the examination proceed, we reserve the right to appear at the Examination in Public should we wish to do so.
7.11	PS1286	872955	Hammonds Estates LLP	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	Sites at West Chelmsford, Great Leighs, Broomfield and North of South Woodham Ferrers do not fully meet the spatial principles. Each site has site suitability and constraints issues that affect the ability to deliver the quantum of development proposed in the plan period. In each case there are significant issues associated with delivering essential infrastructure that is required to support these allocations.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
7.11	PS1933	927695	Redrow Homes								Yes	Not clear why land submitted east of SGS3c has been ruled out. Support identification of development in East Chelmsford given the constraints placed on developing Green Belt or Green Wedge land to the south and west. North-East and East Chelmsford represent the optimum locations for growth.
7.12	PS687	1093950	Mr David Chapman			No			•		No	The proposed development is unsustainable due to lack of transport infrastructure. The increase in traffic on Rainsford Road and through Writtle will have an unacceptable impact on the quality of life of existing and new residents. The homes are better sited along the A12 corridor north-east of Chelmsford and around Witham.
7.12	PS1393	1096887	Marie Wallis	No								What are the 'opportunities to contribute towards and enhance existing facilities and services of the village'? How are you going to enhance existing facilities and services? These should have already been decided. Are you going to ask the local people how the village can be enhanced?
Figure 9: Growth Area 1 - Central and Urban Chelmsford	PS710	1096887	Marie Wallis	No	No	No	•	•	•	•		I do not believe it is legal to build the number of houses proposed especially when there are so many empty buildings in Chelmsford. Why do you not listen to the views of local residents? Are the consultations just a tick box exercise? Why was there not a local plan exhibition/local plans at Galleywood library? Chelmsford is already struggling with inadequate road and local infrastructure, air pollution etc. The document uses a language which is not easily accessible and it is too long.
Figure 9: Growth Area 1 - Central and Urban Chelmsford	PS1686	1159931	Montagu Evans	Yes	Yes	Yes					No	The Council's approach to focussing development towards sustainable centres is considered sound. Whilst the draft Revised NPPF ("dRNPPF") can only be attributed limited weight as a material consideration, Paragraph 69 identifies the important contribution that small sites have in the delivery of housing. Alongside the allocation of medium sized brownfield sites in the central area, the Council's approach of identifying and allocating small sites is considered to represent the most appropriate strategy for the central area, and is therefore sound.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 1a – CHELMER WATERSIDE	PS611	1155857	Environment Agency	Yes	Yes	Yes						Policy should contain the need for appropriate flood risk mitigation, either in the policy or reasoned justification
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 1a – CHELMER WATERSIDE	PS1288	872955	Hammonds Estates LLP	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	Strategy overly relies on the redevelopment of brownfield sites in the urban area. Can be difficult to bring forward. Concern raised on highway connectivity (see appendix 4 - Transport Representation), site assembly, marketability (not everyone wants to live in the centre) and the loss of car parking which may need to be replaced (applicable to some of the sites). Strategic Growth Site 1a - Chelmer Waterside - is reliant on third party defences that do not remove the housing from the flood risk area. No specific proposals for additional school places and healthcare capacity in the urban area as identified by the IDP. Plan is unsound and inappropriate as pursuing significant levels of development without planning for the required infrastructure to be in place as required by Policies S11 and S12. Number of sites were previously identified or part identified in the Chelmsford Town Centre Area Action Plan and will be reallocated. The AAP was adopted in 2008, given the length of time that has elapsed since these sites were allocated HEst questions how deliverable these sites are. Reallocation of these sites is not in accordance with the government's stated draft policy to ensure that housing developments are implemented in a timely manner (paragraph 78, draft NPPF). Additional development should be allocated on sustainable, deliverable greenfield land at Hammonds Farm.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 1a – CHELMER WATERSIDE	PS1329	1157251	Chelmsford Civic Society			No	•		•		Yes	The Local Plan is unsound in respect of Growth Area 1 - Central and Urban Chelmsford. There is failure to match plans for strategic growth with the intention to provide facilities that meet the requirements of City status and strengthen Chelmsford's position as capital of Essex. The main problem is the absence of modern arts and culture venues. See rep for policy text amendments.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 1a – CHELMER WATERSIDE	PS1677	309174	Mr Graham Pooley									There should be greater emphasis on the mixed use of the City's waterways. A link between the canal and river should be a requirement and not an aspiration of the policy.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 1a – CHELMER WATERSIDE	PS1747	1160014	Historic England	Yes	Yes							The wording would be improved to state "conserve or enhance the setting..." as this better reflects national legislation. With regards to the archaeological assessment it would be helpful if the policy was clearer to state whether this will be required upon application to aid decision making.
7.19	PS41	1151815	Mr Mark Holladay			No	•		•		Yes	Concern over the substantial increase in traffic that will come from these new developments given existing issues caused by two large car parks in the area. A new access road should be built to cater for the development on the peninsular and gas works site to take pressure off Wharf Road.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 1b – ESSEX POLICE HEADQUARTERS AND SPORTS GROUND, NEW COURT ROAD	PS523	664147	Sport England	Yes	Yes	No		•		•	Yes	Objection is made to the lack of clarity about the need to retain or replace Essex Police HQ's sports ground as part of the development. In its current form, the policy implies that the sports ground may only need maintaining for meeting the open space needs associated with the development rather than the need to protect the facility to meet current community playing pitch needs. There is a also a lack of clarity about the options for protecting the sports ground. In its current form the policy would not be considered to meet the 'justified' and 'consistent with national policy' tests of soundness. This objection could be addressed through modifications being made to the policy and/or reasoned justification to provide clarity about the need to protect or replace the sports ground and by providing detail about the mitigation options.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 1b – ESSEX POLICE HEADQUARTERS AND SPORTS GROUND, NEW COURT ROAD	PS1493	972052	Mr John Whitlock			No		•		•	No	It is nonsense to suggest car clubs can provide viable alternatives to city centre car parking. Any redevelopment of these two sites should be predicated on maintaining the same number of car parking spaces for the City especially public parking given the demand for such parking throughout the year. Loss of parking is inconsistent with NPPF
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 1b – ESSEX POLICE HEADQUARTERS AND SPORTS GROUND, NEW COURT ROAD	PS1684	1159923	Police, Fire & Crime Commissioner for Essex	Yes	Yes	No		•	•	•	Yes	Support recognition of 1b and para 7.30. Uncertainty about how much land will be available for development. Policy is based upon premise that land will be completely vacated. This is not the case and will have implications on delivery of key infrastructure. Suggest removing requirement for a school and re-wording requirements for open space.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 1b – ESSEX POLICE HEADQUARTERS AND SPORTS GROUND, NEW COURT ROAD	PS1748	1160014	Historic England	Yes	Yes							It is recommended that the policy requires development to consider, conserve or where possible enhance the setting of the nearby listed building.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 1b – ESSEX POLICE HEADQUARTERS AND SPORTS GROUND, NEW COURT ROAD	PS1887	1101348	Education & Skills Funding Agency									ESFA welcomes safeguarding of land for schools. Welcomes the confirmation of site sizes required for the schools as well as confirmation of the anticipated number of FE and cost for each school in the updated Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). The clear requirements within the site-specific policies for financial contributions to offsite education provision are also supported.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 1c – NORTH OF GLOUCESTER AVENUE (JOHN SHENNAN)	PS74	1152380	Ms Karen Harmer									Concern for loss of green space, pressure on schools and doctors, pressure on road infrastructure, landfill contamination, groups losing their green space. Destruction of green space is against local and government policy. Site could be better used to serve the local community
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 1c – NORTH OF GLOUCESTER AVENUE (JOHN SHENNAN)	PS525	664147	Sport England	Yes	Yes	Yes						In view of the site constraints, the site infrastructure proposals in the policy to retain or rationalise open space and to provide, or make financial contributions to, sport, leisure and recreational facilities are considered appropriate. The proposal in paragraph 7.41 of the reasoned justification to provide a substantial area of improved accessible local open space which will include sports is particularly welcomed. The policy approach to address the loss of the open space would be therefore considered appropriate.
7.40	PS129	1152524	Mr Chris Gutteridge									Area would be suitable for independent living/supported living facilities. Concern for air quality, congestion, safety of constructing on an old refuse site.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 1d – FORMER ST PETER’S COLLEGE, FOX CRESCENT	PS524	664147	Sport England	Yes	Yes	No		•		•	Yes	Objection is made to the site allocation in relation to the lack of clarity in the policy itself about replacement playing field provision as there is no explicit requirement in the policy to retain or replace the playing fields as part of the development. Without this clarity, there is a concern that it may be interpreted by the local planning authority or site promoters that there is not a need to retain or replace the playing fields as a development principle. There is also a lack of clarity in the policy about the options for protecting or replacing the playing fields. In its current form the policy would not be considered to meet the ‘justified’ and ‘consistent with national policy’ tests of soundness. This objection could be addressed through modifications being made to the policy and/or reasoned justification to provide clarity about the need to protect or replace the playing fields and by providing detail about the mitigation options.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 1d – FORMER ST PETER’S COLLEGE, FOX CRESCENT	PS1888	1101348	Education & Skills Funding Agency									ESFA welcomes safeguarding of land for schools. Welcomes the confirmation of site sizes required for the schools as well as confirmation of the anticipated number of FE and cost for each school in the updated Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). The clear requirements within the site-specific policies for financial contributions to offsite education provision are also supported.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 1e – FORMER ROYAL MAIL PREMISES, VICTORIA ROAD	PS1693	976073	Bellway Homes			No		•	•	•	No	Support the allocation but consider it should be for over 200 units and that there is no need for an early years and childcare nursery on site but there should be a level of flexible commercial floorspace included.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 1f – RIVERSIDE ICE AND LEISURE LAND, VICTORIA ROAD	PS1494	972052	Mr John Whitlock			No		•		•		Object to loss of any existing public or private car parking facilities in these proposed City centre redevelopments. Any redevelopment of these sites should be predicated on maintaining the same number of car parking spaces for the City especially public car parks given the demand for such parking throughout the year. Does not comply with NPPF.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 1f – RIVERSIDE ICE AND LEISURE LAND, VICTORIA ROAD	PS1749	1160014	Historic England	Yes	Yes							It is recommended that the wording is amended to: “ensure protection and enhancement of the character or appearance of the adjoining conservation area and its setting”.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 1g – CIVIC CENTRE LAND, FAIRFIELD ROAD	PS972	311148	Essex County Council	Yes	Yes	No			•		No	Amend policy to clarify that financial contributions to primary school provision are required to meet the education infrastructure needs generated by the development.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 1g – CIVIC CENTRE LAND, FAIRFIELD ROAD	PS1001	1156883	Theatres Trust	Yes	Yes	Yes					No	To ensure the continued operation and viability of the Civic and Cramphorn Theatres as cultural assets for Chelmsford, it is essential that any new residential development on this site is sensitively located so as to avoid conflict with the existing uses and that appropriate servicing/get-ins for the theatres are maintained. Paragraph 123 of the NPPF seeks to ensure that existing businesses do not have unreasonable restrictions placed on them as a result of changes in nearby landuses, and paragraph 5 of Planning Practice Guidance on Noise requires proposals to be “carefully considered” where in proximity to noise-generation. Planning (Agent of Change) Bill - rigorously protects existing uses and put an even stronger onus on new development to avoid such conflict. In line with a statement from the Secretary of State, the ‘Agent of Change’ principle has been included within the draft revised NPPF (March 2018). The Trust does not object to residential use within the site but needs to be appropriately located. Any new development implements appropriate soundproofing to ensure separation of residential use from the theatre. Should any proposals come forward to redevelop either theatre - engagement with the Trust at an early stage in the design process is encouraged.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 1g – CIVIC CENTRE LAND, FAIRFIELD ROAD	PS1751	1160014	Historic England	Yes	Yes							Wording should be amended to refer to “the character or appearance of the adjoining conservation area and its setting” in place of character and appearance of the conservation area. The West End Conservation is on the 2017 National Heritage at Risk Register (HAR), it is recommended that the supporting text of the policy makes reference to the HAR status of the conservation area as this will help encourage enhancements.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 1h – EASTWOOD HOUSE CAR PARK, GLEBE ROAD	PS973	311148	Essex County Council	Yes	Yes	No			•		No	Amend policy to clarify that financial contributions to primary school provision are required to meet the education infrastructure needs generated by the development.



Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 1h – EASTWOOD HOUSE CAR PARK, GLEBE ROAD	PS1752	1160014	Historic England	Yes	Yes							Wording should be amended to refer to “the character or appearance of the adjoining conservation area and its setting” in place of character and appearance of the conservation area. The West End Conservation is on the 2017 National Heritage at Risk Register (HAR), it is recommended that the supporting text of the policy makes reference to the HAR status of the conservation as this will help encourage enhancements.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 1h – EASTWOOD HOUSE CAR PARK, GLEBE ROAD	PS1775	1160028	Seven Capital Plc	No		No		•		•	Yes	Object to Strategic Growth Site 1h, as a number of elements of the policy are neither justified nor consistent with national policy. The policy does not promote the effective use of previously developed sites. The Policy wording should be amended to express the housing number as a minimum and should allow for town centre uses to come forward as part of a mixed-use development on this site. The reference to ‘integration of flexible workspace facilities’ should be removed. The policy should be amended to allow site infrastructure requirements to be negotiable on a site by site basis.
POLICY GR1 - GROWTH SITES IN CHELMSFORD URBAN AREA	PS512	1146480	Aquila Developments Ltd		Yes	No		•			Yes	Policy GR 1 is considered unnecessary since site specific policies should contain adequate detail.
POLICY GR1 - GROWTH SITES IN CHELMSFORD URBAN AREA	PS521	664147	Sport England	Yes	Yes	Yes						Support is offered to the specific reference to allocated growth sites in Chelmsford being required to provide or make contributions to new/enhanced sport, leisure and recreation facilities. The Council’s evidence base justifies the need for such contributions to address future needs but this will be particularly important on allocated sites in the Chelmsford urban area.
POLICY GR1 - GROWTH SITES IN CHELMSFORD URBAN AREA	PS1405	377147	RWH Properties Ltd	Yes	Yes	Yes					No	Support GR1. However, wording could be clearer tom simply indicate that development proposals at Growth Sites 1i - 1v will be brought forward and considered on a site by site basis. There is no need for policy GRI to reference Planning Briefs or Design Codes, as these can be referenced if necessary within the wording for any of the specific growth sites 1i - 1v.
POLICY GR1 - GROWTH SITES IN CHELMSFORD URBAN AREA	PS1635	1159743	Gladman Developments Ltd	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	The Council will need to be able to demonstrate through robust evidence that these sites will be able to deliver the quantum of development required for the Chelmsford urban area.
POLICY GR1 - GROWTH SITES IN CHELMSFORD URBAN AREA	PS1753	1160014	Historic England	Yes	Yes							We recommend that the wording is amended to refer to “preserve or enhance character or appearance” in order to better reflect the statutory tests in the national legislation.
POLICY GR1 - GROWTH SITES IN CHELMSFORD URBAN AREA	PS1849	377147	RWH Properties Ltd	Yes	Yes	Yes					No	Whilst Policy GRI is supported, it is submitted that the GRI policy reference to 'Integration of proportionate work space employment and community facilities' is unwarranted, unnecessary and onerous. It is submitted that paragraph 7.100 should omit reference to flexible use units, as such flexible uses are not successful in the marketplace and could undermine the viability of sites and lead to additional traffic generation and/ or unacceptable impacts on existing and future residential amenity. It is submitted that the development mix for each site should be considered on a site by site basis with due regard to the potential suitability of each site for possible inclusion of an element of any mixed use alongside residential.
POLICY GR1 - GROWTH SITES IN CHELMSFORD URBAN AREA	PS2027	1160633	Genesis Housing Association	Yes	Yes	No		•				Policy GR1 does not appreciate the full extent of suitable available land within Chelmsford Urban Area. It should include Phase 3 of City Park West for new residential development, reconfigured and enhanced public open space and an improved cycleway and pedestrian link between the City Centre and Central Park. The site is one of the most sustainable within the City Council's jurisdiction. See complete rep by Bidwells (1160633PS-A) and Development Appraisal (1160633PS-B).
GROWTH SITE 1i – CHELMSFORD SOCIAL CLUB AND PRIVATE CAR PARK, 55 SPRINGFIELD ROAD	PS545	1146480	Aquila Developments Ltd	Yes	Yes	No		•			Yes	Following extensive dialogue with the Social Club, there is no realistic prospect of the site coming forward as a comprehensive scheme, the boundary of the site needs to be revised including policy details on transportation and accessibility mitigation.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
GROWTH SITE 1i – CHELMSFORD SOCIAL CLUB AND PRIVATE CAR PARK, 55 SPRINGFIELD ROAD	PS1663	866429	NHS England, Essex Area Team									NHS England would require mitigation for health from this site allocation.
GROWTH SITE 1j – ASHBY HOUSE CAR PARKS, NEW STREET	PS1664	866429	NHS England, Essex Area Team									NHS England would require mitigation for health from this site allocation.
GROWTH SITE 1j – ASHBY HOUSE CAR PARKS, NEW STREET	PS1688	1159931	Montagu Evans	Yes	Yes	Yes					Yes	Supportive of allocation but considers policy should be reworded to support a minimum of 80 new homes and the timescale for delivery bought forward. Suggestion that public realm improvements to Brook Street should be thought CIL and not Section 106.
GROWTH SITE 1k – RECTORY LANE CAR PARK WEST	PS1054	1157037	Ms Sheila Catling	Yes	No	No	•	•	•		No	Insufficient public parking areas in Chelmsford. Congestion on busy route into the city. Park & Ride facility not sufficient to meet the needs of most commuters into London. Concerned about the potential depreciation of existing properties due to the proposed development use. Concerned about the loss of light/ being overshadowed, overlooked, infringement of privacy, noise and disturbance that may be caused by the development.
GROWTH SITE 1k – RECTORY LANE CAR PARK WEST	PS1665	866429	NHS England, Essex Area Team									NHS England would require mitigation for health from this site allocation.
GROWTH SITE 1k – RECTORY LANE CAR PARK WEST	PS1754	1160014	Historic England	Yes	Yes							We recommend that the wording is changed to character or appearance rather than character and appearance.
GROWTH SITE 1k – RECTORY LANE CAR PARK WEST	PS1976	1160532	Mr Michael Kirkham	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	Support recognition of need for student housing. Do not believe this is the correct site - well used car park, no evidence that ARU would consider this an appropriate location. OS1a is a more suitable site for student accommodation. Should delete reference to student housing in the policy.
GROWTH SITE 1k – RECTORY LANE CAR PARK WEST	PS2015	1157037	Ms Sheila Catling									Chelmsford has inadequate public parking. Surprised council is willing to lose annual revenue generated from car park. Park & Ride is not sufficient as it does not run early/late enough or frequently enough. Concern for impact of student housing on surrounding area.
GROWTH SITE 1l – CAR PARK TO THE WEST OF COUNTY HOTEL, RAINSFORD ROAD	PS1666	866429	NHS England, Essex Area Team									NHS England would require mitigation for health from this site allocation.
GROWTH SITE 1l – CAR PARK TO THE WEST OF COUNTY HOTEL, RAINSFORD ROAD	PS1755	1160014	Historic England	Yes	Yes							We recommend that the wording is changed to character or appearance rather than character and appearance.
GROWTH SITE 1m – FORMER CHELMSFORD ELECTRICAL AND CAR WASH, BROOK STREET	PS1668	866429	NHS England, Essex Area Team									NHS England would require mitigation for health from this site allocation.
GROWTH SITE 1m – FORMER CHELMSFORD ELECTRICAL AND CAR WASH, BROOK STREET	PS1756	1160014	Historic England	Yes	Yes							Pleased to see the reference to the setting of the Grade II listed Marconi building, the locally listed Globe House and Marriage Mill, and requirement to ensure layout of development provides appropriate street frontage.
GROWTH SITE 1n – BT TELEPHONE EXCHANGE, COTTAGE PLACE	PS1669	866429	NHS England, Essex Area Team									NHS England would require mitigation for health from this site allocation.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
GROWTH SITE 1n – BT TELEPHONE EXCHANGE, COTTAGE PLACE	PS1757	1160014	Historic England	Yes	Yes							We recommend that the wording is changed to character or appearance rather than character and appearance.
GROWTH SITE 1o – RECTORY LANE CAR PARK EAST	PS1758	1160014	Historic England	Yes	Yes							Pleased to see reference to non-designated heritage assets in the form of locally listed buildings within this policy.
GROWTH SITE 1o – RECTORY LANE CAR PARK EAST	PS1977	1160532	Mr Michael Kirkham	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	Support recognition of need for student housing. Do not believe this is the correct site - well used car park, no evidence that ARU would consider this an appropriate location. OS1a is a more suitable site for student accommodation. Should delete reference to student housing in the policy.
GROWTH SITE 1p – WATERHOUSE LANE DEPOT AND NURSERY	PS1759	1160014	Historic England	Yes	Yes							Development has the potential to impact upon the significance of the barn setting. Expand bullet point 5 to also include reference to the setting of the Grade II listed barn.
GROWTH SITE 1r - BRITISH LEGION, NEW LONDON ROAD	PS1760	1160014	Historic England	Yes	Yes							Amend wording of bullet point 4 to read: “development will preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the New London Road Conservation Area and the setting of the Grade II listed Southborough House”.
GROWTH SITE 1s – REAR OF 17 to 37 BEACH'S DRIVE	PS1123	1157086	Mr & Mrs Claudio & Elizabeth Martone									Beach’s Drive currently gets busy and often ‘blocked’ with cars parked on either side of the road. Concern of existing properties being overlooked by new development and the tranquillity of the area compromised.
GROWTH SITE 1s – REAR OF 17 to 37 BEACH'S DRIVE	PS1406	377147	RWH Properties Ltd	Yes	Yes	Yes					Yes	Supports the allocation of 1s. Site provides a highly suitable site for residential being adjacent to existing residential properties, sustainably located within walking and cycling distance of Chelmsford town centre and representing brownfield land. 1s should be reworded to provide for around 30 (not 14) new homes, as supported through the enclosed drawings. The reference to phasing of residential development at the site to 2026-2031 is unnecessary
GROWTH SITE 1s – REAR OF 17 to 37 BEACH'S DRIVE	PS1761	1160014	Historic England	Yes	Yes							There are no known heritage assets within or around the site that could be affected by its development. Historic England has no comment to make on this allocation.
GROWTH SITE 1v – CAR PARK R/O BELLAMY COURT, BROOMFIELD ROAD	PS1762	1160014	Historic England	Yes	Yes							Recommend that the wording is changed to character or appearance rather than character and appearance.
OPPORTUNITY SITE OS1a – RIVERMEAD, BISHOP HALL LANE	PS1670	866429	NHS England, Essex Area Team									NHS England would require mitigation for health from this site allocation.
OPPORTUNITY SITE OS1a – RIVERMEAD, BISHOP HALL LANE	PS1763	1160014	Historic England	Yes	Yes							Advise that the policy makes explicit reference to the need for development to have regard to the setting of the listed building.
OPPORTUNITY SITE OS1a – RIVERMEAD, BISHOP HALL LANE	PS1975	1160532	Mr Michael Kirkham	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	Consider policy unsound. Site is promoted for student accommodation not residential use, so wording in policy should be amended to reflect this, as set out in the TCAAP. Proposal for new commercial uses rather than improvement of existing uses.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS3	1097348	Mr Stephen Parker									Object to the proposal on grounds of traffic congestion, loss of habitat for local wild life, parking and the merging of Writtle into westlands and the city centre. The traffic is almost at a stand still at the moment another 2000 houses will bring this city to a stop.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS32	963123	Mr Michael Townley	No	No	No			•		Yes	Existing traffic and medical facilities have not been taken into consideration. The construction work and traffic congestion afterwards will create horrendous problems.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS140	1152873	Mrs Eleonora Clugston	No	No	No	•	•	•		No	Concern for congestion and the assumption that residents will use alternative methods of transport to get to work. Local medical facilities and traffic passing through a small village has not been considered by the planners
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS195	307680	Mr Derek Cooley	Yes	No	No		•	•		No	Concern of dividing town - better to develop between A414 and current village. Concern plan uses deceiving wording - site should be Land West of Chelmsford as it is in the Parish of Writtle.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS209	542799	Mrs Helen Padfield									Support development at Strategic Growth Site 2 as it is an ideal site. Suggests an improved bus service will solve some of the problems raised with roads and services. Hopes plans for Warren Farm are passed!
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS229	1092682	Mr Carmichael			No	•	•	•		Yes	Proposed development is not well thought out or based on sound evidence. Writtle suffers a rat race which will be vastly increased. The East of Chelmsford is a far better location with better transport links and Park & Ride.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS247	1096535	Dr Michael Bailey					•	•		No	Traffic flow and congestion to be comprehensively addressed regarding west Chelmsford, especially the Chignal Road/A1060 junction. Writtle will be used as a rat run to the A12. Hump back bridge at Lordship Road/Cow Watering Lane is a safety hazard. Previous comments attached including impact on NHS and increased air pollution.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS448	1095794	Mr Peter Smith									Oppose 800 houses at this site as it would worsen the congestion. Hammonds Farm would be a better location.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS449	970352	Mrs Rosemary Smith									Oppose 800 houses. Lack of medical facilities in the area. Concern for congestion. The idea that residents will be persuaded to walk/cycle into Chelmsford is wrong. There are better areas in East Chelmsford to develop.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS473	1095937	Mr Philip Claydon			No	•	•	•		No	Traffic congestion is already severe along Lordship Road and Roxwell Road. Additional traffic volume from 800 homes cannot be accommodated without significant infrastructure improvements. The assertion that volumes of residents will utilise NCN route 1 to access Chelmsford City Centre is flawed. NCN route 1 is an inadequate alternative to car usage. It is unsuitable for a number of reasons and frequently impassable due to flooding. The east of Chelmsford, with its existing transport links, offers a significantly better and more sustainable site for development
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS478	1096454	Mr Jack Draper			No	•	•	•		No	There is already traffic congestion at peak times from the traffic lights at Chignal road to Lordship Road and towards Roxwell. The proposal will make the situation worse and increase air pollution. It is not realistic to expect residents to walk, cycle or use public transport. NCN1 is prone to flooding, dangerous and difficult to use in winter and unlit. A dedicated pedestrian/cycle bridge or underpass at Roxwell Road is needed from Site 2 to the NCN1 via Lawford Lane. The east of Chelmsford, with its existing transport links, offers a significantly better and more sustainable site for development causing less pollution and traffic congestion.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS479	1095979	Mr Graham Poulteney			No	•	•	•			There are already traffic congestion at peak times from the Chignal Road traffic lights sometimes to Lordship Road. Ongar Road, Lordship Road, the A1060 and Chignal Road are also used as a rat run. Walking and cycling will not solve the problem since site 2 is too far away from the city centre and there are no crossing facilities on the A1060. The East of Chelmsford has the strategic road infrastructure, park and ride and will also have a new station.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS544	963974	Mrs Rachael Hopkins									Concern for traffic, road infrastructure. Infrastructure should be put in place first to cope with traffic. Writtle will become a rat run and will spoil the environment. Concern for pedestrian safety.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS526	664147	Sport England	Yes	Yes	Yes						The requirement in the policy for development to provide or make financial contributions to new or enhanced sport, leisure and recreational facilities is welcomed.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS632	1095081	Mrs Elizabeth Roe									Additional cars will add to traffic congestion and rat running through Writtle to reach the A414/A12. Cyclists will be unable to cross Roxwell Road to reach the cycle path into Chelmsford. The only sustainable way in which housing can be built north of Roxwell Road is to build a bypass from Little Waltham area to the A414.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS636	958895	Ms Susan Fowkes			No	•	•	•		No	Development at Warren Farm would increased traffic on the A1060 and in Writtle. Concern over flooding as proposed development is on higher ground than Writtle and Roxwell Brook already floods. Development should be focussed on brownfield sites and land to the east of Chelmsford.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS641	508451	Mr J Roe			No	•	•	•			Proposed road improvements have not been designed and solutions are not obvious. Do not believe people will change their behaviour and cycle into Chelmsford, there is not space for a cycle path along Roxwell Road and it is not possible to cross the road to access the existing cycle path. Will result in increased traffic along Margaretting Road as commuters travel to Shenfield or the A12. Development should be focussed at Hammonds Farm

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS649	968833	Mrs Linda Creed									Oppose development in West Chelmsford. Land to the east would be better suited for development - like Beaulieu. Writtle has congestion problems and rat runs. There are not enough amenities in Writtle to support development. Previous comments from residents have been disregarded.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS656	1155970	Miss Valerie Neil			No	•	•	•			Development strongly opposed by Writtle residents as wholly unsustainable due to traffic congestion, traffic noise, air pollution, pressure on limited village services, possible flooding, archaeological disruption, impact on the unique historical character and identity of the area and loss of wildlife. Writtle has an extremely limited bus service and people cannot be expected to walk. Development should be sited in the far more sustainable area to the East of Chelmsford.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS657	969565	WEA Sec									Object to 800 houses at Warren Farm. Area suffers from congestion. Lordship road has a hazardous bridge. Concern for pedestrian safety. Land is good agricultural land and should be conserved. Concern for flood risk. What happened to the Green Belt around Writtle Village?
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS747	1156573	Miss Hayley Brook	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•		No	Increase in number of vehicles on the road causing congestion - the A1060 cannot cater for this. Even with an increased bus service, there would be a need for 44 additional buses to cater for the increase in population during peak times creating a backlog of buses on the road. People would have to leave their homes far earlier than previously, more tired and more stressed, leaving them more liable to be involved in road traffic collisions Flooding problems in Writtle. Local people should be consulted in person rather than online Writtle has already experienced the brunt of development and the neighbouring villages do not wish to be next in line. Unlike Warren Farm, Hammonds Farm would have linked to the new Beaulieu railway station and helped support the delivery of the North-East Chelmsford bypass The new Local Plan gives insufficient attention to the provision of essential infrastructure.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS760	963049	Mrs Louise Gannicott									Traffic generated by development at Warren Farm will cause Writtle to become gridlocked. Concern people will be too constrained by time to walk/cycle. Concern that having only one access road for cars will be unsafe. There's no mention of when a new school will be built or what type of healthcare facility will serve the community. Concern there are no cycleways/footbridges in the plan to give safe access to central Chelmsford. Consider developing on land south of Writtle between A414 and Writtle as this is more appropriate.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS761	968855	Mr Paul Gannicott									Affordable houses are in great demand. Concern for traffic in Writtle, additional pollution, no provision of safe footpaths or cycleways. My vision is for a greener city, less reliant on cars, with better footpaths and cycleways.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS826	1156679	Mr James Palmer			No	•	•	•		No	Strategic Growth Site 2 is not well-thought-out or based on sound evidence. East of Chelmsford is a more preferable and sustainable location. Insufficient attention has been paid to essential infrastructure which will cause traffic, public health and pollution issues.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS837	1156713	Mrs Jenny Palmer			No	•	•	•		No	Insufficient attention has been paid to essential infrastructure such as Traffic, Public Health and Pollution. Locations to the east of Chelmsford would be better in terms of sustainability.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS959	970492	Mrs Sofie Lawrence			No	•	•	•			Already traffic congestion on Lordship road and Roxwell Road, a new road would have to be built first to cope with traffic from proposed development. People will not walk or cycle to Chelmsford. Before houses are built need to sort out roads, schools, doctors etc.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS989	1102573	Mr Max Lawrence			No	•	•	•			Already traffic congestion on Lordship road and Roxwell Road, a new road would have to be built first to cope with traffic from proposed development. People will not walk or cycle to Chelmsford. Before houses are built need to sort out roads, schools, doctors etc.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS961	507777	Mr James Lawrence			No	•	•	•			Already traffic congestion on Lordship road and Roxwell Road, a new road would have to be built first to cope with traffic from proposed development. People will not walk or cycle to Chelmsford. Before houses are built need to sort out roads, schools, doctors etc.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS977	1102571	Mr Oscar Lawrence			No	•	•	•			Already traffic congestion on Lordship road and Roxwell Road, a new road would have to be built first to cope with traffic from proposed development. People will not walk or cycle to Chelmsford. Before houses are built need to sort out roads, schools, doctors etc.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1059	1097263	Mr Peter Brisley			No	•	•	•		No	The plan for West Chelmsford site is not 'sound' since the 'aspirational' sustainable transport proposals in it are plainly not viable either in improving traffic flow and certainly not in reducing the severe impact on Writtle. The plan also threatens the existence of Writtle as a separate village. The east of Chelmsford provides a more suitable location. The plan should therefore be rejected.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1033	511293	Mrs S Field			No	•	•	•		No	The proposed development referred to as 'Area 2 West Chelmsford' Writtle north of the A1060 Roxwell Road in the emerging Local Plan consultation is not well-thought-out or based on sound evidence, and is strongly opposed.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1057	1157047	Mrs Terri Bearman			No	•	•	•		No	Writtle is already at capacity in terms of services. Traffic congestion around the doctors, school and Roxwell Road. Flooding of the village, by building on surrounding fields, puts further pressure on Roxwell Brook, whose drainage and engineering infrastructure is already insufficient. Properties surrounding will see further rises in insurance premiums as a result.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1058	1156945	Mr Terry Warby	Yes		No		•	•		No	Concern traffic assumptions are not realistic of current traffic conditions on the A1060 Roxwell Road and Lordship Road/Ongar Road/The Green in Writtle. Increase in traffic from development will cause further congestion. Concern that an assumption is made that people will cycle or walk along a congested road and to gain access onto the National Cycle Network Route 1 would require a need to cross the A1060. Flood risks Loss of green space Location of development - No major road artery exists to the west of Chelmsford; or easy access to one. New station to the east of Chelmsford with easier access makes far greater sense for development. Not enough consideration of all infrastructure requirements.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1080	970544	Mrs Ann Claydon	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•			Not 'well thought out' or based on sound evidence. Lordship Road and the A1060 Roxwell Road are seriously congested additional houses will cause greater congestion and air pollution in and around Writtle village. Writtle village has become a 'Rat Run'. Unrealistic to expect new residents to walk or cycle into Chelmsford - unhealthy exercise given its proximity to a main road with all the traffic risks and air pollution. Flooding of existing national cycle route. Issue with safely crossing the A1060 to reach Lawford Lane to access cycle route. Locating development to the east of Chelmsford would be far more sensible and effective given the better transport links. Insufficient attention has been given to address the inadequacies of essential infrastructure.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1098	966168	Mr Michael Brown			No			•		No	Local road infrastructure is already at capacity and adding 800 new homes will cause significant pollution, safety and congestion issues. Development should be located to the east and north of Chelmsford which has easier access to A12 and new Beaulieu station.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1147	961741	Mrs Sarah Mills			No		•	•			Development will add traffic to this already congested area of Chelmsford will cause further pollution, safety and congestion issues. Writtle will become a rat run to access the A12. More suitable locations are east and north of Chelmsford with easy access to the A12 and new station. Infrastructure is key to any plan, and this does not take any of this into account.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1129	1157093	Mrs Hannah Brown			No			•		No	Local road infrastructure is already at capacity and adding 800 new homes will cause significant pollution, safety and congestion issues. Development should be located to the east and north of Chelmsford which has easier access to A12 and new Beaulieu station.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1143	1098616	Norman Smith			No						This proposed development would also significantly increase traffic volumes on the A1060 which is already heavily congested at peak times. The Plan does not appear to contain any proposals for additional infrastructure to deal with this problem. Loss of Grade 2 agricultural land. Green Belt review should have been undertaken.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1138	1156926	Mr Robert Bennett									Lordship Lane and Roxwell Road already beyond capacity and any further loading of existing roads will lead to further congestion and hold-ups. Pedestrians and cyclists along the A1060 will be subject to pollution and subsequent health consequences. Development should be located to the east of Chelmsford.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1176	1157143	Mrs Hilary Higginbotham			No			•		No	Traffic in Writtle is already very high at peak times, adding the amount which will undoubtedly be substantial, will be intolerable and unavoidable. This will increase with Crossrail. Flooding concerns as Writtle has an area prone to this close to the proposed area. The village surgery will be under extreme pressure. The school will not have the infrastructure to cope with the numbers. Walking to shops and to catch buses will be very difficult and unpleasant due to traffic causing delays and the danger of crossing roads. Concerns about pollution. Please listen and consider all issues of concern the residents of Writtle have, and work with the local Parish Council.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1289	872955	Hammonds Estates LLP	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	The proposed allocation is not a sustainable form of development, with the scale of development relatively small and only limited local facilities to be provided. New village at Hammonds Farm would be more sustainable providing a 'community for life'. Notes promoter of site has previously commented on site boundary in PO Document, proposing alternative masterplan providing more open space provision and structural landscaping. The ability to fund infrastructure and community requirements of the draft policy will be reduced if capacity reduced. The inability to deliver these requirements means that the proposed allocation is inappropriate and unacceptable and would not meet planning policy requirements. It is not an appropriate strategy. Given that the level of development planned at West Chelmsford will not be delivered and the impacts of the development cannot be satisfactorily mitigated through necessary infrastructure provision, the plan is not positively prepared, justified or effective and is therefore unsound. Locating growth at new sustainable village at Hammonds Farm, which would provide significantly greater benefits to Chelmsford with certainty that suitable mitigation can be provided and is an appropriate strategy.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1214	964293	Mr Rod Higginbotham			No			•		No	Traffic speed and congestion on Lordship/Ongar Road is already an issue. Concern that residents of the new development will make use of this route to access A414 west, with more congestion and potentially more speeding/accidents. Can the local school and surgery in Writtle cope with 800 extra homes. Will the bus services cope with the increased traffic flows past the Green in Writtle. Concern about flooding and pollution once Warren Farm is concreted over. The run off is bound to make issues for the River Can and Writtle village worse. CCC should work well with local parish councils to resolve some of the issues of concern to existing residents before building at Warren Farm begins. Explain the route of 'strategic road improvement schemes' will be and who will fund these developments.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1229	965179	Mr Andrew Pegg			No			•			Main concern is this will be the beginning of the end for Writtle as a village. Writtle experiences high traffic volumes at peak hours. The plan joins Chelmsford and Writtle together, but will also see Chelmsford's higher traffic volumes through Writtle. Concern for the safety of children walking to school, cyclists etc - not enough alternatives to travelling by car. Cycle paths are dark and thus intimidating to ride at night. No easy access to Cycle Route 1 from Warren Farm estate. Buses are not effective as they simply get stuck in the same traffic. Roxwell Road into Chelmsford cannot take extra traffic. Local infrastructure and services cannot cope with another 800 homes, i.e. doctor's surgery, Writtle school. Flooding is also common around Writtle college etc. This plan will only cause extra likelihood of flooding as run off from Warren Farm is inevitable. Better transport links in East of Chelmsford - don't agree that location will cause as much congestion around A12 as Writtle. Better access to pedestrian and cycle path access would be required for crossing A1060 from Warren Farm. Lack of comprehensive consideration to essential infrastructure and traffic calming/management should the Warren Farm development go ahead.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1231	1097236	Mr Andrew Hutchinson	No	No	No	•	•	•		No	I strongly object to the proposed development at STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD (Warren Farm) as the increase in traffic movements through the village of Writtle will lead to increased pollution (noise and air pollutants). The road infrastructure in Writtle is inadequate to take any more vehicle movements through the village. The extra development at Warren Farm will undoubtedly lead to a significant increase of vehicles travelling through the village to the A12 and past the Writtle primary school, with potential for school children to be seriously injured or killed with the increased traffic flows. Sstrategic road infrastructure must be incorporated in to the proposed local plan if Warren Farm is to be permitted.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1238	1157188	Mrs Victoria Pegg			No			•			I'm very worried about the volume of traffic that will have to travel through the village. The roads are already very busy at peak times. How will the doctors cope with the number of new people in 800 new homes? I believe the schools in Writtle are already full/oversubscribed and therefore feel the proposal has not been carefully thought through. I'm saddened by the thought of the beautiful village of Writtle being made into just the overspill of Chelmsford.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1333	513024	Mr R Oscroft			No	•	•	•		Yes	Resident on the A1060, personally aware of the existing congestion. The development of 800 houses, with a single access point on to a busy road will not be effective. Other modes of transport - cycling, walking and Bus services - are not a viable alternative to reaching the City Centre.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1327	1096235	Mrs Wendy Harvey			No	•	•	•		No	Object to site allocation 2 due to increased traffic, lack of health services and ability to walk/cycle from the site. Development at location 3 is a better alternative.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1336	1102446	Mr Ivor Smith			No	•	•	•			Concern over increase traffic congestion on the A1060. A new road linking Rainsford Road to the A414 is necessary.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1353	1093097	Ms Susan Braddock			No	•	•	•		No	Concern over impact of traffic congestion and traffic going through Writtle Village, impact on other infrastructure such as doctors and schools. Suggest sites to the east of Chelmsford would be better.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1378	1102394	Barbara Baird			No			•			Concern about traffic congestion and lack of GP provision in the area to support new development. Create a new roundabout at top of Cow Watering Lane to divert direct to the A414.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1386	1096494	Ms Clare Biggs			No	•	•	•			Concern that the road infrastructure will not cope with additional traffic and will lead to rat running through writtle and pollution. East of Chelmsford would be a better location for development.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1390	1097037	Miss Hellen Brown			No	•	•	•	•		Traffic concerns for Lordhsip Road Writtle and Warren Farm area. Busy already at rush hour(s) and constantly busy the rest of the day. Most of the people who would live in the proposed houses would either be heading for the A414 or A12 and that would bring horrendous increases in pollution and car numbers through Writtle village. Its a 2.5km walk to Chelmsford station from there - people will not walk this distance on a day to day basis and therefore car dependence will increase for travel to doctors/school/etc. Suggests that Hammond's Farm site has many more advantages and less environmental damage.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1398	970644	Mrs Susan Howden			No	•	•	•	•		Roxwell Road is already congested. The field slopes towards the village of Writtle - concern about flooding. Our doctor's surgery is at capacity now. Schools are full and traffic to the schools already at a dangerous level. To walk would mean going along an unlit path, prone to flooding. To say people can walk to the station is quite ridiculous - anyway the trains are full! You have empty shops and properties in Chelmsford, don't take good farmland. Could have used Britvic site for residential use. Chelmsford is not a City - No art gallery, no concert hall, just more empty shops and nightclubs.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1400	1153670	Mr Michael Webb	Yes		No	•	•	•		No	Not convinced about the solutions put forward for traffic, healthcare and pollution in Writtle. Writtle will become part of Chelmsford through urban sprawl. Needs more detail and costing for infrastructure.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1388	308344	Mr John Trusler			No	•	•	•		No	Concern that site 2 is wrongly considered as an extension of Chelmsford when it is in Writtle Parish. There is no evidence to support people walking/cycling rather than driving. There is already traffic congestion and rat running through Writtle, this will increase with more homes. Site 2 should be removed and development placed to the east of Chelmsford.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1391	1157397	Mr Robert Harvey			No	•	•	•		No	Concern over traffic increases and rat running through Writtle. Does not consider people will walk or cycle and there is insufficient provision for GPs and schools in the area. Infrastructure should be in place before housing development and Location 3 would be better suited to more development.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1392	1157399	Mr Neil Rettie			No	•	•	•	•		Warren Farm site is already extremely congested at rush hour times of the day. When the second Chelmsford Railway station gets built a major housing development at Warren Farm would not benefit from being able to use it. Pollution levels around Writtle will dramatically increase as all these extra cars come through the village to the A414/A12. A housing development at Warren Farm would effectively join Writtle into Chelmsford and a special 'Doomsday' noted village and its history would be encompassed into the city! Do not include this site, use Hammonds Farm, or a site that can utilise new rail station/park and ride.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1403	510682	Miss Mary Steadman	No	No	No	•	•	•		No	Concerns about increased volume of traffic on Roxwell Road and through Writtle village. Doctors is at capacity, there are additional houses being built now. Concern about building site access, should be no access through Lordship Road/Ongar Road. Walking or cycling into Chelmsford would be dangerous, with no pavements or lighting. Would the bus company think it viable to provide extra services? Broomfield Hospital is under stress but not mentioned. Concern about the effects on wildlife - flora and fauna - and that villages will become sprawling urban towns. The more preferable area for development is on the east side of Chelmsford where traffic congestion would be less than the already congested side of west Chelmsford.



Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1407	308354	Mr Chris Hibbitt			No		•	•		No	Concern over traffic congestion in and around Writtle. Suggest sites closer to the new railway station and NE Bypass would be more suitable.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1408	968845	Mrs Wendy Hibbitt			No		•	•		No	Concerned about traffic congestion in and around Writtle and lack of space at schools and GPs in the area. Does not believe people will walk or cycle from the development and considers sites closer to the new train station would be more appropriate.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1409	970923	Mr Edward Sclater			No		•				Concern over increased traffic pollution. Prefer development to go to the east of Chelmsford.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1410	967153	Mrs Hazel Jackson			No	•	•	•	•	No	Concern over traffic congestion, increased pollution, impact on wildlife and Writtle merging with Chelmsford.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1419	968912	Mrs Isabel Clarke			No	•	•	•		No	There are serious delays on the Roxwell Road during peak hours now. Any accident on the A12 causes even more serious delays and traffic both around and in Writtle. The road system can only just cope now. Due to different work times car sharing does not work. People do not have time to walk to public transport, they need to drop children off on their way. How do people get to the cycle route across the busy road? The East of Chelmsford is far more suitable, there would be less chaos caused on the roads by more transport on the roads. Not only people going to work - but deliveries of food and goods.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1425	1102266	Mrs Brita Junker Smith			No	•	•	•			Area already at saturation point regarding transport, traffic, schools, doctors and hospitals. New infrastructure needs to be built to support development.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1427	1157583	Mr James Williams			No		•	•			Congestion in and around Writtle, and adding another 800 plus houses will only make the situation worse. Getting out of Writtle onto the A1060 can take as long as an hour at rush hour (pm). Traffic backs up to the Blue Bridge from Writtle Primary/Infants Schools - the rat run along Margaretting Road to access Crossrail at Shenfield will increase the risk to the children of Writtle. Bus service along the A1060 only runs once an hour Mon-Sat (no service on Sunday) and starts after 7.30 at the Warren Farm: commuters would have to drive to Chelmsford to get the earlier trains. We already have very bad flooding at the Cow Watering Lane junction and this will increase with the additional 800 houses being uphill from this point. As there isn't the road infrastructure on this side of Chelmsford to support this many additional new houses, it would make more sense to locate them near the A12 on the other side of town.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1428	1157588	Mr Christopher Willis			No	•	•	•		No	The proposed development is not well thought out or based on sound evidence Concern about traffic congestion on the key links comprising Roxwell Road, Chignall Road, Lordship Road. The bus service is extremely poor and very limited. Lack of existing healthcare is of major concern with the introduction of a further 800 households. The east of Chelmsford would be a far preferable and more sustainable location for any new major development with better transport links generating far less traffic congestion and pollution. Insufficient attention has been paid to essential infrastructure which will continue the downward spiral into traffic, public health, and pollution chaos.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1434	1102583	Ms Georgina Mayes			No	•	•	•	•		Traffic will be a significant problem. Writtle is already gridlocked by people parking and busing into Chelmsford. The car park at the station is full by 6.45am. 800 houses will generate more than 800 cars to use the already congested road. The bus service will be inadequate. Cycling will be very dangerous. To reach oversubscribed schools children will have to cross a very busy road. The GPs are also oversubscribed and parking is impossible now. Accidents on the A12 cause Chelmsford to become gridlocked. Concern that development will affect the value of houses in Writtle. Move the site to the east of Chelmsford, more space, better transport. The A12 needs updating for the future.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1435	1157650	Mr Steven Williams			No		•	•			Local traffic increasing. Roads unable to cope with cars and lorries now. Stop just building houses on farmland.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1436	1102607	Mr John Murphy			No	•	•	•		No	Concern that the site will not be accessible to services in Writtle without driving and development will increase traffic congestion. The development will destroy the character of Writtle.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1439	1157691	Mr Lefras Coetzee			No	•	•	•		No	Two main objections relate to insufficient infrastructure with regards to: Traffic - access to A12 and A414 via Writtle. The Green and Lordship Road single lane road carrying 1000 cars an in peak hours; Access to Chelmsford via A1016 already congested single lane road; more traffic and congestion will lead to increased pollution. Doctors - could current doctors surgery be expanded as it is already under pressure.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1401	963133	Rev Canon John Howden	No	No	No	•	•	•	•		There has been little consultation. Concern about traffic congestion and provision of infrastructure. Failing to listen to the residents of Writtle. Major concerns are traffic management and single access onto A1060 Pedestrian safety - little thought being given to crossings, lighting, safe footpaths Schools are full Surgery - oversubscribed, and concerned that a new surgery on Warren Farm will take away the existing facilities. A better site would be to the east of Chelmsford. Need a sustainable traffic plan to include A12; an infrastructure plan for shops, schools, medical facilities; housing to be built after facilities are in place.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1402	1097314	Mrs Deborah Webb			No	•	•	•	•	No	Traffic concerns - A1060 Roxwell Road already operates at 96% capacity and the traffic regularly queues back towards Writtle village along Lordship Road, additional traffic will cause peak time misery for commuters. The A1060/Chignal Road junction is already wholly inadequate, there is no improvement plan and limited space. The traffic through Writtle village centre ill inevitably increase, and Writtle could become a rat run for traffic accessing Crossrail in Shenfield. Safety concerns - A1060 is only 7m wide, unlit, and if people are to access what will become the 'southern' portion of the village / as well as cycle paths into Chelmsford they will need to cross this national speed limit / very busy road. The proposal for just one access road onto the new estate at the roundabout at Lordship Road is absurd. Bus services are limited and expensive. Individual transport plans will not overcome traffic congestion problems. Lack of health care provision for the proposed additional population. The east of Chelmsford would preferable and more sustainable location for a new development, including transport links. Insufficient attention has been paid to essential infrastructure. A smaller (400 house) development would be more appropriate for the Area 2 West Chelmsford site.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1413	967132	Mr Kevin Jackson			No	•	•	•	•	No	Concern over increased traffic congestion and pollution, impact on wildlife and Writtle merging into Chelmsford. An alternative site with better traffic links should be considered instead.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1414	1102143	Mr Nigel Fox			No	•	•	•		No	Strongly opposed on traffic grounds. Chignal Road, A1060 Roxwell Road, and Lordship Road already experience high levels of congestion and this development will increase traffic and journey tome considerably. Cyclists from the development would have to cross the A1060 (currently without crossing facilities) and subject to national speed limit to access the National Cycle Route 1. East of Chelmsford (Hammonds Farm) would be a far preferable and more sustainable location. Insufficient attention has been paid to the infrastructure for Warren Farm, whereas the Hammonds Farm site would develop the infrastructure before the building of the houses and has direct access to the A12.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1416	962490	Mrs Lauretta Fox			No	•	•	•		No	Strongly opposed on traffic grounds. Chignal Road, A1060 Roxwell Road, and Lordship Road already experience high levels of congestion and this development will increase traffic and journey tome considerably. Cyclists from the development would have to cross the A1060 (currently without crossing facilities) and subject to national speed limit to access the National Cycle Route 1. East of Chelmsford (Hammonds Farm) would be a far preferable and more sustainable location. Insufficient attention has been paid to the infrastructure for Warren Farm, whereas the Hammonds Farm site would develop the infrastructure before the building of the houses and has direct access to the A12.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1418	968899	Mr Peter Lewington			No	•	•	•			Concern over traffic congestion in and around Writtle. Writtle will merge with Chelmsford and loose its historic identity. East Chelmsford would have less impact than the west in terms of traffic and pollution.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1421	968900	Ms Helen Riddington			No	•	•	•			Concern over traffic congestion, pollution and rat running through Writtle. Writtle will merge with Chelmsford and lose its character. Access onto the A1060 is not suitable for more traffic. east Chelmsford would be a more sustainable location with less traffic congestion and pollution.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1422	511765	Ms N Pippen	Yes		No	•	•	•		No	Traffic - into city centre, through Chignal and through Writtle Bus services - poor Schools - primary, junior and secondary inadequate for this volume of housing. No definite plans for these. Pedestrians - the idea that people would walk into the city from the development on a regular daily basis it totally unrealistic. Individual personal transport plans not specific. The traffic consultants reports in 2017 specifically relating to Writtle cast doubt on CCC report assumptions.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1424	968913	Mr Geoffrey Clarke			No	•	•	•			Traffic congestion will get worse and rat running through Writtle. Pedestrian, cycling and car sharing are not a suitable option. East Chelmsford is better served to accommodate this growth as it is more sustainable.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1437	1093104	Mrs Janet Osborne Williams			No		•	•			Traffic: At the A1060 junction with Lordship Road between 5.30 and 6.00pm, it takes around 20 minutes to get from the end of the queue to the Writtle roundabout, and an hour driving to Chelmsford (Theatres). Congestion is already too great west of Chelmsford, the roads are already at capacity. Schools and traffic: Margaretting Road - route to the A12, concern Crossrail at Shenfield Station will generate extra traffic, which would pass Writtle Infant and Junior Schools and be dangerous for children. Cyclists: Accessing The National Cycle Route 1 (nearest joining point) into Chelmsford involves crossing the A1060, and no road lighting in Lordship Road. Doctor's/Dentists Surgery: Surgeries in Writtle village are on the other side of the A1060 – is no crossing point and no road lighting. Flooding: Flood area at the junction of Cow Watering Lane near the bridge and the ford. Concern that the problem would become worse with development. Access to Chelmsford: Limited bus service is limited, no service on Sunday. Walking would not be an option for most people. Archaeology: A high concentration of Archaeological sites within the Writtle area - if the site is developed, will it be excavated first? East of Chelmsford (Hammonds Farm) would be a far preferable and more sustainable location, nearer to roads and infrastructure.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1438	1102569	Miss Anne Murphy			No	•	•	•		No	Concern that there is no pedestrian access to Writtle Village from the site or crossing over the A1060. Without this and access to bus services concern that there will be increased traffic congestion. Flooding in the area needs to addressed. Development will destroy the character of Writtle village.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1507	970701	Mrs Ann Gardner			No	•	•	•	•		Concern over impact on roads and traffic congestion, healthcare, schools, pollution, flooding, minerals not safeguarded and public safety. People will not walk or cycle.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1509	963534	Mr Laurence Catchpole			No						Traffic congestion will increase and people will not walk or cycle. Concern over flood risk.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1486	970480	Mrs Susan Bell			No				•		A1060 is already approaching capacity which will be exceeded by the proposed development, with no proposed relief. Health, wellbeing and environment of the existing community would be adversely effected.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1488	972052	Mr John Whitlock			No	•	•	•	•	Yes	development will have adverse affect on Writtle. Concern for loss of countryside, urban sprawl, developing on green belt land, possible irreversible harm to Writtle, congestion. There is no assessment of impact on Writtle. Travelling showperson plot is unlikely to integrate with development. Development is not sustainable and does not comply with parts of NPPF. No timescale/commitment for SUD provision. Inconsistent with S9, SPS13, CO1, CO4. Allocation should be deleted.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1489	1151474	Mr Daniel Bell			No				•		A1060 is already approaching capacity which will be exceeded by the proposed development, with no proposed relief. Health, wellbeing and environment of the existing community would be adversely effected.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1490	971425	Mr Christopher Bell			No				•		A1060 is already approaching capacity which will be exceeded by the proposed development, with no proposed relief. Health, wellbeing and environment of the existing community would be adversely effected.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1492	1096774	Mrs Sophie Jackson			No	•	•	•	•		Existing road system would not be able to support the increase in traffic caused by new development. Proposed transport plans would do little to overcome traffic problems. Services and facilities would be unable to cope with proposed development. Need to protect villages from merging with Chelmsford. Development should be located to the east of Writtle with Green Belt land replaced at Warren Farm.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1503	1158459	Mrs Elaine Crook	No	No	No	•	•	•		No	Key links, in and around Writtle, comprising Chignal Road, A1060 Roxwell Road, Lordship Road and The Green, which already experience congestion, will experience higher levels of congestion and journey-time delay. Roxwell Road would be undesirable walking route to reach city centre. Limited bus service and improvements unlikely. Individual personal transport plans proposed by CCC will not overcome these traffic congestion problems. Development should be located to the east of Chelmsford.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1505	964909	Mr Graeme Crook	No	No	No	•	•	•		No	Key links, in and around Writtle, comprising Chignal Road, A1060 Roxwell Road, Lordship Road and The Green, which already experience congestion, will experience higher levels of congestion and journey-time delay. Roxwell Road would be undesirable walking route to reach city centre. Limited bus service and improvements unlikely. Individual personal transport plans proposed by CCC will not overcome these traffic congestion problems. Development should be located to the east of Chelmsford.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1513	969707	Mr Norman Awcock			No	•		•			Writtle should be retained as a village and not a suburb of Chelmsford. Concern over traffic congestion, flooding, Writtle Surgery being moved. People will not walk or cycle. Consider East Chelmsford would be a better option as all traffic from West Chelmsford will head to the A12.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1511	969695	Mrs Mavis Awcock			No			•		No	Concern over traffic congestion and rat running through Writtle, and safety of pedestrians and cyclists crossing busy roads, impact on flood risk. People are unlikely to walk and cycle. Development would be better to the east of Chelmsford where there is existing infrastructure.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1514	1094033	Mr Michael Petty	No		No	•		•		No	Increased traffic congestion and people will not walk or cycle. Hammonds Farm is better suited to development as closer to the A12.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1534	1096971	Mrs Janet Petty									Concern over increased traffic congestion in Writtle. People will not walk and cycle to destinations and crossing the Roxwell Road will be dangerous.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1537	1099195	Mr William Jackson			No	•	•	•	•		Existing road system would not be able to support the increase in traffic caused by new development. Proposed transport plans would do little to overcome traffic problems. Services and facilities would be unable to cope with proposed development. Need to protect villages from merging with Chelmsford. Development should be located to the east of Writtle with Green Belt land replaced at Warren Farm.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1544	1158676	Crest Strategic Projects Ltd	Yes	Yes	No		•			Yes	further clarity is required to the infrastructure requirements requested as part of the policy allocation as there are discrepancies between this and the Council's own evidence - in particular the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. The only issue of unsoundness relates to the evidential justification for locating 5 Travelling Showpersons Pitches within the West Chelmsford site. Delete the second bullet point in Policy SGS2 See attached for proposed site plan.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1545	1095422	Mr David Walker			No	•	•	•			Concern about increased traffic on Roxwell Road, with vehicles using Lordship Road and Writtle village instead. Access to the cycle path is across the busy road with no crossing point. People will not walk 45 minutes to the railway station. Will impact on doctors and schools. Concern that it is an area of flooding, and that development will have an adverse effect on lower areas. Consider Hammonds Farm - closer to A12 and new railway station, CCC previously said they would consider Garden City principles, so why not here?
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1533	1099010	Mr James Holtom									In summary I oppose the Warren Farm proposal; the plans as published will harm the communities of Writtle and northern Chelmsford. For reasons it does not deign to share, the council persists in refusing to explore alternatives, creating the impression that this 'consultation' is a charade.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1540	1158682	Mr David Ketley			No	•	•	•	•		Healthcare, access to Hospital care, adequate parking, extra patients, impact of vehicles, pollution, traffic congestion, infrastructure, cyclists access to National Cycle Network crossing A1060, Flooding on low lying land.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1541	966156	Mrs Wendy Ketley			No	•	•	•	•		Healthcare - Access to hospital care, adequate parking for extra patients. Pollution - Impact of vehicles. Traffic - Congestion, infrastructure. Cyclists - Access to National Cycle Network crossing A1060. Flooding - On lower lying land.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1547	1158715	Mrs Jasmine Montague			No		•		•	No	1, No consideration to the rich wildlife currently resident in this area 2. The secondary school proposed is Hylands which would need to be extended to accommodate the additional students. This can only be done by removing the school from green belt land, against national policy. 3. The development would result in gridlock on Roxwell Road, which is already at capacity. Walking to Chelmsford is unrealistic. Local busses have been cancelled. 4. Creating a cut through to Avon Road would make Trent Road a 'rat run' in this already busy road. 5. New residents would require private cars to access shopping. 6. A development of this size would require dental and doctors surgeries. 8. Travelling show people plots. It is stated there should be room for expansion but no consideration of controls in place to restrict access to five units only at the present time. 9. There is no existing cycle route in Chignal Road, this road is extremely hazardous for cyclists.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1551	1096216	Mrs Sue Emery			No	•	•	•			Object to increased traffic flow and congestion on A1060 Roxwell Road / Chignal Road / Lordship which already back-up through the village at peak times. Writtle would become a rat-run through to A12 & A414 links. Unrealistic to assume young families will walk / or bus / or cycle. It will be unsafe to cross A1060 for village facilities and cycle paths. School is already oversubscribed with no extra capacity. Doctors and pharmacy will find it impossible to cope with 800 new households. There is professional evidence indicating concerns ref flooding. Lack of strategic road improvements and traffic management make the Warren Farm plan unmanageable. Traffic, people, health and pollution are all important issues under concern. Take on board the recommendations of the new action group and Writtle PC, independent consultants ref traffic issues. Address concerns of Writtle surgery and schools. Take measures to show consideration to pollution / flooding & environmental matters. Give assurance of road improvements and infrastructure.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1553	1158725	Mrs Madeleine Woodyard			No	•	•	•	•		I am concerned that increased traffic caused by the new housing will snarl up the village and raise pollution levels. I also cannot see how the doctors and schools will cope with the resultant increased pressures on their services.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1554	1094988	Mrs Wendy Walker			No	•	•	•		No	This will create traffic chaos both to Writtle and Chelmsford. Traffic around The Green, Lordship Rd, Roxwell Rd , Chignal Rd , around the school will increase. Householders not going to walk into Chelmsford/Writtle, or work from home, or cycle. Query whether the existing doctors and school can cope with 800 new homes. Likely to cause flooding to certain houses in Writtle. Bus service is limited. Suggest consider Hammonds Farm, nearer to A12 with better transport links, and believes that infrastructure would be built there before houses.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1555	1095836	Mr David Woodyard			No	•	•	•	•		As a regular user of A1060 Roxwell Rd between Lorship Rd and Chignal Rd between 4-6pm on weekdays, I can state that there is no spare capacity for extra traffic caused by the proposed housing development. In fact on occasions even Lordship Road leading to the A1060 is snarled up raising pollution levels. Also the new housing will adversely affect the doctors and schools in the village which are already overstretched. Concern that Writtle will become absorbed into West Chelmsford and lose its village identity in an urban sprawl.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1556	970591	Mr David Stock	No								I understand that there is a legal challenge being mounted by the N.W Chelmsford Action Group to this plan. I feel that the major problem with this plan is the disastrous affect the large amount of traffic from this site at peak times will have on the Roxwell Road and Writtle (at peak traffic times now surveys have recorded 100% plus traffic volumes on Roxwell Rd, Lordship Rd Writtle and Writtle Green). Concern that traffic will delay emergency ambulances attending the village. I understand a school and medical centre are to be provided by Essex Education Dept and NHS. Failure to provide these in adequate time will have a very damaging effect on the local area.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1558	970589	Mrs Pauline Stock	No								I understand that there is a legal challenge against this development to build 800 homes on the Warren Farm site by the N W Chelmsford action group. This development would be an absolute disaster with the infrastructure that is in place now, doctors, schools etc. The traffic is running over capacity now in Writtle village. Crossing roads by foot or car is dangerous. Traffic queues through the village, along Lordship Road to Warren Farm and along Roxwell Road to Chelmsford town centre. Extra traffic from 800 dwellings would exacerbate the problem and bring it to a complete stand still, with no access for emergency vehicles. Nobody would be able to get to hospital, the station, work or school.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1561	962427	Mrs Celine Mallett			No	•	•	•	•		The infrastructure needed to go along the 800 houses has not been thought through. Concern about increased traffic (and therefore pollution) - Lordship Road in Writtle and the road around the Green are already at full capacity during rush hour. People will be encouraged to cycle/walk to town but no cycle lane/paths will be put in place putting cyclists/walkers at risk. The planners need to offer considered and realistic measures to ease traffic and congestion on the Roxwell Road and on Lordship Road and Green in Writtle before going ahead with the development.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1562	962426	Mr Lee Mallett			No	•	•	•	•		The infrastructure needed for these 800 houses is not in place. Parking, congestion and danger to children around the schools will be much worse as a result of the increased traffic and the inevitable 'rat running' along Margaretting Road and access to Crossrail at Shenfield. Traffic generated by the site at Warren Farm will be loaded onto one point of Roxwell Road which already has high congestion. People would be more encouraged to walk/cycle to Chelmsford but the infrastructure is not in place and bus services are extremely limited and improvements are unlikely. The infrastructure needs to be put in place first - to include measures to divert traffic away from Writtle, the Green, Lordship Road. There are far more appropriate sites that could be considered to the east of Chelmsford.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1579	1102204	Mrs Lyn Parsons			No	•	•	•	•		Experts forecast your project will increase traffic in the area by 90-100% on roads that are already congested.. The area around Writtle Primary School is not safe, too many cars in an area that is used to access the A12. Writtle School is at capacity. The Writtle doctors surgery is at capacity. Writtle bus service is not great, often buses are cut. Roxwell Road cannot possibly take any more traffic. Pollution will increase in Writtle. The west of Chelmsford is not fit to take any more traffic. Make use of the infrastructure in the east of Chelmsford, bigger road, direct access to A12, new station at Beaulieu Park. Park and Ride already built.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1580	1158855	Miss Jessica Davis	No		No		•	•		No	With better services, links and facilities to the east of Chelmsford, if more houses are to be built anywhere they would be far more suitable placed here than to the west, notable within the Parish of Writtle. Concerns about: traffic congestion school and doctor capacity Writtle becoming a suburb of Chelmsford loss of countryside near to an Agricultural College safe walking/cycle routes into Chelmsford loss of habitat, build somewhere where the impact on habitats would be less substantial
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1552	1096250	Mr Robert Emery			No	•	•	•	•		Traffic - will increase through Writtle and village green and Lordship Road and 1060 to Chignal Road, already queues back to Writtle College. Increase through 1060 to The Rodings as rat runs through the back lanes, will cause verge deterioration. School and doctors - no-one walks - congestion will increase at Writtle School and doctors in the village. Flooding - water run-off from Warren Farm will enter River Can, and flooding Lordship Road and Roxwell Road should be considered. Loss of prime agricultural land. Consider pollution, flooding, wildlife, schools and doctors surgery and impact on Writtle. Listen to Parish Council and N West Action Groups for Writtle and villages and Chelmsford.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1574	512587	Mrs Mary Roberts			No	•	•	•		No	The road is heavily congested into Chelmsford already, without additional traffic from new homes. Traffic from the new site to the A12 would head through Writtle (passing the College and the Junior School) causing congestion. The same problem in reverse (out of Chelmsford) 5-7pm and from the A12 through Writtle. Warren Bridge and the road itself would require major upgrade. Concern if children go to Hylands School, there would be big increase in cars parking on the bend beyond Mill House, as there is no bus from Chignal Rd through Writtle. The children will not cycle a) because the road is narrow and would be dangerous and b) because modern parents do not let children cycle in the rain. Need road infrastructure including pavements. Health services - primary care and the need to increase beds at Broomfield - already at capacity. Warren Bridge floods. More water will accrue as rain cannot soak into the fields. Loss of excellent unspoilt agricultural land at a time when we are increasing imports of wheat. Would be better located to the east of Chelmsford.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1578	969496	Mrs Margaret Adams			No	•	•	•		No	A1060 is relatively narrow, lacking street lights and already heavily congested at peak times. Traffic queues in Chignal Road, A1060, Lordship Road, Writtle Green. Access to Crossrail, Shenfield and the A12 through Writtle passing the Primary School and Writtle College. Lordship Road bridge is very narrow and the road itself floods in very wet weather. Walking to Railway Station and City Centre takes too long to be practical. The cycle route is south of A1060 so crossing is necessary. Children attending Hylands School would face hazardous walking and cycling conditions or those taken by car would face parking problems and add to congestion. The east of Chelmsford has better transport links to the A12 generating less traffic congestion and pollution.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1582	963273	Mr Jeffrey Worvell			No	•	•	•			Concern about extra traffic to be generated by this development, especially at peak flow times. The new population would not have access to relevant medical and educational services. The increased risk of flooding due is of serious concern. Areas to the east of Chelmsford are better placed to take increased population, e.g. because of the A12. It would be preferable if the City and relevant Parish Councils (Writtle & Chignal) could co-operate to ensure a more viable plan.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1583	968354	Councillor John Aldridge	Yes	Yes	No		•	•		Yes	Plan does not include sufficient infrastructure to support the development. Increased traffic through Writtle and insufficient public transport to get to the City Centre. Traffic data is insufficient to predict new traffic movements and does not take into account the growth of Writtle University College. Further development should be closer to the A12 and new train station, for example 'Hammonds Farm'.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1592	1097044	Mrs Christine Coetzee			No	•		•		No	Traffic congestion will increase. Local schools and doctors are at capacity and new ones are required. A bypass avoiding Writtle is required and local cycle paths should be improved.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1581	1095867	Mrs Maria Worvell			No	•	•	•		No	The road network, traffic flows and transport services have not been fully considered . The additional population will not have proper access to education and medical services - which are currently being overwhelmed. There is also additional pollution to be considered and the potential flooding issues. Consider East of the city rather than the West where road (A12 & A130) and rail links already exist. To make this plan 'sound' the City and Parish(s) planners must co-operate and consider all aspects before going ahead.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1593	970356	Mrs Dianne Collins	Yes		No		•	•			No facilities being built with housing. no capacity at surgery for 2000 people 800 homes would generate. Not enough places at school already - where would children go? Increased traffic and pollution. People would not walk the 2 miles to station down Roxwell Road at beginning and end of day. Increase in water table would increase liable flooding to properties down in the village by this growth in housing.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1594	967077	Mrs Deanna Loveday			No	•	•	•			Increased traffic congestion and pollution. Public transport options, cycling and walking are not suitable options. Development would be better to the east of Chelmsford where there are more transport links and less traffic congestion.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1595	1012897	Mr Peter Pearce			No	•	•	•			Increased traffic congestion and pollution. Development would be better to the east of Chelmsford where there are more transport links and less traffic congestion.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1650	1159803	Mr James Whitlock			No	•	•	•	•	No	Development would encroach on Writtle and separation from Chelmsford. Traffic generated would have adverse impact on Writtle. Proposed allocation and policy SGS2 should be deleted from the Plan.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1652	1152098	Mr Ralph Bray			No	•	•	•		No	Development would cause traffic congestion in and around Writtle. The Travel Plan would be unlikely to overcome the traffic problems. Insufficient attention has been paid to essential infrastructure, traffic management and danger to people. Development should be located to the east of Chelmsford. If development goes ahead, CCC should work with Writtle and Chignal Parishes to resolve congestion.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1661	1159886	Mr Oliver Whitlock			No	•	•	•	•	No	The allocation will result in a loss of open countryside and result in urban sprawl next to Writtle. The allocation does not represent sustainable development due to the traffic, congestion and pollution that would be generated and the impact it would have on the community. The allocation will undermine Green Belt principles. The allocation should be deleted or the Green Belt and Green Wedge should be extended to form part of the allocation. Or the recreation area in the allocation should be sited to the front to create a buffer with Writtle.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1682	965406	Mr Jonathan Weymouth			No						Impact of developments on Writtle not given due weight. Development should be located to the east of Chelmsford e.g. Hammonds Farm
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1696	1159936	Mrs Christina Brewster			No	•	•	•	•	No	Concern over flood risk, traffic congestion, pollution, lack of supporting infrastructure to support the development and lack of alternative public transport/walking and cycling options. Sites east of Chelmsford would be better placed due to their location to better existing infrastructure.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1714	1157238	Mr Alex Birch									Concerns: potential impact on our property value; loss of the advantages of backing onto fields; volume of people passing through to connect to Chelmsford; roads and increase in traffic; effect on wildlife behind our property ( deer/ badgers / birds and many more); concerned about well-being of our own animals and impact of building work and more people on them; concerned to hear that travellers may also be occupying some space; noise pollution during the building works and when the building is complete; being able to resell our property during the building work and after; impact on the local schools.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1722	1099197	Mr Charles Jackson			No	•	•	•	•		Traffic is already an issue and will be made worse by proposed development. Transport plan will do little to overcome the traffic problems. Services and facilities are already at capacity. Instead of Warren Farm, development should be located to the east side of Writtle, with Green Belt allocation switched to Warren Farm site.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1705	1096679	Mrs Ann Weymouth			No						Traffic impact and congestion in Writtle, poor cycle and pedestrian alternatives to car use. Writtle will lose its separate identity.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1764	1160014	Historic England	Yes	Yes							We welcome the specific section on the historic and natural environment which establishes design principles and an appropriate framework for landscaping and visual impact mitigation.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1793	1096374	Ms Julia McClure			No	•	•	•			Development will increase traffic in the area. Proposed mitigation measures unsuitable. Development should be allocated to the east of Chelmsford.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1811	1160052	North West Parishes Group									Area requires the development of sensitive landscapes, does not represent a sustainable growth of the rural area in which it is situated. Issues in terms of social infrastructure provision and impact on the existing local communities. Concern for traffic generation, modal shift - there is no evidence to suggest encouraging people to walk/cycle will work. Site is not connected to the cycle/walking path on River Can. Concern for landscape sensitivity, loss of agricultural land. Concern that current facilities (eg doctors) cannot support growth. Oppose greenfield land lost on this site (comments also under PS SA45).
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1843	476873	Little Waltham Parish Council			No					Yes	Does not comply with S1 as unsustainable. Site is beyond acceptable walking distance to schools/retail/trains. There is no space for bus/cycle lanes on A1060. (For breakdown of North West Parishes Group response see PS1808 - PS1832 and PS SA45 - PS SA49)
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1873	1160380	Mrs Barbara Blouet			No	•	•	•	•	No	Concerned at loss of separation from Chelmsford and urban sprawl. Traffic concerns - roads already struggling to cope. Medical services and schools are overstretched. Water supply concerns. Not sustainable. Suggest moving site significantly further north of the A1060 to preserve countryside approach/setting for Writtle.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1834	1099041	Writtle Neighbourhood Plan Group									Points in PO rep were not adequately addressed in "You Said - We Did". Site is unsuitable for development - particularly inadequate infrastructure. Does not prevent coalescence of surrounding villages. Oppose site name as West Chelmsford and referring to Writtle as having their own NP. Support Writtle PC rep to CCC Pre-Submission.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1835	308558	Writtle Parish Council									Traffic report and North West Parishes response attached. WPC refer to statistics in traffic report to oppose development in SGS2 due to congestion concerns. Hammonds Farm should be considered. Concern for urban sprawl. Minimal infrastructure is planned so roads in the area will exceed 100% capacity. Concern plan will not achieve health and wellbeing. Development here is a poor use of land and does not conserve or enhance soil quality. Concern for flood risk and impact on archaeological aspect of site.



Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1869	1160377	Sue Whitlock			No	•	•	•	•	No	Suggest siting the development parcel further north, with redrawn Green Wedge north of Roxwell Road to increase distance between new development and existing Writtle village. Or extend the Green Wedge for this purpose. Or resite the recreation/SUDS area shown in draft masterplan north of Roxwell Road, with the development to the north of it. Previous plans showed 2-300 homes which would have extended further north in any case.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1870	1160379	Judith Woolley									Please ensure there are plenty of cycle tracks and footpaths from Warren Farm development to Chelmsford, also Morrisons, surgery, school and library. Ensure they are wide enough for double buggies. These have not been provided from Hollow Lane development; a disappointment for those living there. Suggest a cycle track from the college to the new roundabout, and from the roundabout into Chelmsford, does not need to be at the side of the road. In the short term please provide a footpath from Hollow Lane to Chignal Road.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 2 – WEST CHELMSFORD	PS1889	1101348	Education & Skills Funding Agency									ESFA welcomes safeguarding of land for schools. Welcomes the confirmation of site sizes required for the schools as well as confirmation of the anticipated number of FE and cost for each school in the updated Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). The clear requirements within the site-specific policies for financial contributions to offsite education provision are also supported.
7.111	PS481	1096344	Mrs C Eubanks			No	•	•	•			The area around site 2 is already very congested at peak times and there are insufficient buses to serve the needs of a new development, no space for bus lanes, and no cycle lanes for safe cycling along Roxwell Road. The area East of Chelmsford would make a much more suitable location with better transport links. .
7.111	PS549	963020	Mr Elfed Owen			No	•	•	•		No	I strongly oppose development at Warren Farm. The CCC traffic assumption is not a true reflection of the chaotic situation on the A1060 and Lordship Road at peak times. The proposal will cause grid lock with further congestion created by the new development at the old BT site. The development should be located east of Chelmsford which has better transport links.
7.111	PS606	1155336	Mr Ian Buick			No	•	•	•	•		Development will cause major traffic issues in the Writtle area. In short not enough consideration as been given for the need for sufficient infrastructure, the need to minimise traffic in our towns and cities, the effect on public health and to reduce pollution. The proposed housing development could be located to the east of Chelmsford where there are better transport links, particularly the A12 and the proposed NE bypass and new rail station at Boreham.
7.111	PS645	1155942	Mr David Taylor			No	•	•	•		No	Development in Writtle is not sound. Concerns for traffic congestion, noise pollution, danger to pedestrians. CCC should consider development in the east of Chelmsford as there are better transport links.
7.111	PS691	1096385	Mr Norman Preece		Yes	No	•					The road infrastructure in Writtle and the A1060 are already inadequate, highly congested and dangerous. The development would create further congestion and increase rat running through Writtle, putting more strain on the narrow road bridge and create safety hazards together with other planned development in Writtle. East Chelmsford has the road links required.
7.111	PS725	1095110	Mr Richard Parrotte			No	•	•	•			Concern over traffic congestion and pollution in and around Writtle. If allocated there should be reduced speed limits and improved junction layouts and traffic lights for Site 2; bus, pedestrian and cycle connections into Chelmsford and Writtle; and internal road layouts should allow for bus priority measures. East Chelmsford has better connections than site 2.
7.111	PS914	1156759	Mr Malcolm Burrells			No		•				The proposal does not provide "a development that maximises opportunities for travel by sustainable modes" Increased impact on traffic. It will be a car lead development.
7.111	PS943	965123	Mr Richard Brotherton			No	•	•	•			Unacceptable levels of traffic congestion and lack of suitable public transport options.
7.111	PS1051	965125	Miss Carolyn Carlile			No	•	•	•			Increasing traffic on A1060 Roxwell Road. The road is not wide enough to be upgraded, nor wide enough to accommodate a bus only lane. Limited buses in the area with bus companies cutting services especially in rural areas. Cycling is not practical along the road due to as heavy goods vehicles. Lack of footpaths in this area plus issue of crossing the Roxwell Road if walking. Flooding on Lordship Road. Negative effect on the Green Belt. Impact on Wildlife. Delivery timeframe of the new primary school. Capacity for secondary education. Healthcare facilities - Writtle Surgery is overflowing, where will the new residents go.
7.111	PS941	1156826	Mr Cymon Van Sertima									The development of West Chelmsford will increase traffic and with no changes in infrastructure will be unsustainable. Will place additional pressure on local facilities.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
7.111	PS1030	962926	Mr Andrew King			No	•	•	•		No	Traffic assumptions are flawed. Heavy congestion at all junctions around Writtle and Chignal Road, additional houses will add to the congestion and pollution in the village. Only one exit onto A1060 will further increase journey times into Chelmsford. Road into Chelmsford is not wide enough for a bus lane or cycle path. Need essential infrastructure before development can take place. No means of crossing the A1060 to the national cycle path. The proposed development will make north / south split of the village. Extra strain on the village doctors and amenities in village. East of Chelmsford would be a more sustainable location where there are better transport links generating less traffic congestion and pollution.
7.111	PS1209	1157144	Mrs Rita Askwith	No				•	•			Little evidence that improving walking/cycling ways increases use. Development will cars to a very congested area. Very few of the residence will choose to walk or cycle to Chelmsford. The proposed housing will reduce the farm land left for flooding and increase problems in Writtle village.
7.111	PS1323	963250	Mr Tom Key			No	•	•	•			Objection to Location 2. Development will add to existing traffic congestion. The site is poorly connected, bus services are very limited and there are poor walking and cycling links. Insufficient attention has been given to essential infrastructure e.g. schools, transport links and GP Surgeries which will only worsen pollution and chaos. East of Chelmsford has better transport links generating less congestion and pollution.
7.112	PS609	1155336	Mr Ian Buick			No	•	•	•	•		Development will cause major traffic issues in the Writtle area. In short not enough consideration as been given for the need for sufficient infrastructure, the need to minimise traffic in our towns and cities, the effect on public health and to reduce pollution. The proposed housing development could be located to the east of Chelmsford where there are better transport links, particularly the A12 and the proposed NE bypass and new rail station at Boreham.
7.113	PS610	1155336	Mr Ian Buick			No	•	•	•	•		Development will cause major traffic issues in the Writtle area. In short not enough consideration as been given for the need for sufficient infrastructure, the need to minimise traffic in our towns and cities, the effect on public health and to reduce pollution. The proposed housing development could be located to the east of Chelmsford where there are better transport links, particularly the A12 and the proposed NE bypass and new rail station at Boreham.
7.113	PS1549	1158676	Crest Strategic Projects Ltd	Yes	Yes	No		•			Yes	Crest's concerns would be reduced if paragraph 7.113 was modified to make it clear that TSP plots can be located within the master plan area of the strategic allocation rather than within the development boundary. Final sentence should say: "The precise location of the Travelling Showpeoples site within the master plan area will be addressed through the wider master planning process".
7.114	PS612	1155336	Mr Ian Buick			No	•	•	•	•		Development will cause major traffic issues in the Writtle area. In short not enough consideration as been given for the need for sufficient infrastructure, the need to minimise traffic in our towns and cities, the effect on public health and to reduce pollution. The proposed housing development could be located to the east of Chelmsford where there are better transport links, particularly the A12 and the proposed NE bypass and new rail station at Boreham.
7.115	PS613	1155336	Mr Ian Buick			No	•	•	•	•		Development will cause major traffic issues in the Writtle area. In short not enough consideration as been given for the need for sufficient infrastructure, the need to minimise traffic in our towns and cities, the effect on public health and to reduce pollution. The proposed housing development could be located to the east of Chelmsford where there are better transport links, particularly the A12 and the proposed NE bypass and new rail station at Boreham.
7.115	PS730	1095110	Mr Richard Parrotte									Concern over traffic congestion and pollution in and around Writtle. If allocated there should be reduced speed limits and improved junction layouts and traffic lights for Site 2; bus, pedestrian and cycle connections into Chelmsford and Writtle; and internal road layouts should allow for bus priority measures. East Chelmsford has better connections than site 2.
7.115	PS915	1156759	Mr Malcolm Burrells			No		•				CIL of 25% for Writtle Parish will never compensate for the 'forever' amount of traffic grief that this proposal will create for current and future generations. Please keep the CIL and look elsewhere to deliver your Local Plan.
7.116	PS614	1155336	Mr Ian Buick			No	•	•	•	•		Development will cause major traffic issues in the Writtle area. In short not enough consideration as been given for the need for sufficient infrastructure, the need to minimise traffic in our towns and cities, the effect on public health and to reduce pollution. The proposed housing development could be located to the east of Chelmsford where there are better transport links, particularly the A12 and the proposed NE bypass and new rail station at Boreham.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
7.117	PS470	1095937	Mr Philip Claydon			No	•	•	•		No	Traffic congestion is already severe along Lordship Road and Roxwell Road. Additional traffic volume from 800 homes cannot be accommodated without significant infrastructure improvements.
7.117	PS615	1155336	Mr Ian Buick			No	•	•	•	•		Development will cause major traffic issues in the Writtle area. In short not enough consideration as been given for the need for sufficient infrastructure, the need to minimise traffic in our towns and cities, the effect on public health and to reduce pollution. The proposed housing development could be located to the east of Chelmsford where there are better transport links, particularly the A12 and the proposed NE bypass and new rail station at Boreham.
7.117	PS728	1095110	Mr Richard Parrotte				•	•	•			Concern over traffic congestion and pollution in and around Writtle. If allocated there should be reduced speed limits and improved junction layouts and traffic lights for Site 2; bus, pedestrian and cycle connections into Chelmsford and Writtle; and internal road layouts should allow for bus priority measures. East Chelmsford has better connections than site 2.
7.117	PS1022	964994	Mr Christopher Pastakia			No		•	•		No	Traffic congestion on Roxwell Road (A1060) The bridge over the River Wid on Lordship road will need to be strengthened and enlarged to easily accommodate increase in traffic, especially to the A414 through Writtle. Concern for sole entry/exit from the A1060 into site. Alternative routes should be considered.
7.118	PS471	1095937	Mr Philip Claydon			No	•	•	•		No	As a cyclist and Sustrans volunteer, I need to point out that the assertion that a significant number of future residents at site 2 will walk or use NCN route 1 to access Chelmsford City Centre is flawed. This route is an inadequate alternative to car usage. It is unsuitable for a number of reasons and frequently impassable due to flooding. In addition most people remain wedded to private car usage.
7.118	PS616	1155336	Mr Ian Buick			No	•	•	•	•		Development will cause major traffic issues in the Writtle area. In short not enough consideration as been given for the need for sufficient infrastructure, the need to minimise traffic in our towns and cities, the effect on public health and to reduce pollution. The proposed housing development could be located to the east of Chelmsford where there are better transport links, particularly the A12 and the proposed NE bypass and new rail station at Boreham.
7.118	PS729	1095110	Mr Richard Parrotte					•	•			Concern over traffic congestion and pollution in and around Writtle. If allocated there should be reduced speed limits and improved junction layouts and traffic lights for Site 2; bus, pedestrian and cycle connections into Chelmsford and Writtle; and internal road layouts should allow for bus priority measures. East Chelmsford has better connections than site 2.
7.118	PS918	1156759	Mr Malcolm Burrells			No		•				Assurances should be given that the people associated with the promotion and development of this site actually live close by. Often the proposals are instigated by persons who live too far away from the site to ever experience the practical consequences of their actions.
7.118	PS1026	964994	Mr Christopher Pastakia	No	No							Concern that walking/cycle route requires crossing the Roxwell Road into Lawford Lane. Safety concerns of existing walking and cycling routes. False assumptions made that everyone will walk and cycle. How priority can be given to public transport over private cars is questionable. The Roxwell/Rainsford Road is not wide enough for a dedicate bus lane, neither is Lordship Road. All aspects of transport infrastructure should be assessed. Transport must include all-time provision for infants and parents, the elderly and the disabled.
7.118	PS1062	1092809	Ms Lois Bowser		No	No	•					No clear evidence of willingness to co-operate by the bus companies or county council in the provision of sustainable transport. No statements from the NHS about assessment of health needs. Need improved bus services to serve the site and how will this be sought. Traffic Congestion should be addressed at the beginning of the site development process rather than at the other end of the process through sec 278/106/conditions. Limited space for road improvements. Any improvements would be contrary to the rural character of the area which is protected by spatial policies. Plan unsound in respect of its consideration of the environmental and quality of life aspects.
7.119	PS472	1095937	Mr Philip Claydon			No	•	•	•		No	Given the current volume of traffic using the A1060 Roxwell Road, coupled with the inevitable increase from Site 2, there is no safe access from Site 2 to the NCN 1 via Lawford Lane. This could only be delivered with a dedicated pedestrian / cycleway bridge or underpass to cross Roxwell Road.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
7.119	PS617	1155336	Mr Ian Buick			No	•	•	•	•		Development will cause major traffic issues in the Writtle area. In short not enough consideration as been given for the need for sufficient infrastructure, the need to minimise traffic in our towns and cities, the effect on public health and to reduce pollution. The proposed housing development could be located to the east of Chelmsford where there are better transport links, particularly the A12 and the proposed NE bypass and new rail station at Boreham.
7.119	PS727	1095110	Mr Richard Parrotte									Concern over traffic congestion and pollution in and around Writtle. If allocated there should be reduced speed limits and improved junction layouts and traffic lights for Site 2; bus, pedestrian and cycle connections into Chelmsford and Writtle; and internal road layouts should allow for bus priority measures. East Chelmsford has better connections than site 2.
7.120	PS619	1155336	Mr Ian Buick			No	•	•	•	•		Development will cause major traffic issues in the Writtle area. In short not enough consideration as been given for the need for sufficient infrastructure, the need to minimise traffic in our towns and cities, the effect on public health and to reduce pollution. The proposed housing development could be located to the east of Chelmsford where there are better transport links, particularly the A12 and the proposed NE bypass and new rail station at Boreham.
7.120	PS726	1095110	Mr Richard Parrotte				•	•	•			Concern over traffic congestion and pollution in and around Writtle. If allocated there should be reduced speed limits and improved junction layouts and traffic lights for Site 2; bus, pedestrian and cycle connections into Chelmsford and Writtle; and internal road layouts should allow for bus priority measures. East Chelmsford has better connections than site 2.
7.121	PS621	1155336	Mr Ian Buick			No	•	•	•	•		Development will cause major traffic issues in the Writtle area. In short not enough consideration as been given for the need for sufficient infrastructure, the need to minimise traffic in our towns and cities, the effect on public health and to reduce pollution. The proposed housing development could be located to the east of Chelmsford where there are better transport links, particularly the A12 and the proposed NE bypass and new rail station at Boreham.
7.121	PS958	1156871	Miss Hayley Temple Temple		No	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	Wildlife impact needs to be addressed. Traffic congestion needs to be addressed. Noise pollution needs to be addressed. Residents have not been suitably notified.
7.122	PS622	1155336	Mr Ian Buick			No	•	•	•	•		Development will cause major traffic issues in the Writtle area. In short not enough consideration as been given for the need for sufficient infrastructure, the need to minimise traffic in our towns and cities, the effect on public health and to reduce pollution. The proposed housing development could be located to the east of Chelmsford where there are better transport links, particularly the A12 and the proposed NE bypass and new rail station at Boreham.
7.123	PS623	1155336	Mr Ian Buick			No	•	•	•	•		Development will cause major traffic issues in the Writtle area. In short not enough consideration as been given for the need for sufficient infrastructure, the need to minimise traffic in our towns and cities, the effect on public health and to reduce pollution. The proposed housing development could be located to the east of Chelmsford where there are better transport links, particularly the A12 and the proposed NE bypass and new rail station at Boreham.
7.124	PS283	1154541	Sandon Parish Council									Overview of sites 3a,b,c,d. Note, each point has previously been summed up by Parish in individual web reps that they submitted. 3a: concern for lack of school. Pleased with cycle routes, PROW and bridleways. Not understanding para 7.141. Improvement for infrastructure is needed. What are the plans for the Country Park? 3b: pleased with nursery allocation 3c: object to removing part of Cross Wood. Concern for traffic on Molrams Lane. Pleased with open space provision. Concern for location near pylons and gas mains. Para 7.170 not understood. 3d: para 7.185 not understood General: no mention of improvement to Maldon Road/ Molrams Road. No real footpaths from Sandon to P&R. Expansion of P&R should be prior to development. Concern for health risk from pylons. All new houses should be north of Maldon Road.
7.124	PS849	308540	Great Baddow Parish Council	Yes	Yes	No		•	•		Yes	Lack of community facilities proposed alongside the development and insufficient GP and school places in vicinity. Traffic congestion, particularly at the Army & Navy and the proposed new access roads/junctions in Molrams Lane & Maldon Road. There are no plans for the A12 to be improved around Chelmsford.
7.124	PS853	308540	Great Baddow Parish Council	Yes	Yes	No		•	•		Yes	There is a need for a substantial proportion of really affordable housing, especially 2 bedroom housing as opposed to larger housing.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
7.124	PS1052	1156922	Mr Darren Chaplin	Yes	Yes	No		•	•	•	No	Development on green wedge land. Transport network can not cope and development will push more traffic through Sandon Village. Villages need to be protected. Site 3c is connecting Great Baddow with Sandon, leaving further farmland open to further development in the future. No proposal to increase the capacity of the Sandon High school There are other sites available which do not have such a detrimental effect of existing residents and quality of life.
7.124	PS1228	1071307	Mr Elton Hurrell	Yes	Yes	No		•	•		No	Road infrastructure of the area is not able to cope with any increase in volume. Cycle paths etc will not be enough. Concern over loss of Green Wedge to the north of Maldon Road. Concern over loss of light/outlook to existing properties on Molrams Lane. The low hedgerow along Molrams Lane should be strengthened and all access to Molrams Lane from site 3c be prevented (vehicular and pedestrian). Objection to proposed business uses.
7.124	PS1237	1062571	Mr D King	Yes	Yes	No		•	•		No	Traffic congestion on A414 Maldon Road. Air quality in the local area will inevitably suffer No evidence that a comprehensive traffic assessment has been carried out.
7.124	PS1239	1062571	Mr D King	Yes	Yes	No		•	•		No	Traffic congestion on A414 Maldon Road. Air quality in the local area will inevitably suffer No evidence that a comprehensive traffic assessment has been carried out.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 3a – EAST CHELMSFORD (MANOR FARM)	PS503	1155350	Hilary O'Connor									Concern for congestion on Maldon Road; air quality; overstretched medical facilities; loss of countryside. Concern that large vehicles passing through narrow parts of Maldon Road will have a negative impact on residents. Essential infrastructure should be prioritised over housing.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 3a – EAST CHELMSFORD (MANOR FARM)	PS528	664147	Sport England	Yes	Yes	Yes						The requirement in the policy for development to provide or make financial contributions to new or enhanced sport, leisure and recreational facilities is welcomed.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 3a – EAST CHELMSFORD (MANOR FARM)	PS829	489882	Mr Ron Knott			No			•			Increased traffic congestion. Increased use of public transport is not realistic. There should be more pedestrian road crossings to schools etc considered.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 3a – EAST CHELMSFORD (MANOR FARM)	PS863	908048	Essex Bridleways Association	Yes	Yes	No	•				Yes	The Policy should require a multi-user crossing at the junction with Maldon Road/Sandford Road, together with fully inclusive access to the Country Park stated within the Policy.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 3a – EAST CHELMSFORD (MANOR FARM)	PS892	1155501	Nick & Charlotte Lyons									Development will raise prices of flats and neutralise any benefit created by increasing housing supply. Concern for pollution increase, school places, GP provision, A&E provision, congestion, wildlife destruction, the impact of aging population, impact of immigrants moving to Chelmsford.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 3a – EAST CHELMSFORD (MANOR FARM)	PS1007	1062571	Mr D King	Yes	Yes	No		•	•		No	Traffic congestion on A414 Maldon Road. Air quality in the local area will inevitably suffer No evidence that a comprehensive traffic assessment has been carried out.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 3a – EAST CHELMSFORD (MANOR FARM)	PS1036	1157002	Mrs Jane Willis	Yes	Yes							Manor Farm Development: No school planned - local schools all at capacity. Maldon Road - traffic congestion and has recently collapsed with a sinkhole at Danbury. Country park - this is a flood plain, how can this be a country park. Land South of Maldon road: Removal of Croft wood which was to remain until 2027? Molrams Lane cannot take any more traffic, it is already completely at full capacity at peak times. Infrastructure must be in place before any more homes are built, and Park and Ride should also be extended. All houses (if any) should be north of Maldon Road.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 3a – EAST CHELMSFORD (MANOR FARM)	PS1043	1062571	Mr D King	Yes	Yes	No		•	•		No	Traffic congestion on A414 Maldon Road. Air quality in the local area will inevitably suffer No evidence that a comprehensive traffic assessment has been carried out.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 3a – EAST CHELMSFORD (MANOR FARM)	PS1130	965985	Mrs Sue Dobson	Yes	Yes	No	•				Yes	The existing high hedge should be preserved and further trees/hedgerows planted to mitigate the impact of new housing on the residents opposite. New country park should include access for all users, including horse riders, along with the new public rights of way being planned linking other proposed developments in this Strategic Growth Area. Recognise the acknowledgement within the Plan that horse riders are poorly provided for in this area. Increased development brings increased traffic making the roads even more dangerous for vulnerable road users (horse riders, cyclists and disabled users). Multi-user crossing on Maldon Road near Sandford Mill Lane should be provided along with a speed limit reduction from 60mph to 30mph from the Park and Ride site to the existing 30mph zone.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 3a – EAST CHELMSFORD (MANOR FARM)	PS1190	971027	Howe Green Community Association								Yes	The unspoilt natural views to the north across the existing Chelmer valley from the A414 are among the most attractive features of the City. They permit the natural environment to extend to the very boundaries of the city's urban area at Moulsham Mill. The valley also provides a valuable flood plain. The development proposals contained in Strategic Growth Sites 3a, 3b and 3d will for all time eliminate these features, and must be considered among the most destructive in Pre-Submission Local Plan. These new development proposals are a profound departure from policies in the existing Local Plan, They are not consistent with Section 3 - Strategic Priorities - Priority 7, river valleys, nor Section 4 - 4.13 protecting valued landscapes, green wedges and corridors - of the draft Pre-Submission document. At peak times the existing A414 is close to or at capacity, and to now propose additional access points, generating significant additional traffic as a result of these three proposals, is to ignore the present reality. The proposal of a country park as a substitute for the existing unspoilt natural environment is a parody. There is no justification or demand for it, but it may be considered a cynical attempt to justify this destruction of the natural river valley. A far better use of resources would be to increase the capacity along this length of the A414 by widening the road on the north side.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 3a – EAST CHELMSFORD (MANOR FARM)	PS1161	714889	Essex Wildlife Trust	Yes	Yes	No			•	•	No	Policy fails to mention biodiversity and/or a commitment to protecting and enhancing biodiversity and contributing to either biodiversity net gain and/or ecological networks. Policy should include a statement that the development must aim for biodiversity net gain, protection of existing biodiversity assets and provision of new well-connected wildlife habitats to be managed for the benefit of biodiversity as part of the new country park.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 3a – EAST CHELMSFORD (MANOR FARM)	PS1292	872955	Hammonds Estates LLP	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	The relatively small-scale nature of growth proposed at this location (400 dwellings across three sites together with 5,000sqm of B1 space) with no ancillary facilities to be provided is not sustainable on its own. Sites 3a, b and d would need to be removed from the Green Wedge – limited evidence to justify. The removal of these sites from the green wedge represents an example of the inconsistent approach taken by CCC to identifying locations for growth and directly contradicts the stated aim of protecting and enhancing green wedges. Improvements to the local and strategic highway network required together with the provision of opportunities for sustainable travel, which would include the use of Sandon Park and Ride. Hammonds Farm site is well located to make use of and, if appropriate, contribute to these improvements. By themselves, there is sufficient justification for these sites. However, this would become a more sustainable location if brought forward together with a new sustainable, community-focussed village at Hammonds Farm. This would create a wider and more comprehensive spatial strategy for growth east of Chelmsford in this key strategic transport corridor and would provide a green corridor that would compensate for the loss of the green wedge. Residents of East Chelmsford would also have access to the wide range of quality facilities that would be provided at Hammonds Farm. The Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment identifies the landscape capacity rating for this site as low to medium. The assessment states on (page 5) that locations that have a medium, medium to high and high landscape capacity are more favourable locations in landscape terms to take forward in the local plan review. Despite the site having a lower landscape capacity it is identified for development in the PSD. This demonstrates an inconsistent approach to the application of the Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment in respect of the allocation of sites in the plan.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 3a – EAST CHELMSFORD (MANOR FARM)	PS1765	1160014	Historic England	Yes	Yes							Pleased to see the inclusion of the historic and natural environment - this will help deliver the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 3a – EAST CHELMSFORD (MANOR FARM)	PS1857	927684	Hopkins Homes			No	•	•	•	•	Yes	Support use of 3a. This is a sustainable location. Ecological appraisal found there is scope to enhance opportunities for wildlife on site. Good facilities, transport links, accessibility, low flood risk, social and economic benefits, recreational area. Suggest increasing to 390 homes on site. Policy text which requires the masterplanning to ensure the significance of the Late Bronze Age enclosure is protected is more justified. Amend policy wording to detail country park as "adjacent to site" 3a, not "on-site". Additional comments should be made to accompanying policy text to detail the benefits of country park and its mitigating impact on European designated sites. Requirement to provide sports provision is disproportionate and unjustified and should be removed from policy.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 3a – EAST CHELMSFORD (MANOR FARM)	PS1901	927695	Redrow Homes				•	•	•	•	Yes	Development will meet 3 elements of sustainable development and is sustainable.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 3a – EAST CHELMSFORD (MANOR FARM)	PS2082	1161039	Natural England		Yes	No					No	Reference to the RAMS is required for Strategic Growth Site 3a, not just in the supporting text. The policy to be amended to specify needs for contributions from developments towards RAMS. The entire rep has been attached for completeness (1161039PS-A).
7.125	PS368	1150896	Mr Mark Mayhew			No		•	•		No	Any reference to the allocation (3a) being close to local services and facilities in Sandon should be removed in view of their obvious limitations.
7.125	PS845	308540	Great Baddow Parish Council	Yes	Yes	No		•	•		Yes	The plan to remove the land allocated as Site 3a from the Green Wedge, should be reversed. This area makes an important contribution to the Green Wedge, to the character of the river valley and to the separation of Great Baddow from the river and Chelmer Village. Consideration should also be given to extending the boundary of the Conservation Area to the A1114/A1060 to include agriculturally important valley sides. Concern about the removal of part of the Green Wedge, which has helped mitigate pollution from the Army & Navy.
7.125	PS857	308540	Great Baddow Parish Council	Yes	Yes	No		•	•		Yes	Concern about possible pollution from the nearby former waste tip which has been redeveloped.
7.125	PS1047	1062571	Mr D King	Yes	Yes	No		•	•	•	No	Contaminated land from some leakage from previous rubbish tip which is now Baden Close. Building on this slope is likely to result in pollution entering the water course in the valley and having an environmental impact.
7.126	PS267	1154541	Sandon Parish Council									We are still concerned by the lack of an actual school planned for this development, just financial contributions for the provision of one as required by the Local Education Authority. This could mean, no school being provided. Local schools are at full capacity and struggling. We would also advocate the provision of community facilities including a shop and a medical centre to accommodate the huge rise in people to the area.
7.126	PS361	1150896	Mr Mark Mayhew			No		•	•		No	Maldon Road is already significantly congested and a misery to local residents. Surrounding minor roads have become a rat run for impatient motorists seeking short cuts. The development at 3a will make it worse. Would welcome more details about proposed improvements to the local and strategic road network and how sustainable modes of transport will be promoted.
7.126	PS940	1062571	Mr D King			No		•	•		No	Traffic congestion on A414 Maldon Road. Air quality in the local area will inevitably suffer No evidence that a comprehensive traffic assessment has been carried out. A reduction in the number of units proposed to mitigate the impact on traffic flow.
7.129	PS272	1154541	Sandon Parish Council									The Country Park appears to be a big carrot for this project. This is a flood plain. What plans have been approved? How is the Park to be attractive? Can it be used year round? What is the funding to make these improvements and ensure a safe and useful Country Park?
7.133	PS269	1154541	Sandon Parish Council									We are pleased that there will be cycle routes, footpaths, Public Rights of Way and hopefully bridleways within this development.
7.135	PS266	1154541	Sandon Parish Council									Have said para 7.135 is OK
7.136	PS271	1154541	Sandon Parish Council									Improvement to the local infrastructure is seriously needed for this and all the development along Maldon Road, it is already grid locked at prime travel times.
7.141	PS270	1154541	Sandon Parish Council									Item 7.141 is not understood. If this site is within the 10km zone of influence of the Crouch and Roach Estuaries Special Protection Area, and European designated sites being particularly sensitive to increased visitor pressure, which may be caused by new residential development within the zone. Surely this development would not be permitted? Plus a new Visitor Centre?

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 3b – EAST CHELMSFORD – LAND NORTH OF MALDON ROAD (EMPLOYMENT)	PS864	908048	Essex Bridleways Association	Yes	Yes	No	•				Yes	Policy should require a multi-user crossing near the proposed new access junction.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 3b – EAST CHELMSFORD – LAND NORTH OF MALDON ROAD (EMPLOYMENT)	PS1131	965985	Mrs Sue Dobson	Yes	Yes	No	•				Yes	Reference also made to comments made on 3A. All users (including horse riders) should be catered for. Retain and enhance the existing bridleway links from Sandford Mill Lane, under the A12 and linking with Hammonds Road, enabling users to access Great Graces and the network beyond in Little Baddow. May not choose to ride through a business park, but safe access is very important regardless of the immediate surroundings, and the existing bridleway should be preserved and links enhanced. Plan for a multi-user crossing on the Maldon Road in the vicinity of the junction with Sandford Mill Lane. Ensure that adequate parking is provided within the new employment area.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 3b – EAST CHELMSFORD – LAND NORTH OF MALDON ROAD (EMPLOYMENT)	PS1294	872955	Hammonds Estates LLP	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	The relatively small-scale nature of growth proposed at this location (400 dwellings across three sites together with 5,000sqm of B1 space) with no ancillary facilities to be provided is not sustainable on its own. Sites 3a, b and d would need to be removed from the Green Wedge – limited evidence to justify. The removal of these sites from the green wedge represents an example of the inconsistent approach taken by CCC to identifying locations for growth and directly contradicts the stated aim of protecting and enhancing green wedges. Improvements to the local and strategic highway network required together with the provision of opportunities for sustainable travel, which would include the use of Sandon Park and Ride. Hammonds Farm site is well located to make use of and, if appropriate, contribute to these improvements. By themselves, there is sufficient justification for these sites. However, this would become a more sustainable location if brought forward together with a new sustainable, community-focussed village at Hammonds Farm. This would create a wider and more comprehensive spatial strategy for growth east of Chelmsford in this key strategic transport corridor and would provide a green corridor that would compensate for the loss of the green wedge. Residents of East Chelmsford would also have access to the wide range of quality facilities that would be provided at Hammonds Farm. The Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment identifies the landscape capacity rating for this site as low to medium. The assessment states on (page 5) that locations that have a medium, medium to high and high landscape capacity are more favourable locations in landscape terms to take forward in the local plan review. Despite the site having a lower landscape capacity it is identified for development in the PSD. This demonstrates an inconsistent approach to the application of the Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment in respect of the allocation of sites in the plan. Supports the expansion of the existing Sandon Park and Ride but expansion should take place on the eastern side of junction 18, which would take traffic off the A414 before it reaches the junction with the A12, thereby facilitating improvements to the operation of this junction. Mineral resource assessment required. Prior extraction of the mineral resource and restoration of this site, if required, would considerably delay the delivery of this site, and affect delivery of the plan.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 3b – EAST CHELMSFORD – LAND NORTH OF MALDON ROAD (EMPLOYMENT)	PS1766	1160014	Historic England	Yes	Yes							Pleased to see the inclusion of the historic and natural environment, which will help deliver the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 3b – EAST CHELMSFORD – LAND NORTH OF MALDON ROAD (EMPLOYMENT)	PS1940	927695	Redrow Homes								Yes	Obligations towards primary education provision is not necessary as masterplans include a primary school. There is an imbalance in the uses proposed by CCC for Redrow to deliver. Concern that the costs/obligations of Redrow are disproportionate to no. of houses proposed. Encompassing land east of 3c would overcome these issues.
7.144	PS273	1154541	Sandon Parish Council									We are pleased with the addition of a childcare nursery, as it was previously felt that there is not an overwhelming need for any more business space. Could this site be kept for the much needed schools? We desperately need more schools for all these new houses.



Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
7.144	PS362	1150896	Mr Mark Mayhew			No		•	•		No	Maldon Road is already significantly congested and a misery to local residents. Surrounding minor roads have become a rat run for impatient motorists seeking short cuts. The development at 3b will make it worse and there will be commercial vehicles serving the business park. Would welcome more details about proposed improvements to the local and strategic road network and how sustainable modes of transport will be promoted.
7.145	PS1426	308554	Springfield Parish Council									7.145: A12 in the Chelmsford area is no longer fit for purpose - this road needs improvements. A12 should be a 3 lane transport link. 7.205-7.221: CNEB needs to be in place before approval of zone 4 construction. Concern for regular gridlocked roads. 7.222: Beaulieu is a piece of essential infrastructure. Delay of this has been significant. Strategic Growth Site 4: Confirmation is sought that provision for statutory allotment sites will be made.(p140) planned sites for travelling community are to be welcomed.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 3c – EAST CHELMSFORD – LAND SOUTH OF MALDON ROAD	PS546	1098747	Jackie Church									Houses should be allocated elsewhere. Concern for congestion on Maldon Road, Molrams Lane. Concern for air pollution, how schools/doctors will cope. Site 3b will also be a nightmare.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 3c – EAST CHELMSFORD – LAND SOUTH OF MALDON ROAD	PS529	664147	Sport England	Yes	Yes	Yes						The requirement in the policy for development to provide or make financial contributions to new or enhanced sport, leisure and recreational facilities is welcomed.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 3c – EAST CHELMSFORD – LAND SOUTH OF MALDON ROAD	PS831	489882	Mr Ron Knott			No			•			Concern over the proximity of the development to the school, this will further increase traffic in an area which is already busy. The woodland on site should be retained.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 3c – EAST CHELMSFORD – LAND SOUTH OF MALDON ROAD	PS866	908048	Essex Bridleways Association	Yes	Yes	No	•				Yes	Policy should require a multi-user crossing near the proposed new junction.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 3c – EAST CHELMSFORD – LAND SOUTH OF MALDON ROAD	PS974	311148	Essex County Council	Yes	Yes	No			•		No	Amend policy to clarify that financial contributions to secondary school provision are required to meet the education infrastructure needs generated by the development.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 3c – EAST CHELMSFORD – LAND SOUTH OF MALDON ROAD	PS975	311148	Essex County Council	Yes	Yes	No			•		No	Change 'Movement and Access', bullet 3 as follows: • Provide pedestrian and cycle connections including consideration of access to the Sandon Park and Ride.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 3c – EAST CHELMSFORD – LAND SOUTH OF MALDON ROAD	PS1132	965985	Mrs Sue Dobson	Yes	Yes	No	•			•	Yes	Objections to the inclusion of this site - seeks removal of the site. Development will create a built road frontage to Molrams Lane from the Maldon Road to Sandon School and create a built link between the settlements of Great Baddow and Sandon contravening the NPPF. Issue of proximity of the high-voltage power lines running from the substation in the village across this land parcel. Grade II Listed WWII Pillbox should not be impacted upon; recognise the need for green buffer between the housing and the Pillbox, but will have a detrimental impact on its setting, thereby contravening the heritage requirements of the Listing.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 3c – EAST CHELMSFORD – LAND SOUTH OF MALDON ROAD	PS1295	872955	Hammonds Estates LLP	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	The relatively small-scale nature of growth proposed at this location (400 dwellings across three sites together with 5,000sqm of B1 space) with no ancillary facilities to be provided is not sustainable on its own. Sites 3a, b and d would need to be removed from the Green Wedge – limited evidence to justify. The removal of these sites from the green wedge represents an example of the inconsistent approach taken by CCC to identifying locations for growth and directly contradicts the stated aim of protecting and enhancing green wedges. Improvements to the local and strategic highway network require together with the provision of opportunities for sustainable travel, which would include the use of Sandon Park and Ride. Hammonds Farm site is well located to make use of and, if appropriate, contribute to these improvements. By themselves, there is sufficient justification for these sites. However, this would become a more sustainable location if brought forward together with a new sustainable, community-focussed village at Hammonds Farm. This would create a wider and more comprehensive spatial strategy for growth east of Chelmsford in this key strategic transport corridor and would provide a green corridor that would compensate for the loss of the green wedge. Residents of East Chelmsford would also have access to the wide range of quality facilities that would be provided at Hammonds Farm. The Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment identifies the landscape capacity rating for this site as low to medium. The assessment states on (page 5) that locations that have a medium, medium to high and high landscape capacity are more favourable locations in landscape terms to take forward in the local plan review. Despite the site having a lower landscape capacity it is identified for development in the PSD. This demonstrates an inconsistent approach to the application of the Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment in respect of the allocation of sites in the plan.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 3c – EAST CHELMSFORD – LAND SOUTH OF MALDON ROAD	PS1767	1160014	Historic England	Yes	Yes							Pleased to see the inclusion of the historic and natural environment, which will help deliver the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 3c – EAST CHELMSFORD – LAND SOUTH OF MALDON ROAD	PS1938	927695	Redrow Homes								Yes	Object to reduction to 100 dwellings at 3c. Development of the Site (land east of SGS3c) is considered to form an appropriate urban extension comprising mixed used development to the east of Great Baddow, Chelmsford. The technical assessments have concluded: • Access can be secured on to Maldon Road/Brick Kiln Road and Sandford Mill Lane; • The Site is a sustainable location and means of travel other than private vehicle use are readily available; • There is medium – high landscape capacity to accommodate development at the Site; • Proposed Development of the Site could be sensitively designed in landscape terms; • With appropriate mitigation, the potential for harm to heritage assets local to the Site can be limited; and • There is an opportunity for the proposed development of the Site to make a positive contribution to biodiversity.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 3c – EAST CHELMSFORD – LAND SOUTH OF MALDON ROAD	PS2083	1161039	Natural England		Yes	No					No	Reference to the RAMS is required for Strategic Growth Site Policy 3c, not just in supporting text. The policy to be amended to specify needs for contributions from developments towards RAMS. The entire rep has been attached for completeness (1161039PS-A).
7.157	PS276	1154541	Sandon Parish Council									Once again there are financial contributions towards the provision of schools but this does not equate to actual buildings.
7.157	PS363	1150896	Mr Mark Mayhew			No		•	•		No	Maldon Road is already significantly congested and a misery to local residents. Surrounding minor roads have become a rat run for impatient motorists seeking short cuts. The development at 3c will make it worse. Would welcome more details about improvements to the local and strategic road network and how sustainable modes of transport will be promoted.
7.159	PS277	1154541	Sandon Parish Council									Very pleased there is provision of an open space to the south of the site to maximise the separation of the development with Sandon village.
7.160	PS274	1154541	Sandon Parish Council									We are horrified that these plans include plans to remove part of Cross Wood (or Croft Wood as in the Local Plan), when we have been assured that there is an obligation for the woodland to remain until at least 2027? This wood was planted by the Forestry Commission and therefore should remain untouched.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
7.162	PS278	1154541	Sandon Parish Council									Concern has been raised regarding the development being so close to the electricity pylons and the very large gas main.
7.165	PS279	1154541	Sandon Parish Council									The package to include sustainable means of transport needs more explanation
7.166	PS275	1154541	Sandon Parish Council									The exit of traffic onto Molrams Lane is completely insane too, it is already completely grid-locked at school runs and early morning and evening with business traffic. This is a very narrow country lane. What happens when the Brethren Meeting House is also built on Molrams Lane with up to 600 worshippers regularly using the road?
7.170	PS280	1154541	Sandon Parish Council									7.170 is not understood. If this site is within the 10km zone of influence of the Crouch and Roach Estuaries Special Protection Area, and European designated sites being particularly sensitive to increased visitor pressure, which may be caused by new residential development within the zone.
GROWTH SITE 3d – EAST CHELMSFORD – LAND NORTH OF MALDON ROAD (RESIDENTIAL)	PS835	489882	Mr Ron Knott	No					•			Road access will create problems in already busy area near the school. More residents will put further pressure on doctors, schools and other community facilities.
GROWTH SITE 3d – EAST CHELMSFORD – LAND NORTH OF MALDON ROAD (RESIDENTIAL)	PS867	908048	Essex Bridleways Association	Yes	Yes	No	•				Yes	Policy should require a multi-user crossing near the proposed new junction.
GROWTH SITE 3d – EAST CHELMSFORD – LAND NORTH OF MALDON ROAD (RESIDENTIAL)	PS976	311148	Essex County Council	Yes	Yes	No			•		No	Amend policy to clarify that financial contributions to secondary school provision are required to meet the education infrastructure needs generated by the development.
GROWTH SITE 3d – EAST CHELMSFORD – LAND NORTH OF MALDON ROAD (RESIDENTIAL)	PS978	311148	Essex County Council	Yes	Yes	No			•		No	Change 'Movement and Access', bullet 3 of Policy as follows: • Provide pedestrian and cycle connections including consideration of access to the Sandon Park and Ride.
GROWTH SITE 3d – EAST CHELMSFORD – LAND NORTH OF MALDON ROAD (RESIDENTIAL)	PS1134	965985	Mrs Sue Dobson	Yes	Yes	No	•				Yes	Site could accommodate more housing and suggests that the allocation of 100 houses in SG Site 3c is incorporated into 3d to prevent housing (current proposed 50 houses) being isolated next to employment land. Development within this Plan should all be located north of the Maldon Road, and the two land parcels either side of Brick Kiln Road remain a green buffer to ensure that there is no coalescence between the two villages. Provision of a footpath alongside Brick Kiln Road to enable residents of Sandon Village to access the new development would be of enormous benefit.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
GROWTH SITE 3d – EAST CHELMSFORD – LAND NORTH OF MALDON ROAD (RESIDENTIAL)	PS1296	872955	Hammonds Estates LLP	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	The relatively small-scale nature of growth proposed at this location (400 dwellings across three sites together with 5,000sqm of B1 space) with no ancillary facilities to be provided is not sustainable on its own. Sites 3a, b and d would need to be removed from the Green Wedge – limited evidence to justify. The removal of these sites from the green wedge represents an example of the inconsistent approach taken by CCC to identifying locations for growth and directly contradicts the stated aim of protecting and enhancing green wedges. Improvements to the local and strategic highway network required together with the provision of opportunities for sustainable travel, which would include the use of Sandon Park and Ride. Hammonds Farm site is well located to make use of and, if appropriate, contribute to these improvements. By themselves, there is sufficient justification for these sites. However, this would become a more sustainable location if brought forward together with a new sustainable, community-focussed village at Hammonds Farm. This would create a wider and more comprehensive spatial strategy for growth east of Chelmsford in this key strategic transport corridor and would provide a green corridor that would compensate for the loss of the green wedge. Residents of East Chelmsford would also have access to the wide range of quality facilities that would be provided at Hammonds Farm. The Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment identifies the landscape capacity rating for this site as low to medium. The assessment states on (page 5) that locations that have a medium, medium to high and high landscape capacity are more favourable locations in landscape terms to take forward in the local plan review. Despite the site having a lower landscape capacity it is identified for development in the PSD. This demonstrates an inconsistent approach to the application of the Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment in respect of the allocation of sites in the plan.
GROWTH SITE 3d – EAST CHELMSFORD – LAND NORTH OF MALDON ROAD (RESIDENTIAL)	PS1769	1160014	Historic England	Yes	Yes							The policy criteria are appropriate and will help deliver the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment.
GROWTH SITE 3d – EAST CHELMSFORD – LAND NORTH OF MALDON ROAD (RESIDENTIAL)	PS2084	1161039	Natural England		Yes	No					No	Reference to the RAMS is required for Strategic Growth Site Policy 3d, not just in supporting text. The policy to be amended to specify needs for contributions from developments towards RAMS. The entire rep has been attached for completeness (1161039PS-A).
7.173	PS364	1150896	Mr Mark Mayhew			No		•	•		No	Maldon Road is already significantly congested and a misery to local residents. Surrounding minor roads have become a rat run for impatient motorists seeking short cuts. The development at 3a will make it worse. Would welcome more details about improvements to the local and strategic road network and how sustainable modes of transport will be promoted.
7.179	PS281	1154541	Sandon Parish Council									The package to include sustainable means of transport needs more explanation
7.185	PS282	1154541	Sandon Parish Council									7.185 is not understood. If this site is within the 10km zone of influence of the Crouch and Roach Estuaries Special Protection Area, and European designated sites being particularly sensitive to increased visitor pressure, which may be caused by new residential development within the zone.
7.187	PS1105	973857	Persimmon Homes Essex	Yes	Yes	No	•	•			Yes	Between the PO Local Plan and the PS Local Plan, the Council has excluded a site, formerly EC3 'Land South and West of Broomfield Place and Broomfield Primary School' due to concern about 'deliverability'. This is not supported by the evidence and the site remains deliverable. The decision-making that led to the exclusion of this site is unsound and not justified. See also attachment which contains all the representations from this consultee.
EXISTING COMMITMENT EC1 – LAND NORTH OF GALLEYWOOD RESERVOIR	PS225	636292	Galleywood Parish Council									Noted that the print error on EC1 p94 – 200 houses has been duly amended to 13 on p136 of the revised document. Council want clarification on the rules for determining the settlement boundary and on what basis the changes have been made – amendment appears to be to the detriment of The Metropolitan Green Belt specifically in regard to Rignals Lane, Brook Lane and to the North of Pipers Tye.
EXISTING COMMITMENT EC1 – LAND NORTH OF GALLEYWOOD RESERVOIR	PS981	311148	Essex County Council	Yes	Yes	No			•		No	Include the following in the Reasoned Justification: 'The site is located within a Critical Drainage Area (CDA). This development may have the potential to impact on the CDA in respect of surface water flooding. As a result of this the site is likely to require an individually designed mitigation scheme to address this issue.'

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
EXISTING COMMITMENT EC2 - LAND SURROUNDING TELEPHONE EXCHANGE, ONGAR ROAD, WRITTLE	PS1700	1159936	Mrs Christina Brewster			No	•	•	•	•	No	Concern over access to the site. Sites east of Chelmsford would be better placed due to their location to better existing infrastructure.
EXISTING COMMITMENT EC2 - LAND SURROUNDING TELEPHONE EXCHANGE, ONGAR ROAD, WRITTLE	PS1770	1160014	Historic England	Yes	Yes							Recommend that the wording is changed to character or appearance rather than character and appearance, and conserve or enhance rather than conserve and enhance.
7.205	PS579	961749	Mr Keith Francis									If delivery of CNEB has no projected timescale then this is catastrophic. Viability of LP requires testing for the scenario where development occurs without CNEB delivery. Strategic Highways Network must be able to satisfy LP demands - particularly public transport. Additional studies are needed to look at "with and without" scenarios for A12, A414 and A130 being upgraded/improved.
7.205	PS744	308795	Mr Dennis Watts	No								Suggested improvements in infrastructure is unlikely to be delivered before the huge population increase leading to more frequent severe congestion and traffic gridlock than at present. If infrastructure cannot be funded and built in time, the quantity of new housing should be greatly reduced. Hammonds Farm is likely to be far more suitable for over 3000 houses along with improvements to the A12. It is unrealistic sufficient numbers of people will choose sustainable modes of transport.
7.205	PS1291	972047	Mrs Elizabeth Watts									The uncertainty regarding the delivery of the CNEB questions the viability and delivery of Locations, 4, 5 and 6. Reliance on these sites and the omission of Preferred Option site EC3 (Broomfield Place) is short-sighted. Alternative sites are more deliverable in the short term and in more central, sustainable locations.
7.205	PS1559	1099220	Broomfield Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group									Concern that infrastructure required to support development will not be in place when the development commences - in particular the CNEB. Additional sites on the A12 and A130 south corridors, where infrastructure already exists, need to be included in the LP for it to allow flexibility in the event that the planned new infrastructure is not forthcoming.
7.208	PS889	964657	Mrs Margaret Williams			No		•	•			Too many new homes to the north of Chelmsford. These cannot happen without the NE Bypass coming forward. Hammonds Farm would be a better alternative.
7.208	PS1189	1156714	Mr R Watson			No				•		1. There was no review of the Green Belt which could have identified a number of more appropriate sites for building. 2. There is insufficient infrastructure (existing or planned) to accommodate 3,000 new houses in Area 4. Moreover such building would create severe traffic pollution in the village of Little Waltham.
Figure 10: Growth Area 2 - North Chelmsford	PS2064	1098405	The North East Chelmsford Garden Village Consortium	Yes	Yes	Yes					Yes	Figure 10 of the PSLP (page 140), shows diagrammatically the proposals in Growth Area 2 (North Chelmsford). It is considered that this is over-simplified and should show that the North East Chelmsford allocation extending to the east of the Proposed Chelmsford NE By-pass alignment, in accordance with the Policies Map (Inset 1 – Chelmsford Urban Area).
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 4 – NORTH EAST CHELMSFORD	PS218	1069128	Mr Jason Kavanagh	Yes								This development will make Chelmsford lopsided and put yet more pressure on transport infrastructure, already at capacity most of the day.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 4 – NORTH EAST CHELMSFORD	PS531	664147	Sport England	Yes	Yes	Yes						Support is offered for the following elements of the policy: the provision of new/enhanced cycle routes, footpaths and bridleways; the provision of coherent network of public open space, formal and informal sport, recreation and community space within the site; the provision of, or making financial contributions to, new or enhanced sport, leisure and recreation facilities. The recognition for dual use sports facilities within the new secondary school particularly welcomed; the safeguarding of the existing golf course area.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 4 – NORTH EAST CHELMSFORD	PS868	908048	Essex Bridleways Association	Yes	Yes	No	•				Yes	To make this Plan sound, we request that bridleway 213_4 is extended through the new development, a multi-user crossing over A130 at north western point of the development, inclusion of equestrian access within the new Country Park, any new bridges to be multi-user accessible and a non-motorised users' route (which includes equestrians) alongside the CNEB.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 4 – NORTH EAST CHELMSFORD	PS979	311148	Essex County Council	Yes	Yes	No			•		No	Change 'Site infrastructure requirements', bullet 3 as follows: • Land (circa 0.26 ha) for two stand-alone early years and childcare nursery (Use Class D1) and the total cost of physical scheme provision with delivery through the Local Education Authority
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 4 – NORTH EAST CHELMSFORD	PS1298	872955	Hammonds Estates LLP	No	No	No	•	•	•	•		Strategy places an over reliance on delivering development at North East Chelmsford. Urban extension that has failed to deliver housing in significant numbers to date. One third of all new housing allocations to be provided in a single location - approach to delivery of development is neither justified or effective. Limits choice for home buyers and renters. North East Chelmsford has various landowners, complex negotiations both within and outside the consortium, poses significant risk to delivery of the site in the timescales suggested. There is no evidence of a collaborative agreement. Difficult to deliver and are often delayed due to landowner disputes and lack of agreement. North East Chelmsford would comprise an extension to Beaulieu Park and Channels, neither of which have yet delivered either significant levels of housing or the infrastructure required to support it. Allocating development at Hammonds Farm would reduce risk, by distributing development around the city at a location that requires significantly less infrastructure to enable it to be delivered. Beaulieu Park and Channels – delays in completion rates, development is significantly behind schedule and as a consequence development at Beaulieu Park and Channels will overlap with development at North East Chelmsford for a considerable period of time. Timescales for planning applications are optimistic particularly given the complexities associated with large-scale sites in multiple and fragmented ownership. No planning application to rephase minerals extraction at the site has been submitted. Build out rates identified are unrealistic and undeliverable given that all of this housing would be delivered in the same area and is likely to saturate the market. In contrast Hammonds Farm would be brought forward at more realistic annual delivery rates, with a maximum of 200 units per year, delivered by a number of housebuilders, including small and medium size companies, as well as volume housebuilders. Significant concerns that a number of sites in the Plan are promoted by the same developer - does not provide choice in the market, as required by the NPPF. HEst has reviewed completions on sites in Chelmsford, from information provided by CCC and ECC. This confirms that with the exception of sites at the University Campus and former Marconi Works, annual delivery rates have generally been significantly lower. Development of North East Chelmsford is reliant on proposed upgrades to junction 19 of the A12. No planning application submitted for these works. Any delays to delivery of these junction improvements will impact on the ability of North East Chelmsford to be delivered. The scale of infrastructure to be provided is considerable and is reliant, in part, on providing links to development to the south at Beaulieu Park
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 4 – NORTH EAST CHELMSFORD	PS1420	376776	Mr G E Vint			No	•	•	•	•	Yes	Amend Map 1 to include Mount Maskall. By including Mount Maskall within Strategic Growth Site 4, the Council would be able to plan for development at this site in a coherent manner and ensure that the heritage asset significancies not damaged. The Council's strategy has also been to plan large-scale developments. This is an unsound approach that fails to acknowledge deliverability issues with this approach but also ignores emerging national policy in respect to smaller sites.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 4 – NORTH EAST CHELMSFORD	PS1448	873380	Mr Peter Todd	Yes	Yes	Yes					No	Our Client agrees with the principle of the Strategic Growth Site Location 4 in North East Chelmsford so long as the area of land comprising the residential properties in Domsey Lane - shown on the Policies Map 1 Chelmsford Urban Area as 'white land' without notation but proposed to be included within the urban area of Chelmsford - would allow for appropriate development within the area to be treated on its individual merits in accordance with normal development management policies. This is because the 'white land', that is currently subject to restrictive countryside policies, will be surrounded by the proposed Garden Community but will not be subject to the overall comprehensive masterplan process being led by the promoters. It would be unreasonable and inequitable for properties, such as 'Greenacres' and other large residential properties in Domsey Lane to be restricted from appropriate development potential that is sympathetic to its surroundings and neighbouring character.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 4 – NORTH EAST CHELMSFORD	PS1588	931261	Mr Malcolm Taylor	Yes	Yes	No	•		•		No	Plan is unsound as development is located in one area - NW Chelmsford. A review of GB land should have taken place to replace low quality agricultural land with land of higher quality. Hammonds Farm should have been considered. Concern for lack of infrastructure in NE Chelmsford. concern for congestion. Broomfield Place should be included in LP and Site 6 removed. Concern for wildlife destruction in Pudding Wood. Road infrastructure unable to support walking/cycling. Concern for CNEB funding.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 4 – NORTH EAST CHELMSFORD	PS1611	1157387	Miss S Field									Tried to make comments previously (PO), gave up using the Portal, too complicated. Lives in Domsey Lane - proposals are for development all around, property been in the family for 80 years. Proposals will change the way of life - as it has for people at Banter's Lane where new development is taking place. Wish to see buffers put in place to protect existing properties, also suggest that the Country Park is placed between existing properties and bypass, rather than remote from where people will live. Concerned about the future status of Domsey Lane - whether it will remain as it is or become a private road - already had an increase in traffic (and litter) since the new houses have begun. Dislike the modern housing style on Beaulieu development, would prefer houses to be in keeping with existing. Also hope the Council will be flexible on changes to existing property, particularly for security measures. Concern about crime rates since Chelmsford has become a city. Villages will merge into one sprawl and lose their character. Wildlife habitat concerns, at Beaulieu this has been destroyed. Why is green belt and agricultural land being developed? Concerns about how the roads and hospital will cope with population increase. General comments about empty property in the North of England and speculative buyers in London.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 4 – NORTH EAST CHELMSFORD	PS1777	1160014	Historic England	Yes	Yes	No						Concerned about the inconsistencies evident for this allocation and are unable to agree that the allocation is sound. As a major housing allocation this means that there will be repercussions regarding other aspects of the plan relating to housing targets. Improved mapping and a statement to clarify the relationship of the new allocation and the existing committed development at New Hall would help readers better understand the implications of this allocation. The wording of the policy itself may be sound if supported by a policy proposals map which reflects the spatial implications of the policy and the conclusions of the evidence, namely the Heritage Technical Note (March 2017). We request that either the map or the policy text is amended. At present this policy and the allocation are not consistent with national policy in terms of demonstrating that the site can be developed sustainably; they are not positively prepared or justified and therefore the policy and allocation are unsound.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 4 – NORTH EAST CHELMSFORD	PS1732	1160010	David Lloyd Leisure and Aquila Holdings			Yes						David Lloyd Leisure and Aquila Holdings are supportive of Strategic Growth Site 4 and the strategic priorities and policies that support this allocation. Consider that a suitable site exists for its operations on the land south of Pratt's Farm Lane and East of Essex Regiment Way.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 4 – NORTH EAST CHELMSFORD	PS1808	1160052	North West Parishes Group									Oppose development. Risk of not meeting timely delivery. It's an isolated location. Concern for traffic - as per results in traffic report. Concern for loss of high grade agricultural land. Consider Hammonds Farm instead. Concern for lack of infrastructure provision. Risk of delivery due to land having multiple owners. Development would be delivered quicker if the allocation was split across more than one site. Risk development being physically and socially isolated.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 4 – NORTH EAST CHELMSFORD	PS1838	476873	Little Waltham Parish Council			No					Yes	Plan is legally compliant but provision needs to be made for alterations in housing calculations. Oppose high proportion of development in parish of Little Waltham. Concern for urban sprawl and loss of village identity. Oppose lack of reference to "Little Waltham". Risk in terms of delivery on sites with multiple land owners. Concern for congestion, rat-running, and that CNEB will be at capacity soon after completion - refer to traffic report to support this point. Does not comply with S1. Concern that residents will not take up walking/cycling and concern CNEB will not be delivered on time (For breakdown of North West Parishes Group response see PS1808 - PS1832 and PS SA45 - PS SA49)
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 4 – NORTH EAST CHELMSFORD	PS1905	1097127	Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd			Yes						Endorses the draft Spatial Strategy with specific regard to Countryside Properties' interests in respect of the delivery of the following strategic site by 2036: Strategic Growth Site 4 – North East Chelmsford
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 4 – NORTH EAST CHELMSFORD	PS1890	1101348	Education & Skills Funding Agency									ESFA welcomes safeguarding of land for schools. Welcomes the confirmation of site sizes required for the schools as well as confirmation of the anticipated number of FE and cost for each school in the updated Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). The clear requirements within the site-specific policies for financial contributions to offsite education provision are also supported.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 4 – NORTH EAST CHELMSFORD	PS2061	1098405	The North East Chelmsford Garden Village Consortium	Yes	Yes	Yes					Yes	Proposals for Location 4 – North East Chelmsford fully supported. Suggest that the amount and type of development set out at bullet point 1 should be amended to refer to a minimum or at least 3,000 homes within the Plan period. Beyond the Plan period, it should also make reference to a minimum of 2,500 homes being developed. See accompanying masterplanning document. for the amount and type of development, phasing, supporting onsite development, movement, access and site infrastructure requirements. Supported by the Memorandum of Understanding dealing with the Transport Strategy, also attached. Not necessary to safeguard the existing open area currently comprising a golf course on site - the masterplanning process demonstrates that the requirements for multifunctional comprehensive green infrastructure strategy can be catered for across the whole of the allocated area. Suggest that bullet point 15 of the Site Infrastructure requirements, relating to the safeguarding of the existing open space area, currently comprising a golf course, be removed - may affect Proposals Map. Requirements for a country park and green infrastructure are fully covered under bullet point 2 under “Design and Layout” and bullet points 12 and 13 under “Site Infrastructure Requirements”. Bullet point 11 provides - new or enhanced sport, leisure and recreation facilities - the masterplan illustrates a possible location for such a facility within Phase 1 of the development proposals close to Essex Regiment Way and the Park and Ride.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 4 – NORTH EAST CHELMSFORD	PS2070	1098405	The North East Chelmsford Garden Village Consortium	Yes	Yes	Yes					Yes	The Consortium supports the City Council's approach for planning Chelmsford's growth up to 2036 and the identification of North East Chelmsford as a Strategic Growth Site as an allocation for a proposed Garden Village.
7.215	PS2065	1098405	The North East Chelmsford Garden Village Consortium	Yes	Yes	Yes						Paragraph 7.215 makes reference to “the wider site (is) being allocated within this PSLP for 3,000 new homes”. This is incorrect and it is considered that it should state that “the wider site is being allocated within this Local Plan for a minimum of 5,500 new homes, of which at least 2,500 will be developed post-2036”. This will be consistent with our comments regarding Policies S8 and S9.
7.216	PS2062	1098405	The North East Chelmsford Garden Village Consortium	Yes	Yes	Yes					Yes	A substantial proportion of the 45,000sqm required for Strategic Growth Site 4 can come forward in Phase 1 of the development with a possible land take of around 8 hectares. The Consortium believes that the PSLP should therefore contain much greater recognition of this opportunity.
7.217	PS2063	1098405	The North East Chelmsford Garden Village Consortium	Yes	Yes	Yes					Yes	Floorspace limitation should be removed as being unnecessarily restrictive. For example, the recently completed Beaulieu Square Neighbourhood Centre comprises 1,345 sq. m. GIA of A1, A5 and A3 uses. This successful model should be used but there will need to be flexibility to allow for changing circumstances and consumer preferences over time. It is not clear what current evidence leads to the floorspace limitation. Inappropriate, at this time, to set such a parameter for the maximum floorspace of a neighbourhood centre convenience unit.
7.221	PS670	347754	Castle Point Council									CPBC previously welcomed the City Council’s recognition of the significance of the landscape corridor through which the A130 passes and welcomed its commitment to it as an important area of open space in South Essex, including its role in the separation of settlements; it trusts that the CCC Draft LP will continue to demonstrate this commitment through its Spatial and Local Policies.
7.221	PS1301	872955	Hammonds Estates LLP	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	The scale of infrastructure to be provided is considerable and is reliant, in part, on providing links to development to the south at Beaulieu Park and Channels, which is still at an early stage of construction and is likely to continue throughout much of the local plan period. Providing good accessibility to the site is therefore enormously difficult. The provision of the North East Chelmsford Bypass has unresolved delivery issues. The delivery of Phase 3 of North East Chelmsford, comprising 1,350 homes and 5,000sqm of employment, is partially dependent on delivery of the northern section of the bypass.
7.227	PS1451	873380	Mr Peter Todd	Yes	Yes	Yes					No	Landscape features and green buffers will not detract from the urban extension taking place in such close proximity of Domsey Lane. 'White land' or land without specific notation at Domsey Lane should be included within the North East Area defined settlement boundary allowing the normal Local Plan Development Management Policies (not within the countryside) to apply to any development proposals to allow for low density developments in this area.
7.228	PS1302	872955	Hammonds Estates LLP	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	The PSD sets out a requirement to safeguard the existing open area that currently comprises part of Channels golf course. However, the consortium's proposals provide for development of much of this area for housing, thus removing valuable open space from the proposal. The consortium's Proposals document suggests that a ratio of 1:3 (approx.) development to open space will be achieved. HEst's assessment of the proposals confirms that this will not be achieved with a ratio of 1:1.4 more likely, based on the submitted concept masterplan.



Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
7.232	PS1303	872955	Hammonds Estates LLP	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	The PSD sets out a requirement to safeguard the existing open area that currently comprises part of Channels golf course. However, the consortium's proposals provide for development of much of this area for housing, thus removing valuable open space from the proposal. The consortium's Proposals document suggests that a ratio of 1:3 (approx.) development to open space will be achieved. HEst's assessment of the proposals confirms that this will not be achieved with a ratio of 1:1.4 more likely, based on the submitted concept masterplan.
7.233	PS608	1155857	Environment Agency	Yes	Yes	Yes					No	Reasoned justification could be strengthened for developers to refer to SFRA, the term flood risk management could be refined with suggestion made for alternative.
7.236	PS970	311148	Essex County Council	Yes	Yes	No				•	No	Change paragraph 7.236 as follows: '...programme for mineral extraction, which would be determined by the Mineral Planning Authority.'
7.236	PS1304	872955	Hammonds Estates LLP	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	North East Chelmsford is located within a mineral safeguarding area and includes consented minerals sites that are active. Parts of the site have not yet been worked or restored. National planning policy is clear that best use should be made of minerals as they are a finite resource and that sterilisation of mineral resources should be avoided. No known timescales for planning application for rephasing and is subject to EIA - No certainty that NE Chelmsford can be delivered in accordance with phasing scheme or council's housing trajectory. Initial assessment of potential mineral resource availability and information on the rephasing of minerals operations. Only Areas A and B are viable for extraction. Based on technical information available, a substantive case has not been made that Areas C (northern part) and D should be exempted from ECC's mineral safeguarding requirements. Mineral Resource Assessment required. Prior extraction of minerals would undermine the deliverability of North East Chelmsford within the plan period - particularly of Phase 1 and radial distributor road is located within Areas C and D. The delivery of Phase 2 (residential development and country park) which sits within Area A is at particular risk. The consortium suggest that Phase 2 will be delivered in 2026 to 2031. However, minerals operations in this area are not due to be completed until 2032-2033, with restoration to agricultural use due to take a further five years. This area is not therefore deliverable. Should Mineral Resource Assessment demonstrate further minerals extraction and restoration is required, there will be significant delay to the delivery of the site.
7.238	PS1305	872955	Hammonds Estates LLP	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	The site is in an area of known archaeological potential. No archaeological information has been submitted in respect of the site outside of the consented minerals area. One of the reasons that ECC requires EIA to be undertaken in respect of the rephrasing of minerals operations is that the "impact upon archaeological remains, if assets worthy of insitu preservation were found and not retain would be irreversible". The consequences of allocating this site on the archaeological resources of the site are therefore not known and a precautionary approach should be taken as it cannot be certain that this will not result in either parts of the site becoming unavailable for development, in delays to delivery due to the need for mitigation to be carried out.
7.239	PS1188	873524	Great Leighs Holdings & Estates Limited	Yes	Yes	No		•			Yes	Support the overall spatial strategy. Has concern with the following issues at Site 5a: 1. Allocation of land within the north west corner of Site 5a for future recreation and/or SuDS, rather than within the settlement boundary 2. Proposed allocation of Travelling Showpeople's plots on Site 5a in Great Leighs 3. Proposed restriction on size of convenience food store within the neighbourhood centre 4. Provision of health care and community facilities
7.241	PS1038	968043	Mr Derek T Park									I hitherto thought as recent as 2017, that the Council had chosen not to review the Green Belt nor for the potential for it to accommodate any sustainable growth. By Government definition as I understand it if Green belt land, inter alia represents an objective which appears to be: to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas; to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances.
7.241	PS1742	966152	Mr Gregory Ratcliffe									Great Leighs is smallest Key Service Settlement and is being allocated more development than lager places such as South Woodham Ferrers or Boreham. Funding is not available for NE Bypass so including it in Local Plan is misleading. Road links around Great Leighs are already at capacity. Development should be located at Hammonds Farm

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 5a – GREAT LEIGHS - LAND AT MOULSHAM HALL	PS223	1154256	Mr Roy Fentiman									Objection to site 5a. If it has to go ahead there should only be vehicular access from Moulsham Hall Lane, a green buffer should be provided between Dumney Lane and the site and the Travelling Showpeople site should be to the north of the allocation near Moulsham Hall Lane.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 5a – GREAT LEIGHS - LAND AT MOULSHAM HALL	PS224	1154257	Mrs Lindsey Fentiman									Objection to site 5a as it is overdevelopment of Great Leighs. If it must go ahead there should be no access to School Lane or Dumney Lane from the site and the provision of Travelling Showpeople pitches should be removed from the allocation.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 5a – GREAT LEIGHS - LAND AT MOULSHAM HALL	PS539	964091	Mrs Kathryn Varley									Aesthetic charm will be lost. Aragon Road suffers congestion. Development will lead to substantial increase in traffic and parking problems and hazards to both vehicles and pedestrians. There are no shopping outlets, GP etc to support development.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 5a – GREAT LEIGHS - LAND AT MOULSHAM HALL	PS533	664147	Sport England	Yes	Yes	Yes						The requirement in the policy for development to provide or make financial contributions to new or enhanced sport, leisure and recreational facilities is welcomed.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 5a – GREAT LEIGHS - LAND AT MOULSHAM HALL	PS869	908048	Essex Bridleways Association	Yes	Yes	No	•				Yes	Request the retention of the byway and upgrading footpaths to bridleways to improve connectivity, and full multi-user links being created between this and 5b and c.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 5a – GREAT LEIGHS - LAND AT MOULSHAM HALL	PS938	1155912	Felsted Parish Council			No			•			Welcome the 2 areas proposed as ‘Land for Conservation/ Strategic Landscape Enhancement’ and ‘Land allocated for Future Recreational Use and/or SUDS’ to avoid coalescence with Willows Green but these have to be retained. There is no evidence that people will use alternative modes of transport to alleviate traffic congestion in the area. Development needs to be able to accommodate an increase in traffic. Public transport in the area is not reliable or sufficient. The site will be isolated from Great Leighs and the access from Moulsham Hall Lane will lead to rat running through Felsted. Support the NE Bypass but this has to be a prerequisite for the development.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 5a – GREAT LEIGHS - LAND AT MOULSHAM HALL	PS1017	1099047	Mrs Kate Bennett		No	No	•	•	•	•		The lack of integration with the current Great Leighs community is against the principles of the NPPF Guidelines to enhance and protect existing communities (ie Great Leighs, and Felsted and its hamlets). It will be a dormitory town where new residents will be London overspill, and not local people. Infrastructure must be put in place before building the settlement including at the very least the relief road and new bypass. More joined-up working and evidence is required that cross-boundary planning is occurring particularly with Uttlesford District Council and neighbouring Parish Councils.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 5a – GREAT LEIGHS - LAND AT MOULSHAM HALL	PS1025	1156975	Mr Martin Forrester									£13mill funding gap for CNEB. Sites 5a-5d will be completed before infrastructure is put in place. The CNEB will create more congestion. A130 is forecast to be overcapacity by 2036. Site 5b is beyond acceptable walking guidelines for the elderly residents to access amenities. Beaulieu station has been delayed and has a funding gap. Locations accessible to the existing station and infrastructure should be considered first.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 5a – GREAT LEIGHS - LAND AT MOULSHAM HALL	PS1096	968043	Mr Derek T Park									Grade 2 & 3 agricultural land should be retained. Council is turning Great Leighs into a township rather than a village. A131 improvements will achieve little to remedy overloaded main highways. No more traffic should be permitted to emerge from new development either on School Lane - from a safety and parking hazard aspect or on the Main Road. Concern that developers will renege on planning conditions for affordable housing due to a planning loophole on viability. Local shops/services were proposed as part of David Wilson development but not provided. What confidence can be had for future provision of amenities?
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 5a – GREAT LEIGHS - LAND AT MOULSHAM HALL	PS1110	973857	Persimmon Homes Essex	Yes	Yes	No					Yes	Object to Strategic Growth Site 5 a. The allocation is not justified when considered against the reasonable alternatives such as the continuation of former EC3 ‘Land South and West of Broomfield Place and Broomfield Primary School’, which accords with Strategic Policy S1. See also attachment which contains all the representations from this consultee.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 5a – GREAT LEIGHS - LAND AT MOULSHAM HALL	PS1307	872955	Hammonds Estates LLP	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	Site is an unsustainable location for scale proposed - out of proportion with the size of the existing settlement, which is relatively remote from the city centre. Location does not comply with Strategic Policy S1 in relation to locating development at well-connected sustainable locations and securing necessary infrastructure. Plan does not provide rationale for the identification of Great Leighs, other than helping to deliver strategic infrastructure. Location is unjustified, when assessed against the evidence and would not be deliverable. Reasons set out Table 7 of Response to Pre-Submission Document. Growth in this location will reinforce Great Leighs' position as a dormitory settlement to Braintree. Proximity to Braintree should not be the driving factor, as there are more suitable and sustainable locations closer to Braintree and Great Notley, as illustrated by the allocation of a number of sites in and around these settlements, including a Strategic Growth Location on Land East of Great Notley within the Braintree's Publication Draft Local Plan, 2017. Hammonds Farm, in close proximity to the city centre will deliver far greater benefit and represents a more sustainable location for growth.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 5a – GREAT LEIGHS - LAND AT MOULSHAM HALL	PS1191	873524	Great Leighs Holdings & Estates Limited									Proposed number of units should be quantified as a minimum number. 4th bullet point under "Movement and Access" states; "Ensure appropriate habitat mitigation and creation is provided" should be under the heading "Historic and Natural Environment".
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 5a – GREAT LEIGHS - LAND AT MOULSHAM HALL	PS1152	714889	Essex Wildlife Trust	Yes	Yes	No				•	No	Lack of policy commitment to protect existing biodiversity assets.To be consistent with national policy (achieving net gains in biodiversity, wherever possible and the aim to protect and enhance existing biodiversity) the Policy should include, in the list of Site Infrastructure Requirements, a policy commitment to "provide appropriate habitat mitigation and creation, and appropriate buffers to the adjacent Local Wildlife Site, Phyllis Currie/Dumney Lane Woods." In addition, there should be a policy commitment to "seek financial contributions towards mitigating increased recreational impacts on EWT's Phyllis Currie nature reserve."
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 5a – GREAT LEIGHS - LAND AT MOULSHAM HALL	PS1382	1095466	Dr Simon Heffer									Development at Moulsham Hall is separated form Great Leighs Village. Effect on the environment, ecology and heritage and impact on landscape, economy, ancient parkland and wildlife habitat. Detached from a local village, and removed from established amenities. Traffic Congestion on by-pass. Development at Hammonds Farm as alternative location.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 5a – GREAT LEIGHS - LAND AT MOULSHAM HALL	PS1423	950163	Great Notley Parish Council			No		•	•		No	It must be a requirement that CNEB be delivered in the early life of the Plan period. Development will be unsustainable without CNEB. It is fanciful to suppose children will walk from Great Leighs to Notley High. LP references the provision of 'healthcare provision'. This ought to be more specific and require the provision of primary healthcare facilities so as not to burden the two surgery sites
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 5a – GREAT LEIGHS - LAND AT MOULSHAM HALL	PS1432	309079	Mr & Mrs Robin & Dorothy Creighton									Concerned for disruption to Phillis Currie Nature Reserve and wildlife in Lynderswood. Oppose vehicle access onto School Lane or Felsted Road. Traffic will be hazardous to pedestrians. A permanent form of traffic calming is needed through the length of Main Road and Boreham Road otherwise Great Leighs will continue to be a rat run.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 5a – GREAT LEIGHS - LAND AT MOULSHAM HALL	PS1478	964426	Mrs Wendy Daden									If CNEB is not delivered in its entirety, it will fail to serve its purpose. B1008 has not capacity to facilitate location 5. CNEB is undesirable to use at peak times.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 5a – GREAT LEIGHS - LAND AT MOULSHAM HALL	PS1521	309149	Black Notley Parish Council									No consideration for the impact on the infrastructure of the adjoining Parish of Black Notley Braintree, especially with the 1750 dwellings proposed by Braintree District Council at Black Notley. London Road and Bakers Lane already suffer extreme congestion at peak times, which will be made worse by proposed development. Link road should be built between Notley Road and London Road. No green buffer between Great Leighs and Black Notley
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 5a – GREAT LEIGHS - LAND AT MOULSHAM HALL	PS1589	1097822	Mr George Marriage									LP is unbalanced as development is in North and East of Chelmsford. Concern for inadequate transport infrastructure. Concern that CNEB is not guaranteed. Development around Gt Leighs is not a natural extension of the village. The proposal for housing to the west of the Great Leighs by pass does not allow for more than a single entrance into the development at the Braintree end of the bypass. School Lane is inadequate. Area suffers light pollution from Racecourse.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 5a – GREAT LEIGHS - LAND AT MOULSHAM HALL	PS1599	1095799	Mr Kevin Chapple									Oppose Great Leighs development. Concern for destruction of Dumney Lane nature reserve. Concern for traffic increase and parking along School Lane in relation to child pedestrian safety.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 5a – GREAT LEIGHS - LAND AT MOULSHAM HALL	PS1601	1159161	Sian Clark									Oppose development in Great Leighs. Concern for traffic and lack of road improvements in Great Leighs area. Concern for access to Broomfield Hospital. Boreham Road is an accident blackspot. Concern for destruction of arable land. Concern for urban sprawl and villages losing their identities. Concern for lack of commitment to Beaulieu station.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 5a – GREAT LEIGHS - LAND AT MOULSHAM HALL	PS1602	1093111	Mr Matthew Collins									Oppose development in Great Leighs. Infrastructure in the area cannot cope. Fear the historic village identity will be destroyed. Concern for lack of facilities (doctors), wildlife destruction, impact on secondary school placements. Great Leighs has already had too much development.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 5a – GREAT LEIGHS - LAND AT MOULSHAM HALL	PS1657	1153866	Mr James Revell	Yes	Yes	Yes					Yes	Suggests that site shown in attachment 1153866PS-A be included as part of site 5a for 100 dwellings. The site is brownfield and allow access onto School Lane and allows for a reduced density on site 5a.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 5a – GREAT LEIGHS - LAND AT MOULSHAM HALL	PS1654	1159870	Mrs & Mr Gwen and Tim Farrow									Seeking commitment that area around Hump Cottage designated for recreational use/SUDS should remain undeveloped in perpetuity. Area of conservation and enhanced landscaping around Moulsham Hall should be extended into the area immediately adjacent to Stone Hall Cottage. Moulsham Hall Lane should have 40mph limit.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 5a – GREAT LEIGHS - LAND AT MOULSHAM HALL	PS1713	312407	Tritton Family Trust	Yes	Yes	No		•	•	•	Yes	The plan is unsound. It is not justified, effective or consistent with national policy. The SA rationale for the selection of site 5A Great Leighs - Land at Moulsham Hall is not supported. It is incorrect. It provides for development which encroaches into the rural area across a bypass road and its cutting which severs the land from the existing Great Leighs community. Development in this location fails to respect the pattern of the existing settlement of Great Leighs. The timetable for delivery of the site is not established. The south/eastern extension to Great Leighs (parcels of land 17SLAA21, 22, 23, 24 and 26) brings forward sustainable development which meets the Strategic Priorities, Vision, Spatial Principles and Spatial Strategy. The land is available and the development deliverable for housing as well as providing for a primary school and neighbourhood facilities. Growth in this location will be integrated into the existing community of Great Leighs supporting its existing services, facilities and governance. Growth in this location can be effectively integrated into the landscape without compromising the setting of listed building or the amenities of existing residential properties.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 5a – GREAT LEIGHS - LAND AT MOULSHAM HALL	PS1779	1160014	Historic England	Yes	Yes							Welcome the inclusion of historic and natural environment within the policy, the wording is positive. Change of red line area and strengthened policy wording and criterion address our previous concerns.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 5a – GREAT LEIGHS - LAND AT MOULSHAM HALL	PS1827	1160052	North West Parishes Group									Development needs accompanying infrastructure. Refers to transport report to support this statement.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 5a – GREAT LEIGHS - LAND AT MOULSHAM HALL	PS1861	1101772	Mr Laurence Mann									I accept that development in the Council area is needed and justified but this should be concentrated close to existing road and rail links, especially those into London, and nearer Chelmsford itself. Rural villages should be allowed to expand naturally and Great Leighs has already developed significantly – and exponentially – over the past two decades. To create an entirely new settlement that would double the size of the village, and in the middle of a small rural landscape that is already surrounded by development, effectively ends any rural separation between Chelmsford and Braintree. This countryside and rural ‘belt’ between the two towns will be lost forever. Gt Leighs could support a much more modest increase in housing, along / close to the A131 bypass, but not development on the scale proposed. This would represent a disproportionate imposition on Great Leighs and the locality (nearby hamlets and historic listed housing). This is a failure of the planning process and the ineffectiveness of this element of the Local Draft Plan. Opposed to proposed development at Moulsham Hall Lane, Strategic Growth Site 5a.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 5a – GREAT LEIGHS - LAND AT MOULSHAM HALL	PS1877	976073	Bellway Homes			No	•	•	•	•	Yes	SGS5a is not justified. Not including Land north of Boreham Road for residential use is unjustified

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 5a – GREAT LEIGHS - LAND AT MOULSHAM HALL	PS1894	1101627	Gateway 120, Cirrus Land LLP, and L & Q Homes	Yes	No	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	As currently drafted, the plan fails to deliver on its Strategic Priorities, nor Strategic Policy S1 which forms the basis on which the plan is founded. Land east of Braintree offers an opportunity to meet the strategic objectives of both CCC and the north Essex region as a whole, delivering a comprehensively planned urban extension to Braintree with appropriate supporting infrastructure provided on-site in combination with housing delivery. Rather than representing an isolated development with a reliance on private vehicle movements, the site represents the best opportunity to utilise both an existing principle service centre, as well as linking in to the planned spatial growth strategy for the region. In order to be considered effective in delivering its strategic objectives, the plan should be amended to consider more appropriate ways the objectively assessed needs of the region can be accommodated. A suitable alternative exists. With the Braintree District Council Section 2 Local Plan yet to undergo its Examination in Public, the Councils should take the opportunity to reassess whether the strategic development sites of both plans will effectively deliver the objectives of allocating them.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 5a – GREAT LEIGHS - LAND AT MOULSHAM HALL	PS2035	308541	Great & Little Leighs Parish Council									Concern for delivery of housing, lack of school places, increase in traffic, impact on landscape and wildlife, and disproportionate development. Documents for LP are misleading. Oppose inclusion of Great Leighs in development. Concern for delivery of CNEB. Consider Hammonds Farm as an alternative.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 5a – GREAT LEIGHS - LAND AT MOULSHAM HALL	PS2037	308541	Great & Little Leighs Parish Council									Site should be on a smaller scale. Vehicle access to site should be mitigated. Infrastructure needs to be in place before houses. Concern for lack of school places. Oppose travelling show person site allocation.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 5a – GREAT LEIGHS - LAND AT MOULSHAM HALL	PS2090	1161039	Natural England		Yes	No					No	Strategic Growth Site Poliy 5a requires strengthening to comply with para 118 of the NPPF. The River Ter, an SSSI, is located approx. 1.7 km to the south. This SSSI needs to be explicitly mentioned in the policy to avoid any impact. The entire rep has been attached for completeness (1161039PS-A).
7.242	PS1055	1099047	Mrs Kate Bennett	No								The Plan is not legally compliant as the online consultation process is difficult to access or make sense of.
7.245	PS1192	873524	Great Leighs Holdings & Estates Limited									Alter wording from “The neighbourhood centre will need to make provision...” to “The neighbourhood centre will need to make provision for community and health care (facilities?) where practical and viable....”
7.246	PS1519	309149	Black Notley Parish Council									No consideration for the impact on the infrastructure of the adjoining Parish of Black Notley Braintree, especially with the 1750 dwellings proposed by Braintree District Council at Black Notley. London Road and Bakers Lane already suffer extreme congestion at peak times, which will be made worse by proposed development. Link road should be built between Notley Road and London Road. No green buffer between Great Leighs and Black Notley
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 5b – GREAT LEIGHS - LAND EAST OF LONDON ROAD	PS871	908048	Essex Bridleways Association	Yes	Yes	No	•				Yes	Site 5b should have a multi-user access onto Mill Lane at the eastern point of the site to be able to access byway 66_13 and the other byways beyond to improve connectivity.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 5b – GREAT LEIGHS - LAND EAST OF LONDON ROAD	PS1112	968043	Mr Derek T Park									Both sites (5a and 5b) are outside the Defined Village Settlement and should not be contemplated. I dispute the implied convenience and availability of readily accessed local amenities for older people. The City Council should consider before any sale, the existence of any proposed onerous leasehold terms and conditions or exploitative management charges.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 5b – GREAT LEIGHS - LAND EAST OF LONDON ROAD	PS1193	873524	Great Leighs Holdings & Estates Limited									Proposed number of units should be quantified as a minimum number. Reference to Gubbions Hall is not considered relevant to this site as it does not impact upon its setting. It is also unclear what other listed buildings will be impacted by this site.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 5b – GREAT LEIGHS - LAND EAST OF LONDON ROAD	PS1306	872955	Hammonds Estates LLP	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	Site is an unsustainable location for scale proposed - out of proportion with the size of the existing settlement, which is relatively remote from the city centre. Location does not comply with Strategic Policy S1 in relation to locating development at well-connected sustainable locations and securing necessary infrastructure. Plan does not provide rationale for the identification of Great Leighs, other than helping to deliver strategic infrastructure. Location is unjustified, when assessed against the evidence and would not be deliverable. Reasons set out Table 7 of Response to Pre-Submission Document. Growth in this location will reinforce Great Leighs' position as a dormitory settlement to Braintree. Proximity to Braintree should not be the driving factor, as there are more suitable and sustainable locations closer to Braintree and Great Notley, as illustrated by the allocation of a number of sites in and around these settlements, including a Strategic Growth Location on Land East of Great Notley within the Braintree's Publication Draft Local Plan, 2017. Hammonds Farm, in close proximity to the city centre will deliver far greater benefit and represents a more sustainable location for growth.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 5b – GREAT LEIGHS - LAND EAST OF LONDON ROAD	PS1522	309149	Black Notley Parish Council									No consideration for the impact on the infrastructure of the adjoining Parish of Black Notley Braintree, especially with the 1750 dwellings proposed by Braintree District Council at Black Notley. London Road and Bakers Lane already suffer extreme congestion at peak times, which will be made worse by proposed development. Link road should be built between Notley Road and London Road. No green buffer between Great Leighs and Black Notley
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 5b – GREAT LEIGHS - LAND EAST OF LONDON ROAD	PS1726	1160003	Ms Geraldine Southwood									Site 5b Gt Leighs is not an acceptable walking distance for elderly residents to access village facilities. Other options are available to Chelmsford City Council to fulfill their quota of housing. Hammonds farm located next to the A12 would be an infrastructure led development. At least 73% of residents in Chelmsford that use their vehicle for work, use the A12 southwest towards Brentwood or the A130 towards Southend.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 5b – GREAT LEIGHS - LAND EAST OF LONDON ROAD	PS1780	1160014	Historic England	Yes	Yes							Welcome the inclusion of historic and natural environment within the policy, the wording is positive. Change of red line area and strengthened policy wording and criterion address our previous concerns.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 5b – GREAT LEIGHS - LAND EAST OF LONDON ROAD	PS1895	1101627	Gateway 120, Cirrus Land LLP, and L & Q Homes	Yes	No	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	As currently drafted, the plan fails to deliver on its Strategic Priorities, nor Strategic Policy S1 which forms the basis on which the plan is founded. Land east of Braintree offers an opportunity to meet the strategic objectives of both CCC and the north Essex region as a whole, delivering a comprehensively planned urban extension to Braintree with appropriate supporting infrastructure provided on-site in combination with housing delivery. Rather than representing an isolated development with a reliance on private vehicle movements, the site represents the best opportunity to utilise both an existing principle service centre, as well as linking in to the planned spatial growth strategy for the region. In order to be considered effective in delivering its strategic objectives, the plan should be amended to consider more appropriate ways the objectively assessed needs of the region can be accommodated. A suitable alternative exists. With the Braintree District Council Section 2 Local Plan yet to undergo its Examination in Public, the Councils should take the opportunity to reassess whether the strategic development sites of both plans will effectively deliver the objectives of allocating them.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 5b – GREAT LEIGHS - LAND EAST OF LONDON ROAD	PS2032	308541	Great & Little Leighs Parish Council									Concern that developing on land previously used as an overflow car park will lead to a new overflow car park somewhere. Concern that residents will have to travel out of town to access facilities. "Supermarket" is definitely not a supermarket, it is a small shop. Plan goes against "retain local distinctiveness". Concern for congestion and impact of HGVs on road accessing local quarry. See no reason for change to DSB.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 5b – GREAT LEIGHS - LAND EAST OF LONDON ROAD	PS2091	1161039	Natural England		Yes	No					No	Strategic Growth Site Poliy 5b requires strengthening to comply with para 118 of the NPPF. The River Ter, an SSSI, is located approx. 1.7 km to the south. This SSSI needs to be explicitly mentioned in the policy to avoid any impact. The entire rep has been attached for completeness (1161039PS-A).
7.257	PS1194	873524	Great Leighs Holdings & Estates Limited									alter wording to “older people” from “people over retirement age”. A definition of “older people” is proposed within the draft NPPF which would provide consistency with national planning guidance.
7.259	PS1195	873524	Great Leighs Holdings & Estates Limited									include the words “leisure facilities offered by...” Chelmsford City Racecourse. Then add; “It is also in close proximity and well connected to the proposed neighbourhood centre on site 5a.”

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 5c – GREAT LEIGHS – LAND NORTH AND SOUTH OF BANTERS LANE	PS686	830229	Mrs Helen Sadler									Aged accommodation is planned for land North of Banters Lane, Great Leighs (map 16). This is not a suitable location as Highways consider this to be outside the acceptable distance to amenities. Although there will be adaptations to this area to cater for different modes of transport/walking, these do not address the considerations of the aging population.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 5c – GREAT LEIGHS – LAND NORTH AND SOUTH OF BANTERS LANE	PS872	908048	Essex Bridleways Association	Yes	Yes	No	•				Yes	Strategic Growth Site 5c: see our comments on 5a (rep no. PS869) with regard to ensuring multi-user links between the three sites. Paragraph 7.275 mentions the need to ensure new and enhanced pedestrian and cycle links between the site and the wider area and we would prefer to see these links full multi-user rather than limited to pedestrians and cyclists. Any rights of ways severed by the new bypass should be bridged/underpassed or new multi-user crossings created wherever possible, as part of the overall Masterplan for the area.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 5c – GREAT LEIGHS – LAND NORTH AND SOUTH OF BANTERS LANE	PS1120	968043	Mr Derek T Park									Both sites (5b and 5c) are outside the Defined Village Settlement and should not be contemplated.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 5c – GREAT LEIGHS – LAND NORTH AND SOUTH OF BANTERS LANE	PS1308	872955	Hammonds Estates LLP	No	No	No	•	•	•	•		Site is an unsustainable location for scale proposed - out of proportion with the size of the existing settlement, which is relatively remote from the city centre. Location does not comply with Strategic Policy S1 in relation to locating development at well-connected sustainable locations and securing necessary infrastructure. Plan does not provide rationale for the identification of Great Leighs, other than helping to deliver strategic infrastructure. Location is unjustified, when assessed against the evidence and would not be deliverable. Reasons set out Table 7 of Response to Pre-Submission Document. Growth in this location will reinforce Great Leighs' position as a dormitory settlement to Braintree. Proximity to Braintree should not be the driving factor, as there are more suitable and sustainable locations closer to Braintree and Great Notley, as illustrated by the allocation of a number of sites in and around these settlements, including a Strategic Growth Location on Land East of Great Notley within the Braintree's Publication Draft Local Plan, 2017. Hammonds Farm, in close proximity to the city centre will deliver far greater benefit and represents a more sustainable location for growth.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 5c – GREAT LEIGHS – LAND NORTH AND SOUTH OF BANTERS LANE	PS1156	714889	Essex Wildlife Trust	Yes	Yes	No				•	No	Policy is inconsistent with national policy as it lacks a commitment to enhance biodiversity wherever possible and a commitment to protect and enhance existing biodiversity assets. Policy should include a statement on protecting and enhancing existing biodiversity assets. The section on Site Infrastructure Requirements should include a statement requiring financial contributions to reduce recreational impacts on EWT's Sandylay and Moat Woods nature reserve.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 5c – GREAT LEIGHS – LAND NORTH AND SOUTH OF BANTERS LANE	PS1523	309149	Black Notley Parish Council									No consideration for the impact on the infrastructure of the adjoining Parish of Black Notley Braintree, especially with the 1750 dwellings proposed by Braintree District Council at Black Notley. London Road and Bakers Lane already suffer extreme congestion at peak times, which will be made worse by proposed development. Link road should be built between Notley Road and London Road. No green buffer between Great Leighs and Black Notley
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 5c – GREAT LEIGHS – LAND NORTH AND SOUTH OF BANTERS LANE	PS1750	1160022	Landowners of 5c								Yes	The landowners support the allocation of site 5c for residential development and are willing to work with the other landowners to create a masterplan which promotes connectivity across the Strategic Growth Location. The policy should be reworded to state: “A minimum of 100 new homes of mixed size and type to include affordable housing.” In addition, taking the foregoing into account, it is recommend that the site allocation is amended to exclude: • Reference to the main vehicular access off Banters Lane; • Reference to the phasing of delivery being reliant on the provision of a new primary school; • Reference to the need for a MRA.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 5c – GREAT LEIGHS – LAND NORTH AND SOUTH OF BANTERS LANE	PS1781	1160014	Historic England	Yes	Yes							Welcome the inclusion of historic and natural environment within the policy, the wording is positive. Change of red line area and strengthened policy wording and criterion address our previous concerns.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 5c – GREAT LEIGHS – LAND NORTH AND SOUTH OF BANTERS LANE	PS1896	1101627	Gateway 120, Cirrus Land LLP, and L & Q Homes	Yes	No	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	As currently drafted, the plan fails to deliver on its Strategic Priorities, nor Strategic Policy S1 which forms the basis on which the plan is founded. Land east of Braintree offers an opportunity to meet the strategic objectives of both CCC and the north Essex region as a whole, delivering a comprehensively planned urban extension to Braintree with appropriate supporting infrastructure provided on-site in combination with housing delivery. Rather than representing an isolated development with a reliance on private vehicle movements, the site represents the best opportunity to utilise both an existing principle service centre, as well as linking in to the planned spatial growth strategy for the region. In order to be considered effective in delivering its strategic objectives, the plan should be amended to consider more appropriate ways the objectively assessed needs of the region can be accommodated. A suitable alternative exists. With the Braintree District Council Section 2 Local Plan yet to undergo its Examination in Public, the Councils should take the opportunity to reassess whether the strategic development sites of both plans will effectively deliver the objectives of allocating them.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 5c – GREAT LEIGHS – LAND NORTH AND SOUTH OF BANTERS LANE	PS2033	308541	Great & Little Leighs Parish Council									Land was previously deemed unsuitable, why is it now suitable? Concern for wildlife in ancient woodlands nearby. Concern for lack of school places.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 5c – GREAT LEIGHS – LAND NORTH AND SOUTH OF BANTERS LANE	PS2092	1161039	Natural England		Yes	No					No	Strategic Growth Site Poliy 5c requires strengthening to comply with para 118 of the NPPF. The River Ter, an SSSI, is located approx. 1.7 km to the south. This SSSI needs to be explicitly mentioned in the policy to avoid any impact. The entire rep has been attached for completeness (1161039PS-A).
7.273	PS1520	309149	Black Notley Parish Council									No consideration for the impact on the infrastructure of the adjoining Parish of Black Notley Braintree, especially with the 1750 dwellings proposed by Braintree District Council at Black Notley. London Road and Bakers Lane already suffer extreme congestion at peak times, which will be made worse by proposed development. Link road should be built between Notley Road and London Road. No green buffer between Great Leighs and Black Notley
7.274	PS212	961061	Mr Nigel Booley	No	No	No	•	•	•	•		For 5b and 5c, the plan does not comply as it does not support SA Objective 5, 11 and 14. Values of listed buildings will be adversely affected as will views from the rear of my property. Concern about light and noise pollution, privacy of residents and loss of wildlife. Funding shortfall for CNEB will lead to excessive congestion in Great Leighs. Safety concerns about using Banters Lane for access to 5c, which cannot be widened to provide a second lane, walkways and cycleways.. My house is outside the DSB and was heavily restricted on height when built, this setting has not changed. See attachments under PS182.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 6 – NORTH OF BROOMFIELD	PS219	1069128	Mr Jason Kavanagh									Broomfield will lose its village charm and yet more countryside is being lost.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 6 – NORTH OF BROOMFIELD	PS480	965019	Dr Duncan Coles			No			•			Support the reduction to 450 dwellings on site 6, but no increase should be allowed due to significant traffic from Broomfield Hospital. The new access road to the hospital is essential. Other traffic reduction measures should be included to reduce traffic through Broomfield including a dual CNEB. New cycle way links from Broomfield needed to support commuting and recreation. Green wedges are supported with minor boundary alterations. Expansion of Broomfield Hospital should be included in the plan to allow for the increase in population.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 6 – NORTH OF BROOMFIELD	PS482	965019	Dr Duncan Coles			No			•			Support the reduction to 450 dwellings on site 6, but no increase should be allowed due to significant traffic from Broomfield Hospital. The new access road to the hospital is essential. Other traffic reduction measures should be included to reduce traffic through Broomfield including a dual CNEB. New cycle way links from Broomfield needed to support commuting and recreation. Green wedges are supported with minor boundary alterations. Expansion of Broomfield Hospital should be included in the plan to allow for the increase in population.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 6 – NORTH OF BROOMFIELD	PS500	1155334	Mrs Rosemarie Brown			No	•	•	•			Concern for: lack of infrastructure; that village will lose its identity; congestion; safety - as roads are used as rat runs in/out of hospital; parking problems for hospital and high school.



Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 6 – NORTH OF BROOMFIELD	PS502	966265	Mrs Melanie Pimm									Concern for congestion in Broomfield - especially on School Lane. Main Road cannot cope with major traffic congestion. Moving development to Great Leighs will still increase traffic unless an alternative route, bypassing Broomfield, is put in place.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 6 – NORTH OF BROOMFIELD	PS534	1155513	Mr David Smith			No	•	•	•			Not enough consideration has been given to traffic and congestion. Broomfield Road is not adequately sized for current traffic, and there are noticeable adverse affects around School Lane
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 6 – NORTH OF BROOMFIELD	PS532	968127	Mrs Janet Jerome			No	•	•	•			Main Road Broomfield can't cope with current traffic using it, cars using rat runs to get out on to Main Road further towards Chelmsford
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 6 – NORTH OF BROOMFIELD	PS535	664147	Sport England	Yes	Yes	Yes						The requirement in the policy for development to provide or make financial contributions to new or enhanced sport, leisure and recreational facilities is welcomed.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 6 – NORTH OF BROOMFIELD	PS651	1155999	Mrs Diane Herbert									Consideration has not been fully thought out as to the impact extended building would have on residents of an historic village of Broomfield. The B1008 is over congested now without further traffic making it gridlocked for most of the day, and especially rush hours.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 6 – NORTH OF BROOMFIELD	PS652	970177	Miss Ines Nunes			No			•			Oppose building in Broofield. Broomfield road is congested every day. Develop around the outskirt of Chelmsford - like Hammonds Farm with better access to A12. Hospital beds are decreasing.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 6 – NORTH OF BROOMFIELD	PS653	312496	Mr Neil Wiffen			No			•			Lack of extra road capacity. Traffic on Main Road Broomfield is already very heavy. Houses to the north of the hospital will only add to this unsustainable growth. Sites near to the A12 & new railway station should be given priority.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 6 – NORTH OF BROOMFIELD	PS765	967081	Mr Christopher Lodge		No	No	•	•	•			Concern for pollution. Oppose development. West Chelmsford is the worst place for development.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 6 – NORTH OF BROOMFIELD	PS825	310419	Mrs Gillian Lodge			No	•	•	•			The proposed site will force road users onto congested roads to access the A12. building will increase congestion on Broomfield Road. Concern for increased pollution and danger to road users. More GPs schools, supermarkets and hospital provision are needed. Do not build on this site, it is unsustainable.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 6 – NORTH OF BROOMFIELD	PS932	1155273	Leon Lallyette					•	•		Yes	The new Hospital access road gives little relief to current traffic and the creation of the 450 home extension to Broomfield should be accommodated elsewhere. Insufficient school capacity, insufficient public transport and lack of commitment to improved cycle and pedestrian improvements
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 6 – NORTH OF BROOMFIELD	PS1203	1097080	Ms Shyy Sachdev	Yes	Yes	No		•	•		Yes	Whilst this policy, which seeks to allocate land to the north of Broomfield is supported, it is considered that land at Rembrandt House, Broomfield should also be allocated as a small site to complement this larger development. Land at Rembrandt House, Broomfield should be removed from the Green Wedge policy designation as this designation does not reflect the characteristics or nature of the site. The Plan is not justified as it as it is not considered to be the most appropriate strategy, having an over-reliance on large sites. A strategy which includes some small / medium sized sites would ensure more responsive delivery. The plan is not effective in terms of housing delivery over the Plan period.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 6 – NORTH OF BROOMFIELD	PS1023	1156975	Mr Martin Forrester			No	•	•	•			B1008 is already at capacity. Junction 11 of Main Road, Broomfield/School Lane is at capacity. Gt Waltham cycle route should not be considered a sustainable mode. Site 6 is located beyond the acceptable walking distance to Broomfield Primary School
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 6 – NORTH OF BROOMFIELD	PS1310	872955	Hammonds Estates LLP	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	Lower level of housing development proposed, no longer requires the provision of a primary school, provision of neighbourhood centre added. The site is relatively remote from the centre of Chelmsford with limited facilities to be provided, and available in the locality. Development in this location and of the form proposed will not contribute to the sustainability of Broomfield. Location is unjustified, when assessed against the evidence and would not be deliverable. Reasons set out Table 8 of Response to Pre-Submission Document. The scale of development will not achieve objective of creating a new sustainable neighbourhood. Development at this location is not an appropriate, sustainable option to accommodate future growth at Chelmsford. Provision of new community at Hammonds Farm, which would be both sustainable and bring wider benefits to the city and is an appropriate strategy for growth.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 6 – NORTH OF BROOMFIELD	PS1148	961741	Mrs Sarah Mills			No	•	•	•			Local schools and roads are already at capacity. Do not build on this beautiful area and place of tranquillity. There is no affordable housing. Chelmsford does not support ordinary working families.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 6 – NORTH OF BROOMFIELD	PS1249	963560	Mr Shaun Lloyd			No	•	•	•			Increase in road traffic flows, to and from the north, encouraged by the new station together with housing to the north of Chelmsford (Broomfield and Great Leighs), will increase crosstown traffic causing further delays, disruption, congestion, worsened air quality, increased noise and disturbance along Main Road, Broomfield. Should build closer to the site of the new railway station. Working residents of new housing need practicable access to rail transport or A12: both of these requirements would be met by focussing new developments near the A12 and the new railway station, i.e. to the south and east of Chelmsford. Hammonds Farm - well placed for access to the A12 and the new railway station and would not result in an increase in road traffic through Chelmsford compared to sites in north Chelmsford. Encouraging people to cycle to the railway stations is in principle a good idea but the distances involved mean that cycling is most likely to have only a very small impact on traffic congestion. Though hospital traffic from the south and east will still find its way along Main Road. Higher quality farmland to the north and west of Broomfield than that to the south of the A12. Need to preserve character and leisure and amenity value/protection of countryside surrounding Broomfield from development as integral to maintaining the quality of life of Broomfield's residents. (Broomfield's Community Landscape Character Assessment of 2010).
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 6 – NORTH OF BROOMFIELD	PS1248	1157071	Bloor Homes Eastern	Yes	Yes	Yes					Yes	Support the allocation of site 6 but suggest it is capable of supporting more than 450 homes without compromising the ability of the site to deliver a development that respects its rural setting whilst providing all necessary environmental mitigation, open space provision, drainage and strategic planting. Bloor Homes supports an amendment to the Policy SG56 providing flexibility to determine the capacity of the Site through the masterplanning process.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 6 – NORTH OF BROOMFIELD	PS1397	310089	Mr Peter Marriage	No		No		•	•	•	Yes	SA is not adequate. Transport infrastructure must be in place before residential development. There are no cycleway links from Beaulieu. No evidence of segregated cycle routes. Current infrastructure is inadequate. Concern for congestion. Northern bypass needs to be built first with access to Drakes Lane.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 6 – NORTH OF BROOMFIELD	PS1399	310089	Mr Peter Marriage									The housing allocation here has been cut but the boundary of the village envelope has not been reduced accordingly. This should be reduced from the west to the line shown for the new hospital approach road to avoid damage to the very important landscape / Pleshey Plateau to the west.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 6 – NORTH OF BROOMFIELD	PS1475	964426	Mrs Wendy Daden									Site is located further than 2km recommended walking distance. Concern for congestion. Allocation of homes would be better located on a larger development where it could help finance and facilitate a primary school. Concern that using the NE bypass will be undesirable due to congestion. With regard to 7.29, the word "efforts" is unsatisfactory and unsustainable. A direct cycle route from site 6 to city centre does not exist so cycling is not a sustainable form of transport. CCC should enforce a successful scheme to incentivise bus use before committing to the B1008. Developing on good agricultural land should be a last resort.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 6 – NORTH OF BROOMFIELD	PS1587	1159063	Mr & Mrs Sidwell		No	No		•	•		No	1) Unsuitable road width through Broomfield even now 2) Pollution. Both air and noise 3) Any problem large or small causes congestion now before more housing 4) Emergency services access time. 5) Hospital unable to cope now 6) Hazardous, particularly at peak times crossing roads to go in Chelmsford direction both on foot, bicycles, cars 7) The devastation to countryside
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 6 – NORTH OF BROOMFIELD	PS1604	309828	Mrs Teresia Gibson									The proposed cycling route from City Centre to Great Waltham is a great idea, but is more to be seen as a leisure route (not a route to relieve the traffic load on the Main Road). The proposed 450 houses in Broomfield should not be increased. In fact the Main Road as it is, is already at a standstill daily. There seems to be a better and more appropriate solution to expanding Chelmsford by developing potential larger sites near the A12 south of Chelmsford to avoid clogging up the Main Road and City Centre by commuters north of Chelmsford. Car sharing schemes to be promoted (when there was a petrol shortage the Main Road was not too busy). Schools to educate parents and children to walk to school.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 6 – NORTH OF BROOMFIELD	PS1783	1160014	Historic England	Yes	Yes							Advise that the wording of the first bullet point is amended to read “protect enhance the setting of nearby heritage assets, including the scheduled monument”. The wording in the draft at present would not cover the conservation area, only historic properties and the scheduled monument.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 6 – NORTH OF BROOMFIELD	PS1810	1160052	North West Parishes Group									The growth to the North of Broomfield (SGS6) is a concern and must be mitigated to the extent possible through infrastructure improvements (including the new Hospital Access Road) and identification of landscape and woodland improvement areas within the identified development area. The reduction in scale of development is welcomed. Have reservations as to potential impacts of the development on community and infrastructure provision. Concern DSB has not been sufficiently reduced to reflect the reduction in scale of the development. It would be more appropriate to either reduce the allocated area or specify the use of some of this allocation. New access road is essential - refers to traffic report to support this. Consider Hammonds Farm.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 6 – NORTH OF BROOMFIELD	PS1840	476873	Little Waltham Parish Council			No					Yes	Development would result in traffic increase between hospital approach and city centre - supported by traffic report. Does not comply with S1 as site is unsustainable. New access road is vital for development. Concern for rat-running and congestion - particularly in Little Waltham. (For breakdown of North West Parishes Group response see PS1808 - PS1832 and PS SA45 - PS SA49)
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 6 – NORTH OF BROOMFIELD	PS1837	1157089	Broomfield Parish Council									BPC sent Transport report and North West Parishes Group response - both attached. The NWPG response has been summarised under PS1808-PS1832 and PSSA45-PSSA49. Note, previously this was under PS1833 but rep was deleted due to attachment glitch.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 6 – NORTH OF BROOMFIELD	PS1908	1097127	Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd			Yes						Endorses the draft Spatial Strategy with specific regard to Countryside Properties' interests in respect of the delivery of the following strategic site by 2036: Strategic Growth Site 6 – North of Broomfield;
7.282	PS891	964657	Mrs Margaret Williams			No		•				The land that is to be built on is good grade agricultural land providing food. There is a need to grow more crops in UK
7.282	PS1240	967131	Mr & Mrs D Graystone	No								To maintain the character of the area, surrounding villages and Broomfield, the number of dwellings in this development should not be allowed to be increased by the developer at detailed planning stage. Traffic issues - With the Countryside development on Hospital Approach still in progress, the extent of increased traffic in the area cannot be fully judged. Save to say that there is already major congestion in the area, not restricted to morning and evening. The area is at capacity.
7.283	PS1309	972047	Mrs Elizabeth Watts									Site is still deliverable although discussions with ECC education have stalled. Location is sustainable and accessible and not does rely on other large scale infrastructure projects.
7.285	PS1319	972047	Mrs Elizabeth Watts									Location 6 could have been brought forward in tandem with Preferred Options Site EC3 (Broomfield). These are sustainable and well connected locations. This would have represented a proper long term plan for the area.
7.286	PS888	964657	Mrs Margaret Williams			No			•			The development can hardly be termed an extension to either Broomfield or Little Waltham as it straddles the boundaries of both villages. Nor can it become a 'stand alone' community as the development will just be a group of houses with a busy bus and ambulance route going through it.
7.287	PS551	1074334	Mrs Mary Dove			No	•	•	•			There is little need for this relief road as it only benefits cars coming down Blasford Hill from Regiment Way. The only traffic congestion is when the (Broomfield Hospital) staff change shifts maybe an answer would have the shift changes be staggered at the hospital that would ease the traffic
7.287	PS552	1074334	Mrs Mary Dove			No	•	•	•			It would be impossible to make Woodhouse Lane and North Court Road local access only work, hospital staff and visitors could still use it as a shortcut or as a parking area, a sign up saying local access only would not stop people using it, its only a way to appease the local residents who will lose their rural feeling by having houses right on top of their properties. There are not enough parking places at the Hospital for the staff, a staggered start time and finish might help, the Hospital do not have the money or the space to make more parking spaces.
7.287	PS1050	1039843	Mr. Robert Barnard									If a new link road is to be built to create access to King Edward Grammar School Playing Field, then it should come off Larks Lane, Broads Green across to the north side of the field.
7.287	PS1056	1039843	Mr. Robert Barnard	No	No	No	•	•	•		Yes	Concerns regarding access to and from existing housing estate situated at Woodhouse Lane. Suggested route for secondary access into the hospital site to provide ambulances with instant access onto the hospital site and also a better access road to King Edward VI Grammar School Sports Field. Concern of the impact for patients from new development located close to Farleigh Hospice. New proposed housing developments will have a significant detrimental impact on the local wildlife and surrounding countryside. New housing to be built north of Chelmsford should be allocated at brownfield sites near Boreham close to the A12 corridor.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
7.287	PS1252	1157071	Bloor Homes Eastern	Yes	Yes	No			•		No	Delete Para 7.287 and replace with: The opportunity for Broomfield Hospital to have a Secondary Access Road is facilitated by the development of the site. The Policy SPA1 looks to the further development of Broomfield Hospital incorporating a safeguarded corridor linking the Hospital campus roads with the B1008. The opportunity also exists for improved access to Farleigh Hospice and the King Edward VI Grammar School playing fields through the downgrading of Woodhouse Lane and North Court Road to routes for local access only.
7.288	PS890	964657	Mrs Margaret Williams						•			The increased traffic generated by new houses in Gt Leigh's will cause traffic jams and pollution. A roundabout in the Blasford Hill area will not ease the situation, and together with the traffic from the Blasford Hill development will just contribute to greater congestion on the B1008 beyond Hospital Approach.
7.291	PS1251	1157071	Bloor Homes Eastern	Yes	Yes	No			•		No	Delete last two sentences of para 7.291 and replace with: In implementing the Secondary Access Road across land safeguarded by policy SPA1, the Hospital shall consider any necessary mitigation including compensatory measures which replace any habitat lost as part of its construction.
7.293	PS548	1074334	Mrs Mary Dove			No	•	•	•			Paragraph has missed off Woodhouse Cottage on the corner of Woodhouse Lane. Any development will impact this property. New houses should be built at the start of the relief road just off Blasford Hill - not in the other corner of the field, for practicality reasons.
TRAVELLERS SITE GT1 – DRAKES LANE GYPSY AND TRAVELLER SITE	PS679	830229	Mrs Helen Sadler									Inconsistencies and inequalities with the data used for the assessment of need for the travelling community. Whilst it is a legal requirement to make provision for travellers simply making assessments or allocations without merit or over estimating allocations can not considered a sound basis to form part of a local plan. 2014 GTAA concludes that there is no identifiable need for Travelling Showpeople camps between 2013 and 2033. Oppose allocation as there is no known association with the area or specific location and alternative locations have not been considered. Feel site is treated differently to Site 4. Evidence in GTAA 2017 is not consistent with LP as projected growth rate is estimated but with no definitive statistical supporting evidence. There is no explanation as to where figure in S8 have come from. CCC should not take "unknown households" into consideration as CCC do not consider "hidden homeless" who are living in friends/families houses. Prior 2 consultations before PO had not considered GTS1 as allocation. GTS1 has increased in size with no justification. S9 in PO fails to state with GTAA report was used. Assessment of need is contrast to NPPF. See also PS680, PS681, PS682, PS683, PS684, PS685, PS686
TRAVELLERS SITE GT1 – DRAKES LANE GYPSY AND TRAVELLER SITE	PS1230	1157128	WH Marriage & Sons Ltd	No	Yes	No				•	Yes	The Government's planning policy for Traveller Sites sets out the key approach to plan making to be read in conjunction with National Planning Policy. Paragraph 13 requires that Traveller Sites are sustainable, economically, socially and environmentally. The allocated site conflicts with a), is removed from services and facilities in particular, not in close proximity to schools, paragraphs b) and c).
TRAVELLERS SITE GT1 – DRAKES LANE GYPSY AND TRAVELLER SITE	PS1850	1099175	North Chelmsford Villages Community Group	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	We have concerns that the current preferred Gypsy and Traveller Site Allocation has not been prepared positively and fails to provide sufficient justification. We also have concerns as to whether the allocation is deliverable and we are of the opinion that it is not consistent with National policy.
TRAVELLERS SITE GT1 – DRAKES LANE GYPSY AND TRAVELLER SITE	PS2094	925768	Mr Edward Baldock	No	No	No		•	•	•	No	Developers have bought-off the LPA by making available the site TS1 (as it is described within the new Local Plan) and a sum of money in the order of £600K. The site does not constitute sustainable development as it is located in an isolated and unsafe location. The site should be removed from the Local Plan.
EXISTING COMMITMENT EC3 – GREAT LEIGHS – LAND EAST OF MAIN ROAD	PS1524	309149	Black Notley Parish Council									No consideration for the impact on the infrastructure of the adjoining Parish of Black Notley Braintree, especially with the 1750 dwellings proposed by Braintree District Council at Black Notley. London Road and Bakers Lane already suffer extreme congestion at peak times, which will be made worse by proposed development. Link road should be built between Notley Road and London Road. No green buffer between Great Leighs and Black Notley
EXISTING COMMITMENT EC3 – GREAT LEIGHS – LAND EAST OF MAIN ROAD	PS1636	1159743	Gladman Developments Ltd	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	Gladman support policy EC3. The principle of residential development at this site has been established through the planning permission. Development will come forward in line with the principles established in this planning approval.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
EXISTING COMMITMENT EC3 – GREAT LEIGHS – LAND EAST OF MAIN ROAD	PS1782	1160014	Historic England	Yes	Yes							Welcome the inclusion of historic and natural environment within the policy, the wording is positive. Change of red line area and strengthened policy wording and criterion address our previous concerns.
EXISTING COMMITMENT EC3 – GREAT LEIGHS – LAND EAST OF MAIN ROAD	PS1785	1160014	Historic England	Yes	Yes							We advise that the policy is amended to extend consideration of setting as a development requirement to the scheduled monument (Gubbion's Hall moated site) as well as nearby listed buildings.
EXISTING COMMITMENT EC4 – EAST OF BOREHAM	PS1637	1159743	Gladman Developments Ltd	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	Gladman support policy EC4. The principle of residential development at this site has been established through the planning permission. Development will come forward in line with the principles established in this planning approval.
EXISTING COMMITMENT EC4 – EAST OF BOREHAM	PS1786	1160014	Historic England	Yes	Yes							Request that the third bullet point of the site planning principles is amended to the read “protect or where possible enhance the character or appearance of the two conservation areas ...”
7.321	PS25	1096221	Mr John Adams	Yes	Yes	No			•		No	Burnham Road will be very dangerous to cross especially for children, young families and the elderly.
7.321	PS243	1154482	Mrs Trudy Bongard	Yes	Yes	No	•				No	Concern for traffic through SWF. More traffic surveys should be conducted or build a new road north of the town.
7.321	PS263	1154482	Mrs Trudy Bongard	Yes	Yes	No	•				No	Concern for traffic through SWF. More traffic surveys should be conducted or build a new road north of the town.
7.321	PS692	1155000	Mrs Claire Thorogood		No	No	•	•	•			Schools have limited capacity to extend and has to take children from a wider area. Healthcare facilities are very limited, nearest A&E is Broomfield Hospital and emergency services are inadequate for existing residents. The transport network is inadequate and improvements need to be provided first.
7.321	PS664	1156094	Mr Adrian Pilbeam	Yes	Yes		•				No	The towns facilities cannot cope with more traffic, the town's health and school facilities need to be upgraded. More information is needed about the Travelling Showpeople plots. Not clear what the plans are for emergency services and how utility needs will be dealt with.
7.321	PS736	1152350	Mr Martin Davies	Yes	Yes	No	•				No	Insufficient road infrastructure and train services. Travelling showpeople plots need easy access to a trunk road. Existing vacant healthcare facilities should be used. Concern over school capacities, sports facilities and flooding in the area.
7.322	PS30	1096371	Mr Gary Oates			No			•			Plan for South Woodham Ferrers does not adequately address road infrastructure, GP and dentist services. Future use of the Travelling Showpeople site is undefined. Concern that the site will not be supervised. It should be closer to major road networks and not near a town where the infrastructure is already inadequate.
7.322	PS79	1152409	Mr Robert Morrison	No		No	•				No	Concern about congestion on B1012 and reduced service at the fire station
7.322	PS172	1074416	Mrs Linda Fell	Yes	Yes	No		•	•		No	Local roads are heavily congested, the plan is incorrect and a proper audit is needed. Concern about the safe crossing of Burnham Road, a survey is needed. Rail services are inadequate and the anticipated increase in capacity will not be enough. Parking permits and restriction of parking around station are also needed. Would like to know whether the pylons will be removed and how the Travelling Showpeople plots will be policed/secured? Concern that vehicles and equipment storage will be unsightly.
7.322	PS1011	1154131	Mrs Rosemary Dorado			No		•	•		No	Inadequate assessments have been made about traffic problems. No extra provision has been made for roads – needs widening or a ring road so traffic is not concentrated in a small area. Not enough health provision. Secondary school will not have sufficient places - need to increased provision. The town will be divided by a very busy road which will be difficult to cross. Railways not intending to increase provision. Lack of parking provision. No commitment to affordable housing. Difficult for ordinary people to comment.
7.322	PS601	1155000	Mrs Claire Thorogood		No	No	•	•	•			Full consideration has not been given to Maldon District Council Local Plan in regards to the already busy B1012. The proposal cannot be considered to be well-connected to the existing town given it is outside the outer ring road with its own food outlet, neighbourhood centre etc. This will not integrate and revitalise the existing town centre facilities but will create a bolt on small town of its own, unless Burnham Road is diverted.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
7.323	PS693	1155000	Mrs Claire Thorogood		No	No	•	•	•			Maldon District Council LDP's proposed expansion should be carefully considered in conjunction with the Chelmsford LDP. The proposal for South Woodham Ferrers only offers negative effect on daily quality of life for the existing town.
7.323	PS1638	1159743	Gladman Developments Ltd	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	Gladman submit that both Bicknacre and Danbury are capable of accommodating further growth in sustainable locations and that allocating additional sites on the edge of these settlements would help provide greater choice and flexibility for the Local Plan and also help to ensure a rolling supply of housing land over the course of the plan period. Gladman refer to section 8 of attachment 1159743PS-A which identifies sites in both Bicknacre and Danbury which offer sustainable development opportunities, are available, achievable and deliverable
Figure 11: Growth Area 3 - South and East Chelmsford	PS178	1096562	Miss Clare Smith			No		•	•		No	Concerns regarding road/train provision/infrastructure that does not meet towns needs, congestion - especially on A132, bus/car clubs will be ineffective, travelling show people site will sprawl if not supervised/situated by major road, healthcare provision, flood risk, lack of affordable housing, frail/elderly will be isolated in new development, reduction of open space, lack of school places. Consider outer ring road, plan for transport infrastructure, flood defence works
Figure 11: Growth Area 3 - South and East Chelmsford	PS228	1097325	South Woodham Ferrers Health & Social Care Group			No			•		Yes	Existing roads are already overstretched, to be worsened by the new superstore, health centre and housing on the Dengie Peninsula. Emergency services will be severely hampered. Road improvements to be made before developments take place.
Figure 11: Growth Area 3 - South and East Chelmsford	PS602	1155000	Mrs Claire Thorogood	No	No	No	•	•	•			Figure 11 shows there are only two access points through Chelmsford in and out of Maldon and the Dengie Peninsula. Highway studies fail to address the practicality of using these routes on a daily basis with the B1012 out of the Dengie being at or near capacity already. Further traffic studies in conjunction with Maldon District Council is needed and / or re-route Burnham Road.
Figure 11: Growth Area 3 - South and East Chelmsford	PS1563	1158785	Burnham-on-Crouch Town Council	No		No	•	•	•		Yes	Concern for impact on Maldon and Crouch Valley Line. Work is needed to identify and mitigate all enabling infrastructure shortfalls before SWF expansion as envisaged is potentially greenlighted. detailed modeling needs to be completed to assess peak time capacity/demand on the entire Crouch Valley Line with and without the extra demand generated by SWF extra housing, retail and business traffic. Risk that business floor space and retail space will "cannibalise" Maldons plans.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS35	1151727	Mrs Pauline Sherwood	No								This format is very confusing, probably many people will not bother and the Council will be able to say they have not received sufficient objections.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS39	1093677	Mr Richard Brew			No	•		•			Current transport and local infrastructure is already full. Car parks to local parks are full at weekends with cars overflowing onto adjacent roads and grass verges. People are unlikely to walk, cycle, use car clubs or any of the few bus services. This will lead to a future of overcrowding and frustration.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS42	1092974	Mrs Christine Conway									Conclusion: In summary, I feel the planned development would have a huge detrimental effect on the residents of SWF and the surrounding countryside as I have outlined above. For a development of this size to even be considered, it should be infrastructure centred and at present this does not seem to be the case. Tinkering around the edges with existing roundabouts etc. just will not work and will result in chaos and more importantly, possible fatalities.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS43	1151863	Ms Amy Woolmer									Infrastructure and services in South Woodham Ferrers will be unable to cope with the proposed development.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS46	1151298	Mr Kevin Green									Concern that roads are poorly maintained and unsafe for pedestrians. Concern for rail provision, health provision and lack of school places.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS54	1093954	Mr Adam Legon									Infrastructure and services in South Woodham Ferrers will be unable to cope with the proposed development. The proposed offers no benefits to the existing residents of South Woodham Ferrers.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS62	1152278	Mr Mark Perry									Object against new houses. Roads, rail and local services are not suitable. Traveller site should be closer to a major road network
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS44	1151899	Mr Ian Gillard									Concern around the provision of infrastructure: health care facilities, school places, public transport, sewerage. Concern for flood risk and road congestion.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS49	1151917	Ms Gina Claisse									Local infrastructure and services will be unable to cope with proposed development and CIL will be insufficient to improve these.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS51	1151926	Ms Andrea Spicer									Concern with congestion, parking and road safety
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS53	1073970	Mrs Diane Smith									Concern for congestion, traveller site, local services coping, flood risk, CIL amount.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS55	1151884	Ms Donna Morrison									Concern for road provision, train service, school places, GP provision, traveller sites.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS56	1094055	Mr & Mrs Roger & Christine Lucking									Disappointed previous comments have not been listened to and the consultation process appears to have been a waste of time. The site is unsustainable with an inadequate train service and a road network which cannot cope. Inadequate crossing over the B1012 for new development site. Increased parking problems in Town Centre. Unclear healthcare provision, insufficient secondary education provision. Unsuitable site for Travelling Showpeople.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS60	1152034	Mr John Bond	No		No	•		•			Serious investment in transport and local infrastructure would be needed to support the proposed development since existing infrastructure is already at capacity.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS61	1151302	Mr Simon Moss	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	South Woodham Ferrers was planned with a carefully controlled layout and design to establish a distinctive character. It works so well because of the installation of a dedicated infrastructure bypass to the northern perimeter. As a practising Civil and Structural Engineer I have a duty of responsibility to speak out against poor social engineering decisions, especially when the RISK to human life is so clearly evident, yet so clearly unrecognised. The plan does not demonstrate how it will control and mitigate the RISKS associated with the retention of the existing road infrastructure. A separate independent/unbiased report is needed. A new bypass around the northern perimeter has to be provided.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS65	1092842	Mr Noel Taylor			No			•			Road, rail and local infrastructure to be upgraded to recognise the number of people. Developers to be committed to a clearly agreed and reasonably large quantity of affordable properties.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS71	1094366	Mr Alan Feeley									The North/South divide of Woodham Ferrers needs to be removed by way of an outer bypass road. The plan does not mention how flood risk will be dealt with. Concern for train provision. Feel travelling show people would benefit from a more accessible location.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS76	1152390	Ms Jill Hiett									Concern regarding road congestion, provision of road infrastructure, flood risk on Burnham Road and Hullbridge Road, school places, train provision, affordable housing provision, pedestrian safety. Travelling show people site should be located closer to major roads.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS78	1093372	Mr Philip Hiett									Concern regarding road congestion, provision of road infrastructure, flood risk on Burnham Road and Hullbridge Road, school places, train provision, affordable housing provision, pedestrian safety. Travelling show people site should be located closer to major roads.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS80	1152414	Mr Peter Mason									Oppose development, concern for lack of infrastructure
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS81	1152280	Mr Martin Harvey			No		•	•			Concern regarding congestion - particularly on A132, that SWF development is not "infrastructure led". Reconsider location of traveller site.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS75	1152386	Mrs Percy									Concern regarding road congestion, school places, doctors and dentist provision.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS77	1152410	Mr & Mrs Reed									Concern for lack of infrastructure, doctor provision and litter from travelling site
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS124	1152559	Mr & Miss Cornwell & Barker									Object to houses on Bushy Hill
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS130	1092660	Mrs L Hennis									Concern roads and trains will not cope with development. Concern regarding GP provision.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS123	1152553	Mr Brian Osborn									Schools and rail links should come before houses
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS131	1092907	Mrs Mary Powell									Concern for GP provision, dental provision, school places, train provision, parking provision, flood risk, impact on local services
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS136	1074338	Mr Steven Hitchens	No	No	No	•	•	•		No	Objections have not been addressed. Concern for pedestrian safety on B1012 - especially children and pedestrian safety if pupils at William de Ferrers have to cross a road to get to additional school building. Concern for congestion on A132, flood risk, school places and rail provision. The North/South divide needs to be removed
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS139	1098033	Mr Mark Povey	No	No	No	•		•	•	No	Concerns for lack of infrastructure, congestion on B132, pedestrian safety crossing B1012, lack of healthcare facilities, flood risk, concern travelling site will have too many travellers, lack of parking, lack of plans to improve education facilities,
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS142	1098600	Mr David Linsay									Previous comments did not get due, fair and serious consideration. Object to Asda holding control of town centre. Concern infrastructure will not be provided with this development.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS135	1152793	Mrs D Gristwood									Concern for poor public transport, impact of traveller site, lack of shops and condition of pavements



Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS137	1075043	Mr William Jobson			No			•			Concern for lack of infrastructure, secondary education provision, train provision, road services and flood risk.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS143	1152934	McBain			No		•	•			Development needs to be infrastructure led. Concern regarding congestion - especially on A132, train provision. Travelling site allocation needs to be reviewed as road network is not suitable.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS173	1152994	Mrs Monica Streamer									Concerns about traffic levels, lack of improvement to rail line, lack of parking, schools at capacity, GP provision, urban sprawl, loss of beauty.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS179	1151884	Ms Donna Morrison			No	•	•	•			Concern for lack of sufficient roads, traffic, school places, doctor provision, public transport provision.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS186	1153252	Mrs Linda Hitchens	No	No	No	•	•	•			Views of local residents or the Town Council have not been considered. The proposals are ill-conceived because the road, rail and local infrastructure is inadequate; flooding will increase in severity and frequency; a affordable housing is unlikely to materialise and the town would be split in two by a busy road which children have to cross daily and others to access health facilities. The plan needs to be "infrastructure led".
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS187	1096112	Mr Stephen Whitley									Concern that current road system is inadequate, parking is inadequate, schools/doctors wont cope, destruction of nature, town will be divided, health risks associated with electricity lines.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS191	1153367	Mr & Mrs Deeprise									Concern for traffic around ASDA, Hullbridge Road and Clements Green Lane. Concern for parking on pavement along Clements Green Lane, preventing pedestrian use. Concern 94 bus route causing noise/vibration disruption to residents. HGV's and "boy-racers" are of nuisance.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS200	1093143	Mr David Pfeffer			No	•		•			Resident views have not been taken into account. Site should be "infrastructure-led" like site 4. Concern that road infrastructure is inadequate, congestion, divided town, health centre and rail station will be difficult to access.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS194	1153544	Ms Jane Holford									Concern regarding possibility of a divided town, children's safety crossing A132, school places, inadequate GP provision, lack of affordable housing, negative impact of travelling show persons site allocation.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS171	1092908	Mr & Mrs Johnston									Concern regarding potential for urban sprawl, local school places, no money is being spent on improving the town centre, flood risk, who is funding the removal of pylons, travelling show people site allocation, SWF will become a divided town, train provision, congestion.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS174	1150294	Mrs Evelyn Mowforth									Concerns for traffic, that rail provision is not sufficient, that schools are overcrowded, for GP provision, lack of car parking. Need robust infrastructure or no business will invest in SWF.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS176	1074073	Mrs Karen Horton			No		•				Original design of small riverside town rapidly being overtaken by mass development turning the area into a sprawling housing area with no real heart.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS208	1153509	Mr Ian Cottrell			No	•	•	•			Disappointed to see that no credible Risk assessment has been included in the proposals. Suggest conducting an independent professional risk assessment of infrastructure needs arising from the proposed development. Concern for increased traffic around SWF and disruption to B1418.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS216	1154127	Ms Jennifer Boreham									Local services including doctors, dentists, schools, traffic, traveling show persons site, flood risk, railway capacity, overstretched facilities and financial contributions, affordable housing - are all issues which should be addressed
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS217	1075372	Mrs F L Emmett									South Woodham Ferrers positioned in the bottom of the Crouch Valley. Built on a peninsula, surrounded on three sides by a tidal main river. Frequent tidal surges in the north sea, which can cause serious flooding, protected only by man made sea walls, Any further large scale development, on land north of the B1012 the Burnham Road would in my view exacerbate an already serious local flood risk problem that exists today. A geographical situation.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS185	1153214	Miss Helen Broad								No	Questions the need for a new primary school as there is a severely under subscribed primary school just north of the proposed development in Woodham Ferrers village, as well as Chetwood Primary in SWF that was closed some 5 years ago. If new houses are to be built, alter catchment boundaries, reopen Chetwood and fill up St Marys. The local senior school may need an upgrade.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS190	1153338	Mr Simon Woolmer									Concern that there are no improvements to roads, rail, schools or local services. Concern for parking, fire/ambulance/police services will be stretched, healthcare provision, school places. Oppose allocation of Travelling show people site.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS1224	1097127	Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd	Yes	Yes	No					Yes	Countryside therefore supports Strategic Growth Site 7, but has identified minor issues in respect of the detailed wording of the policy, which may impact on the extent to which the policy is able to provide an effective framework for the successful implementation of this proposal. As follows: (1) New development is referred to as an extension to the existing "neighbourhood" - but the proposal itself provides a new neighbourhood. Clearly any new urban neighbourhood will be expected to have linkages between the new community and the existing – it would avoid confusion if the development were correctly referred to as an extension to the existing town. (2) Important to ensure that the policy requirement for a masterplan does not adversely affect the delivery of new homes in the Plan Period - by the process required by the Council; the number of masterplans sought by the Council; that the requirement for a masterplan does not duplicate matters that would ordinarily be the subject of a planning application; that their function is clear. (3) The policy is often repetitious, particularly under Site infrastructure requirements. This is not necessarily harmful, but the clarity of the policy would be helped if the repetition could be removed (particularly where different language is used). (4) The text "maximising" opportunities for sustainable travel is an imprecise term, development that meets the requirements of the 4th-9th bullet points under the Movement and Access heading should be considered acceptable, even if there are other measures that could result in even more opportunities for sustainable travel. The use of superlative language (i.e "the highest" or "the most" etc) does not provide clear guidance. (5) Travelling showpersons plots - we note that the need arises primarily from existing households, which are concentrated in the Chelmsford and Writtle area. There does not appear to be any evidence in either the 2017 or 2018 Assessments that suggests that these existing households require plots in the South Woodham area. (6) No objection to the quantum of business space to be provided, but consider it inappropriate for the Plan to prescribe the space should be divided into 'a range of types and sizes', or prescribe that it should be 'flexible'. The design will need to meet the requirements of the intended occupiers. Request that the words "providing a range of unit sizes and types" and "flexible" be deleted. (7) The policy suggests that the 1000 sqm of business floorspace has to be provided within the Neighbourhood Centre, but we do not believe that is actually the Council's intent, or that such a requirement justified, the business element could be provided separately to the Neighbourhood Centre. 3rd bullet point under this heading relating to the business floorspace is unnecessary and repetitive, already listed in the policy. It would make sense to
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS211	1092840	Ms Rita Bridgman	No	No	No	.	.	.	.		Objections from 2017 consultation have been ignored, portal is almost impossible to access. SWF not infrastructure-led unlike site 4. Concerns regarding congestion; inadequate train service; how economic growth will be promoted; divided town; pedestrian safety; GP/dental/general healthcare provision; CIL figure not sufficient; lack of affordable housing; location of traveller site and impact of their HGVs; school places at William de Ferrers; increased flood risk; stretched rail service.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS244	1154482	Mrs Trudy Bongard	Yes	Yes	No	•		•		No	Concern for congestion, train provision, flood risk and associated mitigation plans, GP provision.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS248	1154483	Mrs Carole Green	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	No	Plan is not legally compliant and previous objections have been ignored. Consultation needs to be easier to comment on. Plan needs to be infrastructure led at SWF like Strat. Growth Site 4. Concern for congestion and rail service.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS306	1095562	Mr Michael Benning									Concern about putting in a footbridge as children and disabled don't like using them. Concern for flood risk; bus and train provision; splitting the town in two - a bypass should be built instead; SWF isn't being treated the same as Strategic Growth Site 4 in respect to infrastructure provision; lack of affordable homes; lack of GP/dental provision; negative impact on countryside Feel Travelling site should be located closer to A130 for better access for HGVs.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS319	1076044	Mr Willian Barr Webster	No	No	No			•		No	Concern for congestion on B1012, town will be divided, pedestrian safety crossing the B1012. Concern for development next to old pylons. Bus and rail services are inadequate.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS320	486211	National Grid									Note the high voltage overhead lines above SWF. Don't build directly underneath them.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS322	1093779	Mrs Sarah Saunders			No	•	•	•			Concern that SWF is already gridlocked and road infrastructure is not suitable for development. Previous comments were not listened to, portal is difficult to use. Concern for train provision, school places, GP provision, flood risk. Object against traveller show persons site allocation.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS325	1098524	Mrs Joyce Arundell									Lack of road infrastructure. Buildings in town as empty. Lack of parking. Lack of school places. Object to travelling show person site for safety fears as there is no police station.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS323	1154714	Mrs Lynne Hatcher			No	•	•	•	•		SWF can't cope with regard to schooling, parking, medical services.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS324	1154813	Mrs Shelley Webster	No	No				•			Plan does not consider Burnham Road which is already congested. B1012 will divide town and can not sustain increased traffic from new development. Concern for rail provision, pedestrian safety crossing the B1012, pylons are eyesores, flood risk.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS326	1092849	Mrs Karen Kemp									Unacceptable that previous comments aren't going to the inspectorate. Portal is difficult to use. Plan lacks detail - like exact positioning of housing. Lack of plans for road/rail/bus infrastructure/provision. Lack of mention that facilities (broadband, telephone, sewage, electricity, gas, water) will be sufficient. Object to Traveller allocation. Concern for flood risk.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS393	1151693	Dilys Renouf									Lack of infrastructure to support development. Concern for impact on GPs, School places, and congestion. The petrol station on Creepthedge Lane is already causing issues.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS409	1155069	Mr Chris Lamberti									Concern with infrastructure in South Woodham Ferrers, particularly road infrastructure, will be able to cope with proposed development. Concern over development around the remembrance garden.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS391	1155047	Ms Jenny Barlow									Concern regarding traffic impact on Burnham Road. Impact on schools and GPs need to be looked into.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS392	1155048	Mr Frederick Knighton									Concern for congestion on Burnham Road. The steep hill is unsuitable for residential development. Site is an area of natural beauty.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS469	1098495	Mr Stuart Fell	Yes	No	No		•	•	•	No	Previous comments were ignored. Town will be divided by B1012. Concern for pedestrian safety crossing B1012. Concern for congestion, train provision, school places, flood risk, GP/dentist provision, provision of police/fire service, what will happen with electricity pylons. Oppose travelling show person site allocation as it should be by a major access road.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS410	1154797	Miss Melanie Brooks									Infrastructure in South Woodham Ferrers would not be able to cope with proposed development.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS463	1075670	Mr & Mrs Peter & Lynda Conway									Portal is difficult to use. Concern that roads are insufficient and congested. Concern that town will be split and for pedestrian safety crossing B1012; train provision; GP/dental provision; CIL figure is not sufficient to improve already overstretched facilities. Object to show person site allocation.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS464	1093684	Mr John Bunyan									Oppose plans for SWF. Concern for congestion, train provision, provision of safe crossings for pedestrians. There are no agreed improvements to infrastructure to support the development. Plan is ill-conceived.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS466	1094313	Mr Andrew Hull									Burnham Road is not sufficient to support additional traffic. Suggest a bypass around the new development. Concern for flood risk. Accept new housing is needed but would like adequate infrastructure to support the development.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS467	1155194	Ms Judith Carpenter									Road infrastructure will not support proposed growth. Concern for child safety crossing the A132. Oppose Traveller show person site allocation - it should be closer to a major road. Concern for the lack of school places, GP/dental provision, train services, flood risk, lack of affordable housing.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS468	1076155	Miss Tracy Minton									Development will lead to urban sprawl across arable land. Development is unsuitable because: the community will be split, facilities (Chetwood School) will be duplicated, congestion will increase, there's lack of guaranteed infrastructure, concern for GP provision, oppose Traveller show person site, increased flood risk and lack of affordable housing.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS499	1155333	Mr Peter Taylor									There must be a provision of affordable homes. A new ring road should be built before any development. There needs to be proof that development will not cause a flood problem.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS504	1155265	Mrs Tracey Frampton									Concern for lack of traffic mitigation provision, healthcare provision, insufficient vehicle/pedestrian access to Sainsburys, urban sprawl.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS547	1155571	Mr Joseph Markwardt			No	•	•	•			The North of Burnham Road development was and never will be a suitable location for development now and in the future. Development will be detrimental. Issues with traffic, pollution, strain on infrastructure flooding and environmental damage will only worsen.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS530	1155508	Mrs Maureen Cornwell									Concern for doctors/dentists provision, school places, congestion, train provision, parking provision. Oppose allocation of Travelling Show Person site.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS536	664147	Sport England	Yes	Yes	Yes						The requirement in the policy for development to provide or make financial contributions to new or enhanced sport, leisure and recreational facilities is welcomed

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS537	1155526	Mr Jeff Hill									Road infrastructure will not support sustainable growth. Town will be divided by B1012. Concern for pedestrian safety crossing B1012. CIL figure is not sufficient to support already overstretched facilities. Oppose Travelling show person site allocation. Concern for health risks associated with pylons. Concern for congestion, train provision, school places, GP/dental provision, flooding, loss of countryside, lack of affordable housing, urban sprawl.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS555	1155389	Mr David Hawthorne									Current commuter parking is obstructive to residents. Suggest waiting restrictions to be enforced on road surrounding the station and consider enlarging the station car park.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS556	1155655	Mr Anthony Davison									Without infrastructure changes children's lives will be at risk. SWF will become a less than desirable town/village/community to live in.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS557	1095905	Mrs Tracey Aquino									With housing going up before infrastructure, object to residents having to wait years for adequate roads/trains/schools etc. Concern for current congestion and current road infrastructure, poor bus service, poor train service. Reconsider plans to implement adequate infrastructure.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS582	1155614	Mrs Kathleen Swan									Burnham Road suffers congestion. Plan for SWF needs to be infrastructure centred. Concern for train provision, school places, doctor/dentist provision. Proposed plan has insufficient facilities and infrastructure and does not meet the needs of the town or support sustainable growth.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS554	1155651	Gemma Jones									Local amenities and infrastructure need to be development alongside housing. Road infrastructure needs improvement as the road in/out of SWF suffers congestion. Sainsburys needs a pedestrian crossing. Concern for school places and quality of education. Concern for doctor provision.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS583	1155741	Shirley Carroll									Concern for school places and GP provision. Roads will not be able to cope.Consideration should be given to the proposed number of houses - its too many for a town of SWF's size.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS591	1074852	Mr Phillip Wakefield									Portal is not user friendly. Concern for road infrastructure; overstretched rail services; medical/dental provision; flood risk - plan does not adequately address surface run off risk; lack of affordable housing; lack of school places - plan does not meet future education needs. Oppose allocation of Traveller site. CIL figure is insufficient to improve already overstretched facilities.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS595	1155823	MR JAMES ALAN ASHMORE	No	Yes	No		•			Yes	The scheme is of a devastating proportion and magnitude. On site face to face presentation, discussion, explanation and consultation with local residents is required. Similar plans were rejected approximately16 years ago, the reasoning has not changed. Reasons it should be rejected again include road/infrastructure capacity, train service and capacity, local infrastructure capacity, profound flooding and housing not affordable for the younger local population.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS596	1075096	Mr Glen Robinson			No	•		•			Inadequate road infrastructure and public transport, the town will be divided by a busy road, massive population increase, destruction of area of natural beauty, increased flood risk, not enough affordable homes will be built. Build a dual carriageway rind road, increase affordable housing to 50% and build mostly 2 and 3 bed homes.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS648	1094382	Mrs Carol McMaster									Development will have a negative affect on biodiversity. Concern that site will not integrate sustainably. Concern for parking provision, GP/healthcare provision, lack of public transport, flooding. Not convinced that development will attract sustainable investment to regenerate SWF. Assumption that improving cycle/walk routes will improve congestion is wrong.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS638	1094388	Mrs Linda Morgan									Infrastructure non existent to provide this kind of development especially when taken into account with Tabrums Farm. Concern for lack of crossing from town centre to health; lack of public transport; flood risk; lack of school funding.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS640	1094388	Mrs Linda Morgan									Infrastructure doesn't exist for any development of this size. There is overwhelming support for no further development in the town or surrounding area.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS673	1093107	Miss Janet Hargreaves									Concern for train provision, congestion, flood risk, GP/dental provision, affordable housing provision, child pedestrian safety, how traveller site will be monitored. Suggest a dual carriageway should be put in on A132. The increased infrastructure and local facilities requirements need to be addressed now so that the proposed plan can be sustainable for the benefit of all residents and businesses as a whole.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS942	1156440	Mr Raymond Osborne			No	•	•	•		No	There are several points that require a careful and thoughtful approach to the proposed additional housing: 1. The increase in traffic utilising the already overloaded Burnham Road from Rettendon to South Woodham and beyond. 2. Schools and medical facilities, can these sustain the population increase. 3. Electrical and gas infrastructure, can this cope with the additional demands without upgrading the existing systems 4. Bus and rail links, these are already very poor and will become unusable unless additional timetables are implemented. 5. If affordable houses are built will these be for people for whom the houses are intended? Developers need to take the responsibility to provide for a satisfactory plan to enable their development to become integrated without compromising the already over stretched services. Profit from the development must not be at the expense of the current and future community.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS666	1155674	Mr John Price	No		No	•		•		No	The Council has not met the legal requirements for community involvement because the process put in place for residents to make a response to the plan effectively barred many residents from participating. The plan is not sound because infrastructure requirements have not been objectively assessed, the necessary improvements have not been included in the plan. The B1012 will be a safety hazard for children.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS671	1156295	Sacha Meade									Against Traveller Show Person site. Lack of infrastructure in town, concern for school places and traffic. Town will not cope with development.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS690	1093697	Mr Rupert Baker	Yes	Yes	No	•	•			No	The local plan does not take into account the changing demographics of the UK. The train service is unreliable and congested and the roads congested due to developments in surrounding areas. There is no spare capacity at A&Es. When the town was built it had a model that was supposed to be the future, everything inside and accessible to everyone, this plan creates two towns. A regional plan with London and other Essex councils is needed. A132 to be widened and diverted around the development.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS763	1156648	Catrina Kemp									Upset that previous comments are not going to the inspectorate. Portal is too difficult to use. SWF does not have sufficient road and rail infrastructure to support development. There is no decent bus service. Concern for congestion. There should be a new ring road around the town to avoid it being split in two. There are no plans for supplies of electricity, sewage, water, gas, broadband etc. Concern for flooding, GP provision and that town will suffer if new supermarket causes Asda to close. Concern that healthcare facility is not easily accessible.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS764	1156568	Mrs Jane Herriott									There is lack of detail on the proposed development (ie. types of housing, community facilities etc.) Concern for GP provision - there should be 1 GP per 1600 patients, lack of primary and secondary school places, congestion, pedestrian safety, and train provision.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS772	308102	Mr Colin Waxham									Services such as roads, railway, healthcare and schools in South Woodham Ferrers will be unable to cope with proposed development. Proposed development will split town in half.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS774	1151909	Mrs & Mr Sandra & Colin Luff									Roads, schools and doctors will be unable to cope with the new development. Parking around the station is an issue, with commuters blocking roads and driveways, which will get worse with further development.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS775	1098304	Mr Ken Wall									Current infrastructure in South Woodham Ferrers unable to support proposed development.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS776	1092811	Mrs Carol Wilson									Concern regarding increased congestion, train provision, school places, GP provision, traveller site allocation, and litter.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS779	1156678	Mr Geoffrey Fallows	No	No	No	•	•	•			The road system is totally inadequate to deal with an additional 1000 homes The rail service along the Southminster line will also not be fit for purpose for the amount of additional residents proposed. A radical approach to address rail problems is vital. Development would impact on doctors and dentists which are already burdened. Increased flooding issues. Question where the Travelling Showperson sites would be situated and how many people would be accommodated. Question whether the issues raised by the National Grid have been addressed. Object to Plan.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS808	1075498	Mr David Jackson			No		•				Object to traveller site. The A132 road to Rettendon needs duelling. SWF/Crouch Valley rail line, already overcrowded, unreliable & too expensive.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS766	1098266	Ms Eileen Maclean									Road infrastructure is inadequate to cope with anymore traffic. Concern for flooding. There is no footpath on the Hullbridge Road from the Chase to Burnham Road. Concern for traveller provision. There are no commitments to provide affordable housing. Concern for lack of commuter parking/commuters parking on residential roads. Angry that previous comments were not passed to the inspectorate.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS769	1151626	Mr & Mrs Burroughs									Objects to South Woodham Ferrers allocations due to unsuitable road/infrastructure, unsuitable trains, GP services, risk of flooding, show people allocation, schools places and associated safety. Suggested need for affordable housing.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS771	1074714	Mr Malcolm Berry									Unhappy that earlier objections have been ignored, concern for lack of road infrastructure and current traffic, train provision, flood risk, against travelling show people site allocation, no adequate schools or adequate amount of affordable housing.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS773	1151904	Karen Budd									Concern regarding: congestion, train service, commuters parking outside houses, unreliable bus service, school places, long wait for GP appointment, impact of travellers, lack of social facilities for younger generation, emergency service staffing, unused community office, poor road/path condition.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS777	1152378	Mr Jon Thomerson									Concern regarding road congestion, school places, GP/dental provision, flood risk, CIL amount, travelling show people site, train provision.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS778	1074823	Mrs Karen Nixon									Concern for the provision of road infrastructure, schools, doctors, dentists, affordable housing. Travelling show people site should be closer to major roads and supervised.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS824	1098432	Mrs Karen Hill									Concern that road and rail infrastructure do not meet the needs of the town or support sustainable growth. Concern for pedestrian safety on B1012, CIL amount is not sufficient to improve overstretched facilities, future school places, GP and dental provision, flood risk, traveller show people site allocation, loss of countryside, not enough affordable housing will be provided. Plan needs to be centred around facilities and infrastructure.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS828	1153413	Mr Paul Dukes									Concern for GP provision, school places, and train provision. Object to travelling show persons site allocation.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS830	1153813	Mr & Mrs Donoghue									Concern regarding GP/healthcare provision; congestion on B1012, A132 and Rettendon Turnpike; insufficient train provision; lack of affordable housing. Oppose allocation of travelling show people site due to historical problems and impact of HGVs on the area.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS833	1093670	Mr & Mrs Armario									Plans contradict pledges that SWF would be a unique riverside town. Concerns for congestion - especially around Dengie Peninsula and B1012, train provision, car park provision - especially at train station, doctor/dental provision, impact on wildlife, risk of flooding, school places, pedestrian safety crossing B1012, lack of affordable housing. Oppose traveller site allocation. Suggest B1012 be diverted around the new development and be a dual carriageway.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS834	966344	Mr John Frankland			No	•	•			Yes	This plan is unsound because the proposed allocation of north of South Woodham Ferrers is not logical nor is its size justified. It bears no relationship to the needs identified for this location. The allocated area could be much smaller as I have tried to demonstrate in the attached supporting information. The 'Reasoned Justification' does not actually provide a reasoned justification for the extent of the allocation and appears to have been based on what land is being offered by landowners rather than what is actually needed for a logical expansion of the town. The development should be provided with an outer 'ring road' to ensure that any new development can be properly integrated with the existing settlement. A smaller allocated area makes such a road more justifiable and both this road and the allocated area would have less intrusion into the open countryside and less impact on the Bushy Hill local wildlife site. A plan that has so many negative impacts on South Woodham Ferrers including excessive intrusion into the countryside and lack of proper integration with the town cannot be considered to have been positively prepared especially when it potentially retains an obtrusive pylon line through the site.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS832	1095106	Mrs Sandra Hawes									Object to town being split in 2 and traveller show persons site allocation. Concern for congestion, pedestrian safety crossing main roads, doctor/dental provision, increased flood risk - this will affect house insurance, lack of affordable housing, and provision of school places at William de Ferrers. Train service needs to be improved. Plan needs to be infrastructure centred for it to be sustainable.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS836	1156558	Miss Trudy Huston			No	•	•		•	No	The plan should be lead by infrastructure requirements such as roads, healthcare, schools etc.SWF as nearing capacity and cannot cope with the additional homes. Concern the site will be built without necessary infrastructure. The site would be divided from the Town by the road. There is nothing in the Plan to prioritise junction improvements in the area. Concern over flood risk, impacts on SSSI, Ramsar, SPA, SAC and Crouch and Roach Estuaries. Overhead Pylons may need to be used in the future and Intermediate Mains Gas Pressure Pipeline that runs through the site. Impact on Listed Buildings. No improvements proposed by Network Rail. Development is not financially viable.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS838	1156725	Mrs Lawrence									Oppose development and concern for traffic.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS841	1102728	Mrs D Tucker									Strong opposition, disrespect to local family of building around Radar Hill, traffic concerns on B1012, times that traffic surveys were carried out, lack of doctors and health provision along with other failed facilities, travelling show people site, that homes will only be affordable for those on London wages, impact on wildlife and flora, health problems of development near power lines, sprawling development
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS858	1095472	Mrs Jill Armand									Development in SWF needs appropriate infrastructure in place. Concerns for congestion on B1012; pedestrian safety on B1012; train provision; lack of affordable housing; congestion - especially around the train station in the morning; GP provision; flood risk; health risks from electricity pylons; school places - fear of detrimental impact on education. Plan has not been thoroughly thought through. Should consider a ring road. Object to Traveller Site - should be closer to a major road for better access.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS846	1102743	Mrs E Dowling									Overall opposition, traffic congestion, times of traffic surveys, traffic from the Dengie area, floods and landslides from higher land, impact on wildlife and flora and Radar Hill, respect for Radar Hill in memory of a local family whose daughter died there, travelling show people, train capacity, parking for railway station, lack of facilities and others which have closed, level of taxes, local views



Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS856	1075200	Mrs Lesley Taylor									Lack of infrastructure, insufficient road and rail improvements, or GP facilities. Is a travelling showpersons site necessary.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS870	1098247	Terry Payne									Does not support the Travelling Showmans site within the allocation.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS881	1074853	Mrs Carol Barnard									Conclusion I feel the new proposed development has not been thought through. The B1012 forms a boundary to South Woodham Ferrers and the new development would become a settlement on its' own The plan has Insufficient facilities and infrastructure. It does not meet the needs of our town.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS873	908048	Essex Bridleways Association	Yes	Yes	No	•				Yes	Request that multi-user links are established along the northernmost boundary to enhance the network for all users and to link up to existing routes.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS880	1154665	Mrs Lyn Weston			No		•			No	The current infrastructure needs to be vastly improved before any further development. Was the traffic survey done at the right time? There is inadequate parking provision already. Local infrastructure is already under pressure. The homes will not be affordable. Flooding and surface water run-off will get worse.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS895	1075031	Mr Robin Munns									Lack of infrastructure, no thought towards traffic, parking is at capacity, doctors are full, congestion to Wickford is terrible, lack of rail provision, oppose travelling show persons site allocation.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS908	1076001	Mr Raymond Towey									Concern for environment, flood risk, congestion on A132 and Dengie area, pedestrian safety on A132, rail provision, GP and dental provision, school places, not enough affordable housing, impact of traveller community.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS885	1155191	Mr Jeremy Kemp									Unacceptable that previous comments are not being passed to inspectorate. Portal is not user friendly. Road and rail infrastructure is not sufficient to support development. There should be a new ring road. There should be a comprehensive bus service. There is no plans for sufficient supplies of gas, electricity, water, broadband etc. Object to traveller site allocation. Concern for flood risk. GP services are insufficient.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS904	1152462	Ms Kathy Lopez									Concern regarding lack of infrastructure, rail provision, road congestion, impact of traveller site, flood risk, GP provision.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS921	1483	Runwell Parish Council	Yes	Yes	No	•				No	Developers need to be made to provide highway improvements in a timely manner.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS937	1076002	Mrs Ann Siveyer			No	•	•	•			Roads/Infrastructure concerns - roads and exits from SWF are extremely congested in the rush hours. Road infrastructure proposed does not meet the needs of South Woodham Ferrers or support sustainable growth. The current B1012 provides a natural boundary to the town and the plan would split the town. A new ring road would seem to be the best solution but this has apparently been ignored due to cost. Impact on train service which is already over stretched and average at best. Commuters park in local roads. The rail infrastructure does not meet the needs of the town or support sustainable growth. Local Services are under pressure, concern that GP and Dentist service will not be able to cope. Flooding/surface water is experiences around the Old Wickford Road/Whalebone/Tropical Wings area. Concern about a greater risk of flooding. What is that action will be taken? Not convinced that affordable housing will happen, there is a shortage of housing for first time buyers. Town Council CIL receipt of £2.2m for the new development payable over the 20 year period of the plan equates to £110,500pa - not sufficient to improve our already over stretched facilities. Schools - It is increasingly difficult to obtain places at primary and pre-schools due to increased demand and cuts in funding. Doubt that secondary school will be able take additional pupils, plus additional demand from outside Chelmsford area. The current plan is not sustainable. The plan will result in a separate settlement with insufficient facilities and infrastructure. The B1012 needs to be relocated to a ring road around the new development. The railway service needs to be improved. Local services such as health provision need to be improved. The number of houses needs to be reduced due to flood risks. Affordable housing needs to be part of the plan including property for first time buyers. Educational provision needs to be improved for the plan to be sustainable. In conclusion, the plan needs to be infrastructure centred for it to be sustainable
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS946	1156865	Mr Danny Abbott									Existing road and rail infrastructure, and local services such as doctors, already under pressure and will not be able to cope with additional development. Empty shops in town centre should be utilised.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS980	311148	Essex County Council	Yes	Yes	No			•		No	Under 'Site infrastructure requirements', include the following: • Capacity improvements to the A132 between Rettendon Turnpike and South Woodham Ferrers, including necessary junction improvements to be brought forward as early as possible • Multi-user bridge across the B1012 in South Woodham Ferrers
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS916	961966	Mr Alan Brunning	No		No	•		•			Suggest: route the B1012 North of the development; the A132 needs to be dualled; the railway needs 12 carriages from the Dengie to Wickford; Take control the development of fluvial flooding; Ensure the sewage treatment works will support development; make up the shortfall in CIL funding to deliver a sustainable development; ensure there is only 1 town centre; Confirm there will be an effective plan to build alongside the IP gas main, pylons and large water main Without these being solved this site cannot be considered a sustainable development
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS1071	1156559	Pauline Gilmore			No			•		No	Increase in the amount of traffic on already congested roads. Impact on residents of the town and residents in Maldon district as Burnham Road is one of the major routes off the Dengie Peninsula. Impact on medical services which already stretched for both residents and those who live in the surrounding villages who use the facilities in the town. Infrastructure changes need to be identified and committed to before any new homes are built. Burnham Road should be diverted to pass to the north of the proposed development. Healthcare facilities in the town centre need to be increased to remain accessible to local residents.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS947	1156879	Ms Jenny Calleja									Infrastructure will not cope with additional houses. Travelling Showpeople site will put more pressure on public service fund.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS1020	1156967	David & Lesley Arnold									Concern for rail provision, road infrastructure, limited bus service, cost to remove pylons, lack of healthcare provision, lack of emergency services, flood risk. Roads are in a poor state and cannot cope with large HGVs. The proposed car club is nonsense. Oppose allocation of traveller show person site. A pedestrian bridge over Burnham Road will be out of place - would need to be disability friendly.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS1041	1157026	Mr Neil Gilmore								No	Inadequate transportation links. South Woodham Ferrers would effectively be split in two, with insufficient links especially for pedestrians (elderly/ children / disabled) and many safety issues in accessing shops and services across the other side of the Burnham Road. Any pedestrian bridge should be built prior to any new development. Inadequate or no extra provision of services to support new development, ie additional places at Primary/Secondary schools; doctors; dentists; health centres; amenity sites for hardcore etc. Inadequate guarantees on liaison with Maldon District Council over screening and landscaping on common boundary. Prominence of new development on high ground visible for miles around, destroying countryside.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS1111	1095756	Mrs Jean Foddering									Infrastructure and services will be unable to cope with proposed development. Removal of pylons and redirection of gas main would be costly. Concern over Travelling Showpeoples site.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS1070	1157055	Mr Phil Barnett	No	No	No						No comment made.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS1087	1157064	Mrs Barbara Lucas									Road and rail infrastructure will not cope with added pressure from development. Why would we need more retail space when in the town we have many empty shops? Trying to get an emergency Doctors appointment is also impossible especially as one Surgery has closed recently - another 4000 patients will not help.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS1312	872955	Hammonds Estates LLP	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	Significant development is proposed at SWF. Appropriate that South Woodham Ferrers supports higher levels of growth, but there are a number of key issues (identified in Table 9 in representation) associated with this site which raise questions as to its suitability, when assessed against the evidence. There are significant constraints to the development of this site which will affect its delivery (aerial photograph provided in representation) related to both the quantum of development that can be accommodated but also the mitigation of impacts on the wider area, particularly related to traffic generation and its accommodation on the surrounding network and the limitations to the provision of sustainable transport. The inclusion of this site as proposed is not justified or deliverable and hence the plan is not positively prepared.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS1133	1093117	Mr George Mihill									There are already some problems with flooding in S.W.F and this will only get worse with further building. The B1012 is already congested at peak times and will not be able to cope with increased traffic. At peak times trains are already badly stretched. Loss of valuable countryside. Concern over Travelling Showpeople site
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS1144	1102758	Mrs M Edwards									The proposed development has overlooked basic factors for a safe, secure and pleasant life for the residents. 5 pylons will have to be removed, at great risks and expense. The B1012 is totally inadequate between 6.30am to 9.30, and from 4pm to 7pm, with an ever increasing traffic from the adjacent villages from the Dengie peninsula. A lower speed limit will cause more congestion. Concerns about crossing the road. Air and noise pollution - can be diminished by trees, greenery, concern about deforesting the hill. The pollution will start right at the beginning of the building. Concern about flash flooding, especially coming from the hill, while it is still covered in plants and trees, so what will happen when it is covered in tarmac and concrete? South Woodham Ferrers is not a historic nor an affluent town, just a commuter one. Its residents are hard working, and rely on the people they elect to represent them, and look after their interests and well being. They deserve to be listened to, and treated with respect. Concern that travelling showpeople site will be unmanned, and add more congestion to the B1012. What is the purpose of a neighbourhood centre? All our schools are at full capacity, there is no room for more demountables. I have seen many changes over 45 years, some questionable, but despite it all the town has kept its cohesion, don't ruin it.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS1210	1157163	Mr Tony Wheeler									Development will lead to increased traffic congestion. Will lead to loss of open countryside.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS1207	1096897	Mrs Kay Waidson	Yes		No			•			The situation has not changed from several years ago, when similar plans were put forward and rejected (and for good reason). Concern about traffic increases - with no improvements to the Burnham Road, and increased traffic from the developments in the Dengie. Concern there will be no improvements to the train service (have to stand to London, even at 6am). Cost of the removal of pylons defeated proposals last time, what has changed? Who is paying for it? How will doctors, dentists, schools cope with a possible 4000 extra people. Querying CIL payment and different amounts that have been quoted.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS1242	1094357	Mr James McGahan			No	•	•	•			South Woodham Ferrers does not have adequate infrastructure or support services currently or for future development of 1000 houses. There is no integration, rather a bolt on community without its own support. Concern about the B1012 which already is gridlocked in morning and evenings with limited routes to SWF. Will impact on congestion and emergency services. Will act as a barrier between the proposed and existing development. Parking impossible. Trains- limited to single track with reduced services particularly after 10.00pm. Divided town Pylons Local services - lack of GP fire Police schools Utilities Environmental
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS1322	1094367	Mrs Susan McGahan			No	•	•	•			Road/transport system - The additional traffic will create gridlock in and around the area at the junction with Burnham Road. There is no plan for improvement in rail services to/from South Woodham Ferrers (SWF) station, already over-stretched. More people will drive to Wickford or Chelmsford stations, resulting in more traffic. Concern about the long term impact on landscape and wildlife. Concerns regarding drainage and flooding not addressed. The plan includes no provision for additional health services, surgeries will be unable to cope with an influx of c.4000 additional residents. Additionally, SWF has no active "on-site" police service and only part time fire Station. Travelling Show people - the proposal to include a site for Travelling Show People is totally inappropriate. Should be located near major roads, not in a countryside town e.g. near A12? Concern about marshalling. Pylons - no detail provided regarding the proposed removal of the Pylons or the cost/environmental impact or how they will be met. Health issues connected to pylons are well documented and the town has insufficient health infrastructure to deal with any issues arising. Education - The William de Ferrers Secondary School will be unable to cope with additional pupils. Desks are empty because of a shortage of teachers. If there are not enough teachers, the school simply can't teach more pupils. The Town centre has been deteriorating for years, the inclusion of 1000sqm of flexible business space will probably end up as more empty shops. The plan is ill founded, funded and does not demonstrate impact on citizens via council tax etc. This proposal will simply create a divided community, loss of surroundings and no increase in services or improved infrastructure.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS1330	1074692	Mr Robert Richardson									Infrastructure, services and facilities will be unable to cope with proposed development. The flood risk has been underestimated. Concern over use of selling leasehold housing by proposed developer.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS1244	1102804	Linda Thomas									Main concern is the huge increase of traffic. Concern of traffic on access by a paramedic or ambulance. The bypass is 'nose to tail' with vehicles all the way back to Rettendon Turnpike. The only way to make improvements to this road is to demolish peoples existing properties. Are you really going to do that? During the 1980s I well remember the slogan 'A Riverside Country Town'. The development may bring hope for some but disappointment for many.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS1440	1156704	South Woodham Ferrers Town Council	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•	•		The executive summary copied from PS827. The proposal for South Woodham Ferrers does, without enhancement to the existing infrastructure to support and accommodate the additional expansion, this contravenes para 7 of the NPPF. Under Site infrastructure requirements it mentions improvements to the local and strategic road network but the Strategic & Local Junction Modelling (Jan 2018) states that highway mitigation is not possible at the Burnham Road/Ferrers Road junction. This contravenes para 9 of the NPPF. Para 7.339 also refers to the need to mitigate impacts from the development on the local and strategic road network including the Ferrers Road/Burnham Road junction. The railway line is at near capacity with no plans to increase it, the PO Local Plan referred to opportunities to increase capacity, but the PS Local Plan does not. South Woodham Ferrers is the only site of its size not getting a primary school on a definite basis. The school proposed for expansion is some distance way from the development and there may be safety issues in young children getting to and from this school. A primary school should be provided on site. Great Leighs Site 5a has a definite requirement for specialist residential homes for older persons, Site 7 has not. We believe there has been insufficient study into the housing needs of South Woodham Ferrers. Development of land to the east of the site is inappropriate due to its closeness to the Garden of Remembrance. The flexible business floorspace proposed is inadequate. The division of the B1418 is detrimental to the town centre and safety and will disrupt traffic flow. The IDP (referred to in the rep as Appendix 12 of the Local Plan) indicates that there is a large funding gap to support proposed development in the Local Plan with no clear indication of how this shortfall will be met.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS1411	1157546	W & P Phillips									Concern for traffic in SWF. Plan has given no consideration to volume of traffic on A132. Suggest that the section of road between the Retendon Turnpike and SWF should be increased to a dual carriage way and the junction of the Lodge Hotel and Hayes Country Park improved to include street lighting and a pedestrian crossing point
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS1457	1095858	Mr John Gable									Not enough emphasis on infrastructure. Burnham road would be a barrier between existing town and new development.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS1433	1157611	John & Yvonne Bowman-Daniels									We are unable to navigate the Chelmsford Planning Web Site and lodge our disapproval of the plans for South Woodham Ferrers as published in The Focus by The South Woodham Action Group.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS1468	1101449	Ms Linda Beard	No		No	•	•	•	•	Yes	I object to the proposed development for STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS. This is a green field site and the development will have severe negative impacts on: • Biodiversity • Heritage • Flooding • Sustainable transport • Road safety • Landscape The principles set out for the development will not mitigate against these impacts.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS1497	1158433	Mr & Mrs Jeffery									Not enough emphasis is being given to the necessary infrastructure to provide a good environment for the existing population of South Woodham Ferrers. Burnham Road would be a barrier between development and current town.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS1496	1157041	Mrs Marian Royce			No		•	•	•		Roads in and around South Woodham Ferrers already busy and more traffic would create more problems. Infrastructure, services and facilities already busy and would be made worse by proposed development.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS1515	1074820	Mrs E Sardeson									Concerns: Traffic congestion on the A132 and the effect of additional cars, including traffic coming from the Dengie area. No provision in place for improved train services, which are currently overcrowded and unable to extend beyond 12 coaches. Flooding concerns for the Whalebone PH area and near the former Tropical Wings site. Underground tanks will not be sufficient as a remedy. Access to travelling show site could be difficult for large vehicles, other proposed sites in the Plan area are more suitable. Dispute the statement that the sewage works has capacity for the development, it often causes odours. Concern about the capacity of the secondary school to cater for future pupil numbers. Additional houses will worsen the ability to make a doctors appointment. Who will pay for the removal of the pylons? Progress is inevitable, but to the detriment of residents, an adverse effect which would split the town in two.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS1516	1102736	Mrs C Dench									Concerns: Traffic congestion on the A132 and the effect of additional cars, including traffic coming from the Dengie area. No provision in place for improved train services, which are currently overcrowded and unable to extend beyond 12 coaches. Flooding concerns for the Whalebone PH area and near the former Tropical Wings site. Underground tanks will not be sufficient as a remedy. Access to travelling show site could be difficult for large vehicles, other proposed sites in the Plan area are more suitable. Dispute the statement that the sewage works has capacity for the development, it often causes odours. Additional houses will worsen the ability to make a doctors appointment. Who will pay for the removal of the pylons? Progress is inevitable, but to the detriment of residents, an adverse effect which would split the town in two.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS1512	1094427	Mr Alan Grimwood									Concern about impact of new development on flooding problems at the Wickford Road, by the Whalebone PH, and worry that Fennfields Road and its housing will flood. Worried that this will be the developers responsibility; and urges ECC/CCC to oversee stream widening and drainage systems being put in place before development takes place - and to inform SWF people of the proposed work. Burnham Road B1012 is already very busy, concern there will be gridlock without a relief road. Already being affected by Sainsburys, new BP garage and M&S shop. Urge ECC/CCC to rethink to consider a relief road. Have been told it's not necessary and too costly.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS1517	1102702	Mr Peter Dench									Concerns: Traffic congestion on the A132 and the effect of additional cars, including traffic coming from the Dengie area. No provision in place for improved train services, which are currently overcrowded and unable to extend beyond 12 coaches. Flooding concerns for the Whalebone PH area and near the former Tropical Wings site. Underground tanks will not be sufficient as a remedy. Access to travelling show site could be difficult for large vehicles, other proposed sites in the Plan area are more suitable. Dispute the statement that the sewage works has capacity for the development, it often causes odours. Additional houses will worsen the ability to make a doctors appointment. Who will pay for the removal of the pylons? Progress is inevitable, but to the detriment of residents, an adverse effect which would split the town in two.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS1535	1098528	Irene Bennett									Development would increase congestion on B1012. To site a Health Facility on this new development would deplete our town centre, which was designed for easy access for traffic, pedestrian & cyclists.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS1542	1158697	Mrs Rose Wheeler									Object to the proposed building of 1,000 new houses in North of South Woodham Ferrers. All that lovely open-air space gone for good, dread what the roads will become with all the additional traffic. Will be unable to park in South Woodham Ferrers.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS1573	1158815	Maldon District Council	Yes	Yes	Yes					No	Concerns remain in respect of further development on the Crouch Valley Line and the impact it will have on the capacity of the line, both into and out of London. In addition, the Local Plan and any subsequent master plan/development brief for the development should ensure that there is good pedestrian access to the South Woodham Ferrers train station to minimise the use of cars during the rush hour peak on the A132 and surrounding roads which could hinder access to and from Maldon District.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS1585	1156835	Mr Peter Wyatt									Plan is not sustainable. No guarantee of any significant infrastructure to support the number of houses that are proposed. The new development will be separated from the Town of South Woodham Ferrers. Road will need to be crossed by children attending the school. Lack of public transport with no improvements. Fluvial flooding and sewerage leakage in parts of the Town which have not been investigated. Plan should not be considered until more concrete information is available.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS1586	1095844	Mrs Gillian Ketland									Development divides the community. Traffic issues. Proposed infrastructure does not meet or support the need of the plan. No proposed improvements to existing rail service. Limited information provided at the exhibition. Consideration not taken of the impact on the environment and quality of life of residents.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS1596	1159145	Ms Sheila Driver									Insufficient infrastructure to cope with development at South Woodham Ferrers, especially increased traffic, need for schools and doctors.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS1597	1159148	Mr Garry Driver									Roads are already at capacity and will get worse with more homes. Trains do not have sufficient capacity. Shortage of other services such as GPs and schools. Development will have an unacceptable visual impact.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS1600	1159155	Ms Debbie Driver									Concern over traffic congestion, lack of doctors, dentists and schools. Railway does not have additional capacity.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS1598	311148	Essex County Council									Executive Summary There are five aspects of the policy that would benefit from changes to the wording: 1. This is a new community that is an extension to the whole town. 2. 1000 new homes is the minimum to be developed in the period to 2036 and the allocated land has capacity for further development post-2036 subject to Local Plan Review. 3. Financial contributions by developers to the delivery of the new school should be proportionate to the number and type of homes developed. 4. There should be greater flexibility about access arrangements for the site, particularly in respect of the eastern parcel. In addition, we are concerned about the clarity of parts of the text that support the policy There are a number of places where issues are conjoined in a paragraph implying that there is a link between them when in fact there is none.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS1675	1156300	Ms Loren Price		No	No		.				CCC have failed in their duty to fully consult with residents on the development of the local plan. The area outlined for development is twice the size it needs to be and cannot be justified. The Plan should not be reducing the size of the wildlife site or making the development area any larger than it needs to be. The Burnham Road, B1012 will form a barrier between the new development and the existing town and be dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists. There are no improvements proposed to the rail and road infrastructure. The plan is unjustified, unsustainable and not sound.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS1699	1151477	Mrs Janice Gilroy									Concern for congestion, lack of improvements to road network, train provision, car park provision, health risks associated with pylons, GP/dentist provision, flood risk, loss of countryside/wildlife and lack of school places. SWF will become urban sprawl. Town will be divided by B1012. Concern for pedestrian/wildlife safety crossing B1012. Uncomfortable that travelling site will not be marshalled.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS1701	1159944	Angus Gilroy									Concern for congestion, lack of improvements to road network, train provision, car park provision, health risks associated with pylons, GP/dentist provision, flood risk, loss of countryside/wildlife and lack of school places. SWF will become urban sprawl. Town will be divided by B1012. Concern for pedestrian/wildlife safety crossing B1012. Uncomfortable that travelling site will not be marshalled.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS1710	1098467	Mr Roger Gatford	No	Yes	No		.	.			No recognised land usage nor property development plan. No need for a Travelling Showpeople site – there is existing sufficient capacity. Town design and future development – broken promises Roads – lack of proposed infrastructure improvements. Additional pressure on the rail network Lack of community facilities to be provided. Questions on how is the new development to be paid for. The allocation should be deleted.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS1711	1159963	Mrs Dawn Vickery									There is lack of detail on the proposed development (ie. types of housing, community facilities etc.) Concern for GP provision - there should be 1 GP per 1600 patients, lack of primary and secondary school places, congestion, pedestrian safety, and train provision.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS1715	1159972	Mr Edward Swan									Infrastructure cannot take the extra load of an additional 1000 homes. Impact on already busy roads - suggest morning and evening rush hour surveys. Strategic Growth Site 4 North East Chelmsford includes infrastructure, this does not. Additional pressure on local services. Suggest smaller, more acceptable housing sites that do not create a blot on our beautiful country side.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS1787	1160014	Historic England	Yes	Yes							Design approach will need to be an important consideration in the planning of any prospective urban extension to ensure its design evolves to reflect modern town planning principles whilst creating a successful seam with the existing settlement. A number of listed buildings around the site – we welcome the inclusion of historic and natural environment. Request that the wording is amended to include an explicit reference to the setting of these (listed) heritage assets. Presently the policy contains an undue focus on the issue of visibility - buffer zones and landscape are often successful ways in mitigating harm, but we request that the policy expresses this in terms of setting. Setting includes more than simply views and proximity, but includes less tangible impacts such as pollution, noise, vibrations, dust, traffic etc. which can have an impact upon the way historic places and heritage assets are experienced or understood. Use of buffer zones and landscaping strategies will likely be a benefit in mitigating some of these aspects of setting. We recommend that the policy is expanded to refer to setting generally thus improving the strength of the policy and soundness of the allocation. We note that paragraph 7.342 does make reference to setting and we recommend that this is retained but that it is also referred to in the policy itself. Welcome the design and layout point which prominently directs prospective development to retain and be defined by the existing pattern of the historic and landscape features.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS1802	1095016	Ms Debbie Brindle			No						Lack of infrastructure plans to support development. Question the usability of the car sharing scheme. Asda car park cannot cope with increase of cars. Disagree with GP surgeries being on the edge of town. Danger to pedestrians. The view up to the hill, and countryside would be ruined. Increase of floods to surrounding areas due to drainage issues.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS1909	1097127	Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd			Yes						Endorses the draft Spatial Strategy with specific regard to Countryside Properties' interests in respect of the delivery of the following strategic site by 2036: Strategic Growth Site 7 – North of South Woodham Ferrers
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS1891	1101348	Education & Skills Funding Agency									ESFA welcomes safeguarding of land for schools. Welcomes the confirmation of site sizes required for the schools as well as confirmation of the anticipated number of FE and cost for each school in the updated Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). The clear requirements within the site-specific policies for financial contributions to offsite education provision are also supported.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS1982	308092	Mr Simon Westbrook		No	No	•	•	•		No	Plan does not contain robust infrastructure proposals, taking developments in SWF, Maldon and the Dengie into consideration.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS1983	1075760	Miss Emma Williams	No		No	•	•	•	•	No	South Woodham Ferrers is already under pressure in terms of transport and local infrastructure and no police present.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS1986	1094179	Mr Ross Silverton									Infrastructure and services in South Woodham Ferrers will be unable to cope with the proposed development.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS1990	1098450	Ms June Salmon									Infrastructure and services are already congested, development should be accompanied by infrastructure improvements. No provision being made for affordable housing Concern over Travelling Showpeople site.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS1993	1075095	Mr Peter Barry			No	•	•	•			The proposal would result in South Woodham Ferrers being split by the extremely busy, 60 mph, B1012. It will not be safe to cross this road for children, parents and the elderly at significant risk. The road infrastructure does not support the present needs of the town and the new petrol station has already generated a number of near misses. Local infrastructure is already inadequate. The railway does not meet the needs of the town and there is already problems with commuter parking in Green Lane. The Travelling Showpeople Site will cause a lot of problems.



Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS1994	1156632	Mrs Gabrielle Barry									Town will be split by B1012. Concern for pedestrian safety crossing B1012. Current road infrastructure cannot support present needs. Concern for lack of health facilities, rail service, lack of commuter parking. Oppose travelling show person site allocation as not appropriate for HGVs and fears for repeat of previous issues from 2011. LP has been badly conceived, poorly prepared and includes little consideration for the serious negative effects on the local residents and the surrounding area.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS1995	1092896	Mr Colin Blake									Our town will not be able to cope with the extra traffic, lack of doctors surgeries etc.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS1996	1093065	Dr Mark Austin									Development will split South Woodham Ferrers into two at the B1012. Road and rail infrastructure will be unable to cope with development as they are already congested. Will increase pressure on local services such as health services. Concern over travelling show people site.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS1998	1094114	Mr & Mrs Iain & Jane Warner									Services and infrastructure will be unable to cope with proposed development. Concern over Travelling Showpeople site. Development has not been thought through properly and will be very detrimental too the existing inhabitants of the town.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS2001	1156022	Jackie Wallace									Oppose to SWF development. Present infrastructure cannot cope. Concern for medical provision, train provision, flood risk. Development has not been thought through. Oppose travelling show person site.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS2003	1156856	Mr Keith Martin									Infrastructure and services in South Woodham Ferrers will be unable to cope with proposed development. Concern over flooding and Travelling Showpeople site.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS2006	1157110	Mr Richard Stevens									Infrastructure and services are already congested, development should be accompanied by infrastructure improvements. No provision being made for affordable housing Concern over Travelling Showpeople site.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS2012	1155937	Mr Kenneth Purcell	No	No	No						Chelmsford City Council has not listened to previous objections raised. Parts of the plan contravene the NPPF. The proposed development around Radar Hill is over development and will put a massive strain on existing infrastructure and services within the town which are already struggling. Beautiful countryside will also be lost. What railway improvements are planned? Doctor services are already at breaking point and we have no police presence and a slow fire service response time. The Travelling showpeople plots will only cause problems.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS1991	1155974	Mrs Shirley Redfearn	Yes	Yes	No		•			No	The traffic using the B1012 at present is considerable and will get worse. This will be another large village rather than an extension of South Woodham Ferrers. Secondary school children can not be expected to cross the B1012 and it will be dangerous for elderly crossing it. Local infrastructure is already stretched. We are on a floodplanin which is not suitable for development and floods frequently.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS1997	1156301	Mrs Pam Austin									Town will be split by B1012. a pedestrian crossing will be dangerous. Concern for road infrastructure, traffic and train provision. Concern for GP/healthcare provision, reduced emergency services. Oppose allocation of traveller show person land.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS1999	1094524	Mrs Julie Letts									Concern for GP provision, financial strain on secondary schools, congestion, flood risk. Oppose travelling show person site as SWF will be financially worse by supporting this group.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS2002	1102851	Mr and Mrs Hill									Expressing outright opposition. Believed that no further growth would be allowed beyond the B1012. New development will be cut off from remainder of the town by the B1012. Crossings will lead to accidents. Population increase would place stress on the infrastructure, little indication of action on this. B1012 and Burnham Road are subject to sever congestion, added to petrol station, supermarket, and Dengie area traffic. No dual carriageway or other improvements are planned, unlike in North Chelmsford (Site 4). Rail service is overstretched which will get worse. No improvements are planned. People may drive to Wickford which will add to congestion. Bus services are also slow or unreliable. Car sharing will be unworkable. Medical services are stretched and would not be able to cope with population increase. Any surgery should be in the town centre, more accessible than a new facility as proposed. Concern that there will be enough secondary school places. Unsure how pylons and their potential removal will be addressed. Flooding concerns particularly near to the Whalebone, which has never been addressed in the past. Impact on landscape and protected species. Travelling show people, concern that the site will not be marshalled, and potential activities and lifestyle problems.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS2004	1156895	Mrs Suzanne Patient									Roads already heavily congested and no planned new roads or extra buses and trains. Concern over Travelling Showpeople site.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS2007	1157159	Lesley & Peter Hooks									Oppose to plans for SWF due to lack of infrastructure. Schools, GPs, emergency services have all declined over the last 30 years. SWF has poor public transport and overcrowded roads. Concern for flood risk, congestion on B1012. Current and future residents should benefit from the development. Consider a new road around the north development. Traveller show person site should be located next to a major road.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS2008	1097299	Mr Nick Parsons									Infrastructure, services and facilities are already overloaded and further development will make this worse. Concern over Travelling Showpeople site.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS2009	1098279	Mr & Mrs Barry & Ann Mayne									Concern for congestion on Burnham Road as there is no proposal of building adequate roads. Concern that proposal of a healthcare centre will not actually increase the number of doctors/dentists in the area and that this healthcare centre will not be easily accessible. Concern for GP provision, train provision, flood risk. Concern that when showperson site is not in use, travellers will pitch up and use the site. Feel previous views have been ignored.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS2017	1157555	Mr Ian Pearson									Object to plans for SWF. Road in and out of SWF needs improvement. Concern for lack of affordable housing, flood risk, schools will not cope, GP/hospitals are overstretched. Plan is unlawful and unfair.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS2018	1157599	Les & Sue Newman									Object to plans for SWF. Oppose allocation of travelling show person site. Plan does not contain proposals to upgrade local services/infrastructure.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS2020	1159847	Mr David Lodge									Would not object to housing if this was accompanied with substantial and appropriate upgrades to services and infrastructure. Proposals within the plan do not address these issues. Object to travelling showpersons site.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS2026	1155666	Stow Maries Parish Council			No						Members concluded the pre-submission proposals relating to the Local Plan were in every relevant planning sense most seriously flawed and unsustainable for reasons of: inappropriate and ill-suited location by standards of best town planning practice: Failure to consider or properly assess other far better suited sites - between Wickford Rd and A132 would benefit from planned infill. Impact on already unmanageable traffic volumes/lack of strategic ‘through routes’ - congestion, traffic from Maldon district, need for new circumference road. Absence of any integrated or co-ordinated rail strategy - need for additional trains and trackwork, development to west/north west could use Battlesbridge station. Unacceptably prominent location/wide environmentally damaging impact - impact on slopes of Bushey Hill, potential impact on various important protected environmentally sensitive sites. Unsuitability of site for development/seriously blighted by pylons and air traffic - pylons will compromise land use, and also quality of development; development will be sited beneath take-off/landing routes for Stow Maries Great War Aerodrome.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS2016	1157604	Ian & Anna Newman & Copping									Object to plans for SWF. Oppose allocation of travelling show person site. Plan does not contain proposals to upgrade local services/infrastructure.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS2019	1158372	Mr & Mrs Paul & Patricia Saville									B1012 and A12 already overloaded Services and facilities in South Woodham Ferrers will not cope with proposed development.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 7 – NORTH OF SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS	PS2081	1161039	Natural England		Yes	No					No	Reference to the RAMS is required for Strategic Growth Site 7. Given the proximity of the development to the Crouch and Roach SPA and Ramsar site, a project level HRA is needed to address other impacts. This needs to be incorporated into the policy wording. Agree with the conclusion of no likely significant effect with respect to impacts on functional land associated with the Crouch and Roach Estuaries SPA and that this allocation could have significant effects with respect to recreational disturbance in the absence of any mitigation. The site will need to have enough of its own green infrastructure, designed to divert some recreational use away from the SPA. The entire rep has been attached for completeness (1161039PS-A).
7.325	PS231	961834	Mr Kevin Green	No	No	No		•	•		No	Plan is not legally compliant and previous objections have been ignored. Consultation needs to be easier to comment on. Development at SWF is not infrastructure led like Strat. Growth Site 4. Concern regarding congestion and rail provision.
7.325	PS14	1092786	Mr Alan Samson	No	No	No		•	•			The consultation process is too complicated and unhelpful to those not IT literate. The information is not concise, has too much jargon and has not taken account of all the objections from the last consultation. The A132 needs to be dualised and the B1012 re-diverted around the back of the new development. The train service needs to be upgraded.
7.325	PS58	1151727	Mrs Pauline Sherwood	No								Dispute against findings from previous traffic survey and has concern about congestion. Concern for pedestrian safety, accessing town centre. Strategic Growth Site 4 has "infrastructure led" development, why not SWF? Concern that pylons will pose as health risk if not removed. Concern that heavy vehicles associated with gypsy sites are unsuitable for roads
7.325	PS82	1074144	Mr Raymond Avis	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	No	Consultation has not taken public comments into consideration and is not accessible to all. Plan is not infrastructure led in SWF. Concern for congestion, train service, economic growth.
7.325	PS111	1152533	Ms Sophie Avis	No	No		•	•	•	•	No	Consultation is not accessible to all and previous objections have not been addressed. Concern for congestion, rail provision and economic growth. Development is not "infrastructure led" like Strategic Growth Site 4.
7.325	PS67	965080	Mr Jonathan Fairclough	No		No		•				There is no logic to the proposed development. Concern that no jobs in the area will result in additional commuters. Concern that roads, trains services will not be expanded and concern that car share scheme will be successful.
7.325	PS94	1075729	Mrs Karen Avis	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	No	Objections made previously have not been addressed. Consultation is not accessible to all. Concern that SWF development is not infrastructure led. Concern for congestion and economic growth
7.325	PS109	1152529	Mr Martin Hatcher			No	•	•	•	•		Concern for congestion - especially on A132, road infrastructure does not support the present needs, doctor provision, school places, train service, pedestrian safety on B1012.
7.325	PS145	1152451	Mr Paul Brunsdon			No						Feel Plan is not sound
7.325	PS148	1152451	Mr Paul Brunsdon			No		•				Plan is not sound because it is not justified.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
7.325	PS134	1094666	Mr Alan Cudmore			No	•	•	•		No	Concern SWF residents have not been informed of proposals. Concern regarding congestion in/out of SWF, new pedestrian crossing will cause traffic, healthcare services will be overstretched, damage from heavy vehicles - traveller site could be problematic for this reason, and consider additional parking.
7.325	PS204	1093143	Mr David Pepper			No	•		•			Concern for pedestrian safety crossing the B1012/A132 - particularly children going to school and those trying to access health facilities.
7.325	PS245	1154482	Mrs Trudy Bongard	Yes	Yes	No	•		•		No	Concern for congestion, safety crossing Burnham Road, new development will be cut off, doctors/police/dentist/ambulance/fire fighters have been reduced - concern for public welfare
7.325	PS259	965054	Mr Paul James	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	No	The many objections to the plan in the 2017 consultation have not been taken on board and they have not been put forward to the Government Inspectorate. Consultation doesn't allow residents to easily make comments. Plan does not comply with sections of the NPPF. Concern that development for SWF is not infrastructure led like Strategic Growth Site 4. Concern for congestion; rail provision; no evidence that car share programs will work; that development won't promote economic growth;
7.325	PS290	1074872	Mrs Donna Eley	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	No	Development at SWF is against sections of the NPPF. The consultation needs to allow residents to comment easily. Comments from 2017 have been ignored. Plan for SWF is not infrastructure led like Strategic Growth Site 4 is. Concern for congestion, rail provision, how economic growth will be promoted.
7.325	PS346	1093079	Mrs Tracy Belgrave	No		No	•	•	•	•	No	Consultation didn't acknowledge comments. Consultation needs to allow residents to comment easily. Development in SWF is not infrastructure led like Strategic Growth Site 4 is. Concern for congestion, train provision, how development will promote economic growth. Parts of the plan do not comply with NPPF.
7.325	PS327	1154920	Mr Charles Belgrave	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	No	Previous comments have been ignored. Consultation needs to be easier to comment on. Plan needs to be infrastructure led like strategic growth site 4. Concern for congestion, rail service, public transport provision, how development will promote economic growth. Plan is in contrast to parts of the NPPF.
7.325	PS379	1075572	Mr David Rey	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	No	No provision of infrastructure have been made. No improvements to roads, trains, buses. No extra schools. Consultation process is not user friendly.
7.325	PS356	1154967	Mrs Dawn James	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	No	Previous objections have been ignored. Consultation is not user friendly. Development for SWF is not infrastructure led like Strategic Growth Site 4 is. Concern for congestion, train provision, how development will promote economic growth. Development does not fully comply with NPPF.
7.325	PS399	1096111	Mrs Louise Clarke									2 gp surgeries have recently closed so extra housing without extra capacity will negatively affect SWF.
7.325	PS406	1096116	Mr Denzil Clarke									Waiting times for doctor & nurses already stretched so more capacity needed for more houses.
7.325	PS411	1097312	Mr Kenneth Gray	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	No	Previous comments were ignored. Consultation process is not user friendly. Plan is not infrastructure led like Strategic Growth Site 4. Concern for congestion, train service and how development will promote economic growth.
7.325	PS436	1155148	Mr Jack Avis	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	No	Consultation is not user friendly. Previous comments have been ignored. Concern for congestion, train provision and how economic growth will be promoted. Plan needs to be infrastructure led for SWF like it is for Strategic Growth Site 4.
7.325	PS424	1097313	Mrs Fiona Gray	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	No	Consultation is not user friendly. Previous comments were ignored. Concerns for congestion, train provision, how development will promote economic growth. Plan for SWF needs to be infrastructure led like Strategic Growth Site 4.
7.325	PS450	1092909	Mrs Susan Eysers	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	No	Consultation is not user friendly. Previous comments have been ignored. Concerns for train provision, congestion and how development will promote economic growth. Plan for SWF should be infrastructure led like Strategic Growth Site 4. Plan does not comply with parts of NPPF.
7.325	PS484	1097710	Mr Stephen Eley	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	No	Previous comments have been ignored. Consultation process on portal is not user friendly. Concern for congestion, train provision and how economic growth will be promoted. Development in SWF is not infrastructure led like Strategic Growth Site 4. Plan does not comply with parts of the NPPF.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
7.325	PS522	1155457	Mr Jeremy Petts	Yes	Yes	No	•		•		No	Concerned about the additional pressure on the train station in South Woodham Ferrers already near capacity. Burnham Road is already very busy, any extra traffic will make a miserable commute even worse. A huge amount of traffic may be pushed onto Woodham Road through Stow Maries, already a major rat run suffering from noise, pollution and speeding traffic. There will be pressure on local infrastructure with no guarantees of additional infrastructure.
7.325	PS506	1097253	Mrs Pauline Price	No	No	No	•		•	•	No	The consultation process is biased. The consultation portal is difficult to locate and navigate and finding the relevant parts of the plan has deterred many from commenting. Insufficient improvements to road infrastructure already at capacity. The B1012 will be a safety hazard for youngsters. New residents will drive to the station adding to the street parking problems. A road around the north of the development is the only solution.
7.325	PS550	1075315	Mrs Lynn Prosser	No	No	No	•	•	•		No	Concerned about the increase in traffic including large vehicles serving the retail units. Significant road improvements and safe crossings over Burnham Road required as well as improvements along the railway line to allow longer trains and more passing places.
7.325	PS603	1155000	Mrs Claire Thorogood		No	No	•	•	•			This proposed development pushes building up to and along its boundary with Maldon District which is currently open farmland and across the Woodham 'escarpment' of Busy (Radar) Hill making the development extremely visual to other Districts including Maldon and across the River Crouch to Rochford.
7.325	PS719	1096368	Mr Gary Brown	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	No	The views of residents have been ignored. There is a complete lack of road and rail infrastructure to support the new housing. Local GP services have been halved in recent years leading to long waiting times. Primary schools are already at maximum capacity. Flooding will increase. The new development will split the town in two, creating a 'middle' Woodham Ferrers.
7.325	PS737	1096552	Mrs Karen Chippette			No	•	•	•		No	Insufficient transport infrastructure and lack of alternative means of public transport available, insufficient school places. Will lead to further pressure on GP surgeries which are already stretched. Unacceptable impact on the landscape and wildlife. SWF will be divided by the road and increased flood risk. Concern over Travelling Showpeople plots and access to roads for them. Site should be reduced in numbers to take account of the above.
7.325	PS839	1075831	South Woodham Action Group	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	Previous objections have been ignored. Consultation process is not user friendly. Plan for SWF is not infrastructure led like Strategic Growth Site 4 is. Concern for congestion, train provision, how economic growth will be promoted. Need a dual carriageway on A132.
7.325	PS899	1153009	Miss Sally Scurrrell			No		•				Concern for increased congestion, problems with car parking, unsafe for children to cross roads, no plans for a police station.
7.325	PS960	1074846	Miss Leanne Moore			No	•	•	•	•		Increased and improved train services are needed before new homes are built. No consideration has been given to the objections of the existing residents of SWF. People have been prevented from making comments as the portal is difficult to use.
7.325	PS965	1074846	Miss Leanne Moore	No		No		•	•			Increased and improved train services are needed before new homes are built. No consideration has been given to the objections of the existing residents of SWF. People have been prevented from making comments as the portal is difficult to use.
7.325	PS1008	1096512	Mrs Margaret Dean									I already have to wait two weeks to see a doctor having more homes will only cause a strain on an already strained system, that is not working for the South Woodham Ferrers residents.
7.325	PS1014	1093915	Mr Richard Dean									I already have to wait two weeks to see a doctor having more homes will only cause a strain on an already strained system, that is not working for the South Woodham Ferrers residents.
7.325	PS1073	1075988	Mrs Alisa Abbott	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	No	Plan for SWF is not infrastructure led like Strategic Growth Site 4. Concern for congestion, rail service, how development will promote economic growth. Consultation ignored previous comments and is not user friendly. Plan does not comply with sections of the NPPF.
7.325	PS1090	1097330	Mr Kyle Jannece	No		No	•	•	•	•	No	Concerns have been ignored. Plan does not comply with parts of the NPPF. Portal is not user friendly. SWF is not infrastructure led like Strategic Growth Site 4 is. Concern for congestion and rail provision.
7.325	PS1338	1157284	Mr Daniel Baker	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	No	Previous objections were ignored. Consultation portal is not user friendly. Plan does not comply with parts of NPPF. Plan for SWF is not infrastructure led like Strategic Growth Site 4 is. Concern for congestion, train provision, how development will promote economic growth.
7.326	PS232	961834	Mr Kevin Green	No	No	No		•	•		No	Town will be split by B1012. Concern for pedestrian safety crossing B1012. Outer ring road should be built.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
7.326	PS26	1096221	Mr John Adams	Yes	Yes	No			•			Current road infrastructure is inadequate, building more homes will make travelling to and from South Woodham Ferrers much worse. The existing rail infrastructure does not meet the current needs of the town and does not support sustainable growth.
7.326	PS83	1074144	Mr Raymond Avis			No		•	•			Pans for the B1012 will be dangerous for pedestrians to cross - in particular children, elderly and those trying to access the health facilities.
7.326	PS112	1152533	Ms Sophie Avis			No		•	•			Safety concerns regarding B1012 particularly pedestrians including elderly, children and those accessing the health services
7.326	PS95	1075729	Mrs Karen Avis			No		•	•			Safety concerns around B1012, in particular pedestrian safety crossing the road.
7.326	PS146	1152451	Mr Paul Brunsdon			No						Feel plan is not sound
7.326	PS149	1152451	Mr Paul Brunsdon			No		•				Plan is not sound because it is not justified.
7.326	PS184	1152351	Mr Terry Sheehan	No		No		•	•			Transport infrastructure needs to be upgraded to support this growth since it can barely cope now.
7.326	PS249	1154483	Mrs Carole Green			No		•	•	•	No	Town will be split by B1012. Concern for pedestrian safety crossing B1012. Outer ring road should be built.
7.326	PS260	965054	Mr Paul James			No		•	•		No	Concern that town will be divided instead of building a ring road around the outskirts. Feel profit margins are prioritised over public safety - particular reference made to pedestrian safety crossing B1012. T There should be at least 6 crossing points across the B1012 and B1418 as follows: 1. By Shaw Farm roundabout 2. By Hullbridge Road 3. At the base of Bushey Hill 4. By the Hamberts Road roundabout 5. Across the B1012 to the Garden of Remembrance 6. Across the B1418 A new footpath will be required, extending along the length of the development, from the BP garage at Shaw Farm roundabout along to Compass Gardens. There is currently no footpath on this side of the road.
7.326	PS293	1074872	Mrs Donna Eley	No	No	No	•	•	•	•		Plan is not infrastructure led for SWF like it is for Strategic Growth Site 4. Plan does not comply with sections of the NPPF. Concern for congestion, rail provision an how economic growth will be promoted.
7.326	PS297	1074872	Mrs Donna Eley	No		No	•	•	•	•	No	Plan split by B1012. Consider building outer ring road. Concern for pedestrian safety crossing the B1012. There should be at least 6 crossing points across the B1012 and B1418 as follows: 1. By Shaw Farm roundabout 2. By Hullbridge Road 3. At the base of Bushey Hill 4. By the Hamberts Road roundabout 5. Across the B1012 to the Garden of Remembrance 6. Across the B1418 A new footpath will be required, extending along the length of the development, from the BP garage at Shaw Farm roundabout along to Compass Gardens.
7.326	PS328	1154920	Mr Charles Belgrave			No		•	•			Town will be split by B1012. Concern for pedestrian safety crossing B1012. An outer ring road needs to be built. There need to be at least 6 crossing points along B1012 and a new footpath extending along the development.
7.326	PS347	1093079	Mrs Tracy Belgrave			No		•	•			Town will be split by B1012. Concern for pedestrian safety crossing B1012. An outer ring road should be built. There should be at least 6 crossing across B1012 and B1418. A new footpath is required extending along the length of the development.
7.326	PS380	1075572	Mr David Rey			No		•	•			We don't want our town to be split by the B1012. Too dangerous. Suggest building an outer ring road.
7.326	PS357	1154967	Mrs Dawn James	Yes		No		•	•			Town will be split by B1012. Concern for pedestrian safety crossing B1012. An outer ring road should be built. There should be at least 6 crossing points across the B1012 and B1418. There should be a footpath extending the length of the development.
7.326	PS412	1097312	Mr Kenneth Gray			No		•	•			Town will be divided by B1012. Concern for pedestrian safety crossing B1012. A ring road should be built.
7.326	PS425	1097313	Mrs Fiona Gray			No		•	•			Town will be split by B1012. Concern for pedestrian safety crossing B1012. An outer ring road should be built.
7.326	PS437	1155148	Mr Jack Avis			No		•	•			Town will be split by B1012. Concern for pedestrian safety crossing B1012. An outer ring road should be built.
7.326	PS451	1092909	Mrs Susan Eysers			No		•	•			Town will be split by B1012. Concern for pedestrian safety crossing the B1012. A new ring road should be built. There should be at least 6 crossing points across the B1012 and B1418. A new footpath is needed extending along the length of the development.
7.326	PS485	1097710	Mr Stephen Eley			No		•	•			Town will be split by B1012. Concern for pedestrian safety crossing B1012. A new outer ring road should be built. There should be at least 6 crossing points across the B1012 and B1418. There should be a new footpath extending the length of the development.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
7.326	PS695	1155000	Mrs Claire Thorogood		No	No	•	•	•			The proposal is flawed due it not being 'Infrastructure Led' and poorly thought through in regards to its positioning north of the B1012 potentially creating a 'Middle Woodham'.
7.326	PS720	1096368	Mr Gary Brown	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	No	Roads are already congested at peak times. Local GP services have been halved in recent years leading to long waiting times. Primary schools are already at maximum capacity. Flooding will increase. The new development will split the town in two, creating a 'middle' Woodham Ferrers.
7.326	PS840	1075831	South Woodham Action Group			No		•	•		Yes	Town will be split by B1012. A new outer ring road is needed. Concern for pedestrian safety crossing the B1012.
7.326	PS1074	1075988	Mrs Alisa Abbott			No		•	•			Town will be split by B1012. An outer ring road should be built. Concern for pedestrian safety crossing B1012. There should be at least 6 crossing points across the B1012 and B1418. A new footpath is needed extending the length of the development.
7.326	PS1091	1097330	Mr Kyle Jannece			No		•	•			Town will be split by B1012. There should be at least 6 crossings across the B1012 and B1418. A new footpath is needed extending the length of the development
7.326	PS1349	1157284	Mr Daniel Baker			No		•	•			Town will be split by B1012. A new outer ring road should be built. Concern for pedestrian safety crossing B1012. There should be at least 6 crossing points across the B1012 and B1418. A new footpath is needed to extend the length of the development.
7.327	PS240	961834	Mr Kevin Green			No		•	•		No	Concern for lack of GP and dental provision.
7.327	PS16	1092786	Mr Alan Samson			No		•	•			Local services are under daily pressure. No detail is provided about how the dentists and GPs will cope with the expected increase in population.
7.327	PS64	1092842	Mr Noel Taylor			No			•			Upgrade roads and other facilities either before or at the same time as houses are built and occupied.
7.327	PS84	1074144	Mr Raymond Avis			No		•	•			Concern for GP/ dental provision, local services coping.
7.327	PS96	1075729	Mrs Karen Avis			No		•	•			Concerns for GP provision, dental provision, general healthcare provision.
7.327	PS113	1152533	Ms Sophie Avis			No		•	•			Concern for GP provision, dental provision, and how local services will cope with development
7.327	PS147	1152451	Mr Paul Brunsdon			No		•				Plan is not sound because it is not justified.
7.327	PS250	1154483	Mrs Carole Green			No		•			No	Concern for lack of adequate health care facilities, GPs and dentists.
7.327	PS261	965054	Mr Paul James			No		•	•		No	Concern for lack of health care and GP provision
7.327	PS294	1074872	Mrs Donna Eley	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	No	Concern for GP, dental, general healthcare provision
7.327	PS329	1154920	Mr Charles Belgrave			No		•	•			Concern for GP/dental/general healthcare provision. Concern closures in town will lead to fewer amenities.
7.327	PS348	1093079	Mrs Tracy Belgrave			No		•	•			Concern for GP/dentist/healthcare provision. Concern that closures in town centre means less amenities for SWF.
7.327	PS358	1154967	Mrs Dawn James	No		No		•	•			Concern for GP/dental/healthcare provision. Concern that as facilities in town centre close, SWF will have fewer amenities.
7.327	PS400	1096111	Mrs Louise Clarke									2 gp surgeries have recently closed so extra housing without extra capacity will negatively affect SWF.
7.327	PS407	1096116	Mr Denzil Clarke									Waiting times for doctor & nurses already stretched so more capacity needed for more houses.
7.327	PS413	1097312	Mr Kenneth Gray			No		•	•			Concern for GP/dental/healthcare provision. Fear that closure of facilities in town centre will lead to fewer amenities for SWF
7.327	PS381	1075572	Mr David Rey			No		•	•			Sustainable infrastructure is needed.
7.327	PS426	1097313	Mrs Fiona Gray			No		•	•			Concern with GP/dental/healthcare provision. Fear that possible closures in the town will lead to fewer amenities for SWF.
7.327	PS438	1155148	Mr Jack Avis			No		•	•			Concern for GP/dental/healthcare provision. Fear that possible closures in town will leave SWF with fewer amenities
7.327	PS452	1092909	Mrs Susan Eyers			No		•	•			Concern for GP/dental/healthcare provision. Fear that closures in town will lead to fewer amenities for SWF.
7.327	PS486	1097710	Mr Stephen Eley			No		•	•			Concern for GP/dental/general healthcare provision. Fear that possible closures in town will leave SWF with fewer amenities.
7.327	PS643	1155000	Mrs Claire Thorogood			No		•				The new BP service station and the commencement of the Sainsbury north of the B1012 should not automatically lay a pathway for a total building in of all available space South Woodham Ferrers has. Improvements to existing healthcare facilities utilising vacant retail space in the town centre would be more conducive to the reinvigoration of South Woodham Ferrers and the local businesses already in situ.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
7.327	PS721	1096368	Mr Gary Brown	No	No	No		•			No	Local GP's and dentists are already under pressure. No details are provided of any increase in our local services. The new health centre may impact on the existing pharmacies and surgeries possibly leading to closures and leaving the town centre with less amenities. This is contrary to para 2.32 of the NPPF stating that planning should ensure the vitality of town centres.
7.327	PS842	1075831	South Woodham Action Group			No		•	•		Yes	Concern for GP/dental/healthcare provision. Concern that possible closures in town centre will leave SWF with fewer amenities.
7.327	PS1075	1075988	Mrs Alisa Abbott			No		•	•			Concern for GP/dental/healthcare provision. Fear that possible closures will leave SWF with fewer amenities.
7.327	PS1092	1097330	Mr Kyle Jannece			No		•	•			Concern for GP provision, Police and fire service.
7.327	PS1354	1157284	Mr Daniel Baker			No		•	•			Concern for GP/dental/general healthcare provision. Fear that possible closures in town will leave SWF with fewer amenities.
7.328	PS241	961834	Mr Kevin Green					•	•		No	CIL figure is not sufficient to improve already overstretched facilities
7.328	PS17	1092786	Mr Alan Samson			No		•	•			The CIL payment the Town Council will received will not be enough to improve our already overstretched facilities.
7.328	PS38	308102	Mr Colin Waxham									Challenges CIL calculation for South Woodham Ferrers.
7.328	PS85	1074144	Mr Raymond Avis			No		•	•			CIL figure not sufficient to improve overstretched facilities.
7.328	PS97	1075729	Mrs Karen Avis			No		•	•			CIL figure not sufficient to improve overstretched facilities.
7.328	PS114	1152533	Ms Sophie Avis			No		•	•			CIL figure not sufficient to improve overstretched facilities.
7.328	PS150	1152451	Mr Paul Brunsdon			No		•				Plan is not sound because it is not justified.
7.328	PS198	1096167	Mrs Barbara Beckett	No		No			•			Health centre in the centre of the town is the most convenient place for such a facility and should be developed
7.328	PS251	1154483	Mrs Carole Green			No		•	•	•	No	CIL figure is not sufficient to improve already overstretched facilities.
7.328	PS264	965054	Mr Paul James			No		•	•		No	CIL figure is not sufficient to improve already overstretched facilities
7.328	PS295	1074872	Mrs Donna Eley	No	No	No	•	•	•		No	CIL figure is not sufficient to improve already overstretched facilities
7.328	PS330	1154920	Mr Charles Belgrave			No		•	•			CIL figure is not sufficient to improve overstretched facilities
7.328	PS349	1093079	Mrs Tracy Belgrave			No		•	•			CIL figure is not sufficient to improve already overstretched facilities.
7.328	PS359	1154967	Mrs Dawn James			No		•	•			CIL figure is not sufficient to improve already overstretched facilities.
7.328	PS414	1097312	Mr Kenneth Gray			No		•	•			CIL figure is not sufficient to improve already overstretched facilities.
7.328	PS382	1075572	Mr David Rey			No		•	•			The CIL figure is not sufficient to improve our already overstretched facilities.
7.328	PS427	1097313	Mrs Fiona Gray			No		•	•			CIL figure is not sufficient to improve already overstretched facilities.
7.328	PS439	1155148	Mr Jack Avis			No		•	•			CIL figure is not sufficient to improve already overstretched facilities
7.328	PS453	1092909	Mrs Susan Eysers			No		•	•			CIL figure is not sufficient to improve already overstretched facilities.
7.328	PS487	1097710	Mr Stephen Eley			No		•	•			CIL figure is not sufficient to improve already overstretched facilities.
7.328	PS696	1155000	Mrs Claire Thorogood			No	•	•	•			Empty rep
7.328	PS843	1075831	South Woodham Action Group			No		•	•		Yes	CIL figure is not sufficient to improve already overstretched facilities
7.328	PS956	1074846	Miss Leanne Moore			No		•	•			The CIL would need to be increased significantly to cover the costs of the required infrastructure needed in SWF.
7.328	PS1076	1075988	Mrs Alisa Abbott			No			•	•		CIL figure is not sufficient to support already overstretched facilities
7.328	PS1093	1097330	Mr Kyle Jannece					•	•			CIL figure is not sufficient to improve already overstretched facilities.
7.328	PS1355	1157284	Mr Daniel Baker					•	•			CIL figure is not sufficient to support already overstretched facilities.
7.329	PS233	961834	Mr Kevin Green						•	•	No	Concern that not enough affordable housing will be provided.
7.329	PS12	1151466	Mrs Joanne Cooper	No		No	•					Concerned that the mix of houses to be built may not reflect the needs of the local community.
7.329	PS18	1092786	Mr Alan Samson			No		•	•			The Council has not met its affordable housing target for the last 14 years. There should be a clear 35% affordable housing stipulation to the developer.
7.329	PS86	1074144	Mr Raymond Avis			No			•	•		Concern not enough affordable housing will be provided
7.329	PS98	1075729	Mrs Karen Avis			No			•	•		Concern that not enough affordable housing will be provided.
7.329	PS115	1152533	Ms Sophie Avis			No			•	•		Concern that not enough affordable housing will be provided
7.329	PS151	1152451	Mr Paul Brunsdon			No		•				Plan is not sound because it is not justified.
7.329	PS252	1154483	Mrs Carole Green			No		•	•	•		CCC needs to undertake a proper assessment of what affordable housing is required. Concern there will not be enough affordable housing provided.
7.329	PS296	1074872	Mrs Donna Eley			No	•	•				Concern that not enough affordable housing will be provided.
7.329	PS332	1154920	Mr Charles Belgrave			No		•	•			Concern for lack of affordable housing
7.329	PS350	1093079	Mrs Tracy Belgrave			No			•	•		Concern for lack of affordable housing



Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
7.329	PS415	1097312	Mr Kenneth Gray			No			•	•		Concern for lack of affordable housing
7.329	PS383	1075572	Mr David Rey			No			•	•		35% of the development must be affordable housing. CCC needs to undertake a proper assessment of what is required.
7.329	PS428	1097313	Mrs Fiona Gray			No			•	•		Concern for lack of affordable housing
7.329	PS440	1155148	Mr Jack Avis			No			•	•		Concern for lack of affordable housing.
7.329	PS454	1092909	Mrs Susan Eysers			No			•	•		Concern for lack of affordable housing. CCC needs to undertake a proper assessment of what is required.
7.329	PS488	1097710	Mr Stephen Eley			No			•	•		Concern for lack of affordable housing.
7.329	PS639	1155000	Mrs Claire Thorogood			No	•	•	•			The statement 'Opportunities should be taken to include flexible units for integrated residential and commercial uses, to enhance sustainable and economic growth. is alarming as this area could potentially end up with a real 'mixed bag' of development.
7.329	PS844	1075831	South Woodham Action Group			No			•	•	Yes	Concern for lack of affordable housing
7.329	PS1077	1075988	Mrs Alisa Abbott			No			•	•		Concern for lack of affordable housing
7.329	PS1094	1097330	Mr Kyle Jannece			No			•	•		Concern for lack of affordable housing.
7.329	PS1139	952863	Mrs Christine Weir-Ewing			No				•		The proposal does not meet housing requirements of the NPPF. South Woodham Ferrers is in desperate need of smaller properties, paragraph 7.329 should be re-worded to require this.
7.329	PS1356	1157284	Mr Daniel Baker			No			•	•		Concern for lack of affordable housing.
7.330	PS19	1092786	Mr Alan Samson			No		•	•			The Travelling Showpeople site should be relocated to a site near major road networks suitable for heavy goods vehicles.
7.330	PS242	961834	Mr Kevin Green			No		•	•		No	Object to allocation of Traveller Site as roads are not suitable for HGVs.
7.330	PS27	1096221	Mr John Adams	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•	•		Concern that the Travelling Showpeople's site will not be supervised. It should be closer to major road networks and not near a town where the infrastructure is already inadequate.
7.330	PS87	1074144	Mr Raymond Avis			No		•	•			Traveller site comments previously ignored. Traveller site should be located somewhere more suitable for heavy goods vehicles.
7.330	PS68	965080	Mr Jonathan Fairclough	No		No	•	•	•			Object to quote from plan: 'in order to achieve a mixed and balanced new community, the development will be required to provide a Travelling Showpeople site for 5 plots.' as there is no evidence to suggest SWF is not already a mixed and balanced community or that including travellers will solve this issue.
7.330	PS99	1075729	Mrs Karen Avis			No		•	•			Previous comments about traveller site ignored. Site would be better situated by major road network.
7.330	PS116	1152533	Ms Sophie Avis			No		•	•			Previous comments regarding traveller site have been ignored. Traveller site would be better suited by major road
7.330	PS152	1152451	Mr Paul Brunsdon			No		•				Plan is not sound because it is not justified.
7.330	PS201	1093143	Mr David Peffer			No			•			Country roads cannot support heavy goods vehicles
7.330	PS253	1154483	Mrs Carole Green			No		•	•			Object against Traveller site allocation as roads are unsuitable for HGVs.
7.330	PS265	965054	Mr Paul James			No			•	•	No	Concern for lack of affordable housing. Undertake a proper assessment of what is required for this area, rather than an arithmetic exercise. Once this is done the affordable housing figure should be set in stone
7.330	PS268	965054	Mr Paul James			No		•	•		No	Plan ignored comments made in 2017. Object to Traveller site allocation - should be closer to major roads for HGV use. In 2014, Chelmsford City Council were contributors to the Essex – Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Show People Accommodation Assessment. This document made a number of recommendations which are at odds with the local plan. The recommended siting close to major roads is a very good example.
7.330	PS298	1074872	Mrs Donna Eley			No	•		•		No	Object against traveller site allocation as site should be closer to major access roads for the HGVs.
7.330	PS333	1154920	Mr Charles Belgrave			No		•	•			Oppose Traveller site allocation as HGVs need major access roads
7.330	PS351	1093079	Mrs Tracy Belgrave			No		•	•			Object against traveller site allocation as HGVs need a major access road.
7.330	PS360	1154967	Mrs Dawn James			No		•	•			Concern for lack of affordable housing
7.330	PS401	1096111	Mrs Louise Clarke									i am unclear what benefit ot purpose the addition of travelling show people could possibly bring. Small country roafs are not suitable for HGVs.
7.330	PS408	1096116	Mr Denzil Clarke									Not sure what benefit or purpose travelling showpeople give? Nor for HGVs on existing road network.
7.330	PS384	1075572	Mr David Rey			No		•	•			Comments from the 2017 consultation were ignored. Remove from site 7 and site somewhere more suitable for their heavy goods vehicles.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
7.330	PS416	1097312	Mr Kenneth Gray			No		•	•			Object to Traveller site allocation as HGVs need a major access road.
7.330	PS429	1097313	Mrs Fiona Gray			No		•	•			Object to Traveller site allocation as HGVs need major access roads.
7.330	PS441	1155148	Mr Jack Avis			No		•	•			Object to traveller site allocation as HGVs need major access roads.
7.330	PS455	1092909	Mrs Susan Evers			No		•	•			Object to Traveller site allocation as HGVs need a major access road.
7.330	PS489	1097710	Mr Stephen Eley			No		•	•			Object to traveller site allocation as HGVs need a major access road and motorway networks.
7.330	PS635	1095423	Mr & Mrs Andrew & Maureen Moore									We are concerned over the proposal to construct a travelling show people site for heavy goods vehicles within the new development for South Woodham Ferrers and question what benefit it will bring to our community. Locating the site near a major road network would be more appropriate.
7.330	PS637	1155000	Mrs Claire Thorogood			No	•	•	•			The proposed Travelling Showpeople site will not provide 'Easy and convenient access to the site for heavy goods' as is required. Plots should be sited closer to A type roads. The actual position of the plots is not stated.
7.330	PS722	1096368	Mr Gary Brown	No	No	No		•				There must be far more appropriate areas close to major road networks that would be more suitable for a Travelling Showpeople site.
7.330	PS731	1153391	Mr Colin Stroud			No	•		•		No	Showpeople should be defined as those having specific qualifications, experience and public liability insurance for event/shows/performances. There should be a maximum stay duration, per year, for each person or family using the site.
7.330	PS847	1075831	South Woodham Action Group			No		•	•		Yes	Oppose allocation of traveller show person site as this should be located by a major access road network.
7.330	PS955	1074846	Miss Leanne Moore			No		•	•	•		Alternative sites to SWF should be considered for Travelling Showpeople plots which are closer to major road networks.
7.330	PS1065	1157055	Mr Phil Barnett	Yes	Yes	No			•		No	Essex County Council are to far removed from the town to make an informed decision. Provision should be based on the latest assessment of need and in consultation with Town Council. Not Essex Or Chelmsford Borough Council.
7.330	PS1078	1075988	Mrs Alisa Abbott			No		•	•			Plan ignored previous comments. Travelling show person site not appropriate as HGVs need major road networks
7.330	PS1095	1097330	Mr Kyle Jannece			No		•	•			Oppose travelling show person allocation as HGVs need major road networks and previous comments on this were ignored.
7.330	PS1357	1157284	Mr Daniel Baker			No		•	•			Plan ignored previous comments in relation to Traveller show person site allocation. Oppose site allocation as it should be by a major road network for HGVs.
7.330	PS1458	1095858	Mr John Gable									It is noted that access for heavy goods vehicles is required. Why is this being sited in a residential area and not near a major road network? Groups, not genuine travelling people, have caused major problems in this part of Essex in the past. What guarantees are there that unsupervised areas will not be targeted by them in the future?
7.330	PS1498	1158433	Mr & Mrs Jeffery									It is noted that access for heavy goods vehicles is required. Why is this being sited in a residential area and not near a major road network? Groups, not genuine travelling people, have caused major problems in this part of Essex in the past. What guarantees are there that unsupervised areas will not be targeted by them in the future?
7.330	PS1984	1075760	Miss Emma Williams	No								How is a travelers site legal.
7.330	PS1985	1093915	Mr Richard Dean									Concern over Travelling Showpeople site
7.330	PS2000	1096512	Mrs Margaret Dean									Concern over Travelling Showpeople site
7.331	PS234	961834	Mr Kevin Green			No		•	•		No	I dont believe the plan adequately covers our future educational needs and is sustainable. Concern for lack of school places.
7.331	PS20	1092786	Mr Alan Samson			No		•	•			The plan does not adequately cover South Woodham Ferrer's future educational needs.
7.331	PS28	1096221	Mr John Adams	Yes	Yes	No	•		•			The healthcare facilities are already under severe pressure, the proposal will increase the strain on these services, even with the proposed new facilities.
7.331	PS88	1074144	Mr Raymond Avis			No		•	•			Concern for provision of school places
7.331	PS100	1075729	Mrs Karen Avis			No		•	•			Concern for school places.
7.331	PS117	1152533	Ms Sophie Avis			No		•	•			Concern for school places
7.331	PS153	1152451	Mr Paul Brunsdon			No		•				Plan is not sound because it is not justified.
7.331	PS205	1093143	Mr David Pepper			No	•					The Plan does not specify exactly what provisions for schooling/recreation/ healthcare will be provided.
7.331	PS254	1154483	Mrs Carole Green			No		•	•			I dont believe the plan adequately covers our future educational needs and is sustainable. Concern for lack of school places and possibility of children having to travel to different towns to go to school. Also concern for child safety crossing B1012 to get to school.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
7.331	PS284	965054	Mr Paul James			No		•	•		No	Don't believe the plan is sustainable in terms of educational provision. Concern for lack of school places, having to bus children to different towns, child pedestrian safety walking to/from school along B1012.
7.331	PS299	1074872	Mrs Donna Eley	No		No	•	•	•	•	No	I don't believe the plan adequately covers our future educational needs or is it sustainable. It needs to be reviewed and rewritten to consider the needs of the population of SWF. Provide a primary school within the proposed development area. Put in a pavement along B1012 for school children. Concern for school places, having to bus kids to schools in other towns.
7.331	PS334	1154920	Mr Charles Belgrave			No		•	•			Concern for school places, bussing children to schools in other towns, and provision of schools in walking distance.
7.331	PS352	1093079	Mrs Tracy Belgrave			No		•	•			Concern for lack of school places, bussing children to schools in different towns. Put in a pavement along the B1012 for school children to use.
7.331	PS366	1154967	Mrs Dawn James					•	•			Concern for school places, bussing children to schools in other towns. There should be a pavement along B1012 for children to use. Plan does not adequately consider education needs.
7.331	PS385	1075572	Mr David Rey			No		•	•			No real contingency plans for extra school places. Dangerous crossing of B1012
7.331	PS417	1097312	Mr Kenneth Gray			No		•	•			Concern for lack of school places
7.331	PS430	1097313	Mrs Fiona Gray			No		•	•			Concern for lack of school places. Plan does not adequately cover education needs.
7.331	PS442	1155148	Mr Jack Avis			No		•	•			Concern for lack of school places. Plan does not adequately cover future educational needs.
7.331	PS456	1092909	Mrs Susan Eysers			No		•	•			Concern for lack of school places and bussing children to schools in other towns. Concern for children crossing B1012 - there should be pavement along the B1012 for them to use. Plan does not adequately cover future educational needs.
7.331	PS490	1097710	Mr Stephen Eley			No		•	•			Concern for lack of school places and needing to bus children to schools in different towns. There is no pavement along B1012 for children to use to get to/from school. Plan does not adequately cover educational needs.
7.331	PS697	1155000	Mrs Claire Thorogood			No	•	•	•			The range of new community services and facilities required by the very nature of the sites' positioning cannot deliver 'easy accessibility' to the existing neighbourhood without a re-routing the B1012 and major investment in walking and cycling paths, public transport and private car parking provision. The majority of these provisions are left open ended and up to a developer.
7.331	PS715	1156537	Mr Colin Reynolds			No	•		•			There is no commitment to provide a primary school. Without a primary school serving the new development all primary school aged children will need to cross Burnham Road. Greater details about the crossing points are needed which do not disrupt traffic flow but meets the development need to primary education.
7.331	PS768	1074837	Mr Gary Turner	No	No	No		•	•		No	Concern that more travellers may try to pitch than what has been allocated and questioning who will police the site. More sound and open discussion with residents needs to take place regarding any plans to improve the road network. The trains at rush hour are already packed before they leave, further housing will push more traffic on the road.
7.331	PS822	961966	Mr Alan Brunning				•		•			SWF primary schools are at capacity will only have plans for a precautionary primary school for the proposed 1000+ houses
7.331	PS848	1075831	South Woodham Action Group			No		•	•		Yes	Concern for lack of school places and potential detrimental affect this will have on children's education.
7.331	PS1079	1075988	Mrs Alisa Abbott			No		•	•			Concern for possible lack of school places and possibility of having to bus children to schools in different towns. There is no pavement along B1012 which would be used by children walking to school. Plan does not adequately cover our future educational needs and is not sustainable.
7.331	PS1181	1097330	Mr Kyle Jannece			No		•	•			Concern for lack of school places and possibility of bussing children to schools in different towns. There is no pavement along B1012 which is a route children will/could use to walk to school.
7.331	PS1358	1157284	Mr Daniel Baker			No		•	•			Concern for lack of school places and possibility of having to bus children to schools in different towns. There is no pavement along B1012 where children would walk to school.
7.331	PS2005	1157055	Mr Phil Barnett	Yes	Yes	No		•			No	Travelling Showpeople site is considered unsuitable.
7.331	PS2010	1155937	Mr Kenneth Purcell	No	No	No					No	Chelmsford City Council has not listened to previous objections raised. Parts of the plan contravene the NPPF. The Travelling Showpeople plots will only cause problems.
7.332	PS154	1152451	Mr Paul Brunsdon			No		•				Plan is not sound because it is not justified.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
7.332	PS700	1155000	Mrs Claire Thorogood			No	•	•	•			Locations of provisions within the site will be dictated by the location of the pylons, overhead power lines and public footpaths. These may impact the spread of the provisions within the site potentially resulting in closely compacted high density areas which would have a negative visual impact. A study into the long term health impacts of living and working in close proximity to these should be part of the LDP. Concerned that the recreational space at Busy (Radar) Hill, which have been used for generations, will be lost.
7.332	PS1069	1157055	Mr Phil Barnett	No	No	No			•		No	Impact of community facilities, primary and secondary school has not been considered.
7.333	PS155	1152451	Mr Paul Brunsdon			No		•				Plan is not sound because it is not justified.
7.333	PS642	1155000	Mrs Claire Thorogood		No	No	•	•	•	•		The site can not be presented as providing 'a high-quality development in a landscaped setting' due to its elevation above existing development and the pylons (which are a potential health risk). The character of the historic landscape cannot be preserved with this mixed development which also threatens the River Crouch. Protection of the Local Wildlife Site at Bushy Hill is paramount but once the site is decimated it will no longer attract the wildlife currently present.
7.333	PS919	961966	Mr Alan Brunning	No		No	•		•			Utilities. Area 7 has high tension pylons, and intermediate pressure gas main and a hip water main running through it. The easements and safety concerns are not discussed or addressed in the planning proposal. The necessary easements for these utilities is not discussed. This is not a sustainable development
7.334	PS235	961834	Mr Kevin Green			No		•	•		No	Concern for flood risk
7.334	PS21	1092786	Mr Alan Samson			No		•	•			Concerned that Old Wickford Road/ Whalebone/ Tropical Wings already experience flooding. The development will increase the risk and incidence of flooding.
7.334	PS89	1074144	Mr Raymond Avis			No		•	•			Concern for flood risk
7.334	PS101	1075729	Mrs Karen Avis			No		•	•			Concern for flood risk
7.334	PS120	1152533	Ms Sophie Avis			No		•	•			Concern for flood risk
7.334	PS156	1152451	Mr Paul Brunsdon			No		•				Plan is not sound because it is not justified.
7.334	PS246	1154482	Mrs Trudy Bongard	Yes	Yes	No	•		•		No	Worried that the existing houses off of The Old Wickford road, Whalebone, Shaw Farm area will be adversely affected by development on Bushey Hill in terms of flood risk.
7.334	PS255	1154483	Mrs Carole Green			No		•	•			Concern for flood risk.
7.334	PS285	965054	Mr Paul James			No		•	•		No	Concern for flood risk
7.334	PS301	1074872	Mrs Donna Eley	No		No	•		•	•	No	Concern for flood risk
7.334	PS335	1154920	Mr Charles Belgrave			No		•	•			Concern for flood risk
7.334	PS353	1093079	Mrs Tracy Belgrave			No		•	•			Concern for flood risk
7.334	PS367	1154967	Mrs Dawn James			No		•	•			Concern for flood risk
7.334	PS386	1075572	Mr David Rey			No		•	•			Concern for flood risk.
7.334	PS418	1097312	Mr Kenneth Gray			No		•	•			Concern for flood risk
7.334	PS431	1097313	Mrs Fiona Gray			No		•	•			Concern for flood risk
7.334	PS443	1155148	Mr Jack Avis			No		•	•			Concern for flood risk
7.334	PS457	1092909	Mrs Susan Eysers			No		•	•			Concern for flood risk.
7.334	PS491	1097710	Mr Stephen Eley			No		•	•			Concern for flood risk.
7.334	PS820	961966	Mr Alan Brunning			No	•	•	•	•		Concern for flood risk management. The text shows this will not be co coordinated by CCC but will be left to the developers.
7.334	PS917	961966	Mr Alan Brunning			No	•		•			Concern for flood risk management. Since being built the SWF east flood defences have 'sunk' from their 1973 design level, 5.5m by nearly a meter to 4.6m yet the document claims this present no risk for the town centre and schools
7.334	PS823	961966	Mr Alan Brunning			No	•		•		Yes	Concern for flood risk management. The text shows this will not be co coordinated by CCC but will be left to the developers.
7.334	PS850	1075831	South Woodham Action Group			No		•	•		Yes	Concern for flood risk
7.334	PS1081	1075988	Mrs Alisa Abbott			No		•	•			Concern for flood risk
7.334	PS1183	1097330	Mr Kyle Jannece			No		•	•			Concern for flood risk.
7.334	PS1359	1157284	Mr Daniel Baker			No		•	•			Concern for flood risk
7.334	PS1459	1095858	Mr John Gable									A significant area of South Woodham Ferrers is below sea level and the area in the north-west of SWF around the Whalebone pub area has had flooding arising from the North of the town. Can you guarantee that any development in that area will not increase this risk?

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
7.334	PS1499	1158433	Mr & Mrs Jeffery									A significant area of South Woodham Ferrers is below sea level and the area in the north-west of SWF around the Whalebone pub area has had flooding arising from the North of the town. Can you guarantee that any development in that area will not increase this risk?
7.335	PS236	961834	Mr Kevin Green			No		•	•	•	No	The rail infrastructure does not meet the needs of the town and does not support sustainable growth.
7.335	PS22	1092786	Mr Alan Samson			No		•	•			The existing rail infrastructure does not meet the current needs of the town and does not support sustainable growth. It needs to be significantly upgraded.
7.335	PS59	1151727	Mrs Pauline Sherwood			No		•	•			Concern for train provision, GP provision, dental provision, flood risk.
7.335	PS90	1074144	Mr Raymond Avis			No		•	•	•		Concern for rail provision
7.335	PS121	1152533	Ms Sophie Avis			No		•	•	•		Concern for rail provision
7.335	PS102	1075729	Mrs Karen Avis			No		•	•			Concern for rail provision
7.335	PS157	1152451	Mr Paul Brunsdon			No		•				Plan is not sound because it is not justified.
7.335	PS181	1096586	Mr & Mrs Stephen & Lesley Dearing				•					Existing ditches, kerbs and drains are not cleared of weeds and debris. There is no evidence of adequate drainage being put in. The construction of further dwellings will take away what little natural drainage that exists.
7.335	PS202	1093143	Mr David Pepper			No			•			Train service does not meet towns needs. Access to town centre and other facilities will be difficult.
7.335	PS286	965054	Mr Paul James			No		•	•		No	The Rail service would need to be significantly upgraded to meet the needs of the new development and existing town with extra trains providing a more frequent service. The extra capacity needs to be through to Liverpool Street, not just to Wickford, as that merely moves the issue
7.335	PS302	1074872	Mrs Donna Eley	No		No	•		•	•	No	Rail infrastructure is not sufficient and will not support sustainable growth.
7.335	PS336	1154920	Mr Charles Belgrave			No		•	•	•		Concern for rail provision. Rail service needs improvement to be sufficient for development.
7.335	PS354	1093079	Mrs Tracy Belgrave			No		•	•	•		Concern for rail provision. Current train service cannot cope with development.
7.335	PS397	1096111	Mrs Louise Clarke									no increase to rail services or public parking will negatively impact on the area.
7.335	PS404	1096116	Mr Denzil Clarke									Rail services need to be improved & increased, if more houses built. So too, improved pulic car parking needed with more houses.
7.335	PS387	1075572	Mr David Rey			No		•	•	•		Real service needs of a significant rail upgrade.
7.335	PS419	1097312	Mr Kenneth Gray			No		•	•	•		Concern for rail provision. Train service needs to be significantly upgraded to support new development
7.335	PS444	1155148	Mr Jack Avis			No		•	•	•		Concern for rail provision. Rail service needs significant upgrades to support development.
7.335	PS432	1097313	Mrs Fiona Gray			No		•	•			Concern for rail provision. Rail service needs significant upgrades to support development
7.335	PS458	1092909	Mrs Susan Eysers			No		•	•	•		Concern for rail provision. Rail service needs significant upgrades to support development
7.335	PS492	1097710	Mr Stephen Eley			No		•	•	•		Concern for rail provision. Rail service would need to be significantly upgraded to meet the needs of the new development
7.335	PS634	1095423	Mr & Mrs Andrew & Maureen Moore									Concern for train provision in SWF.
7.335	PS660	1155937	Mr Kenneth Purcell	No	No	No					No	Chelmsford City Council has not listened to previous objections raised. Parts of the plan contravene the NPPF. The doctor's surgeries that remain in are already at breaking point as two of five were shut down, hence the ones that still survive having to take on a massive amount of extra patients.
7.335	PS661	1155937	Mr Kenneth Purcell	No	No	No					No	Chelmsford City Council has not listened to previous objections raised. Parts of the plan contravene the NPPF. Trains are already at capacity with streets around the station and King Edwards Road used as a short and long stay car park. The infrastructure improvements planned will not support sustainable growth.
7.335	PS701	1155000	Mrs Claire Thorogood			No	•	•	•			The site is divided from the local services and facilities by the B1012. Consider re-routing the B1012 which will make it easier to transit via South Woodham Ferrers from the Dengie Peninsula and also provide safe cycle, footpath and public transport locally as a connection between the existing township and new proposed development.
7.335	PS716	1156537	Mr Colin Reynolds			No			•		No	The plan needs to include an assessment of the South-minster branch line and the impact of the new development on that critical service. Sufficient capacity should be in place to deal with peak flow of rail travellers.
7.335	PS851	1075831	South Woodham Action Group			No		•	•	•	Yes	Concern for rail provision. The Rail service would need to be significantly upgraded to meet the needs of the new development and existing town

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
7.335	PS949	1074846	Miss Leanne Moore	No		No		•	•	•		The train service and station parking provided is already inadequate to service the current passenger numbers at peak times let alone more homes.
7.335	PS952	1074846	Miss Leanne Moore			No		•	•	•		Trains as well as other community services in SWF are already inadequate. Guarantees should be obtained that peak time train service provision is increased and improved prior to additional dwellings being built.
7.335	PS1006	1096512	Mrs Margaret Dean									The trains are so crowded and in frequent that this also would be unbearable with extra people
7.335	PS1013	1093915	Mr Richard Dean									The trains are so crowded and in frequent that this also would be unbearable with extra people
7.335	PS1082	1075988	Mrs Alisa Abbott			No		•	•	•		Concern for rail provision. The Rail service would need to be significantly upgraded to meet the needs of the new development
7.335	PS1184	1097330	Mr Kyle Jannece									Concern for rail provision. The Rail service would need to be significantly upgraded to meet the needs of the new development and existing town with extra trains providing a more frequent service.
7.335	PS1362	1157284	Mr Daniel Baker			No		•	•	•		Concern for rail provision. The Rail service would need to be significantly upgraded to meet the needs of the new development and existing town with extra trains providing a more frequent service.
7.336	PS237	961834	Mr Kevin Green			No	•	•	•	•	No	Town will be split by B1012. Concern for pedestrian safety crossing B1012. Outer ring road should be built.
7.336	PS23	1092786	Mr Alan Samson			No		•	•			Burnham Road will be very dangerous to cross especially for children, young families and the elderly. A new outer ring road would be the best option.
7.336	PS91	1074144	Mr Raymond Avis			No	•	•	•	•		Concern for pedestrian safety around B1012
7.336	PS69	965080	Mr Jonathan Fairclough			No	•	•	•			Concern for pedestrian safety (particularly children) crossing Burnham Road, and concern that if crossing points are put in this will cause grid lock.
7.336	PS122	1152533	Ms Sophie Avis			No	•	•	•	•		Safety concerns for pedestrians around B1012 particularly children, elderly and those accessing health facilities.
7.336	PS103	1075729	Mrs Karen Avis			No	•	•	•	•		Concern for pedestrian safety around B1012 - especially children, elderly and those trying to access health facilities.
7.336	PS158	1152451	Mr Paul Brunsdon			No		•				Plan is not sound because it is not justified.
7.336	PS221	1151302	Mr Simon Moss	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	The proposed foot bridge crossing (by Bushy Hill) would by law have to be suitable for the passage of horses since the existing Rights of Way crossing point is a designated bridleway (see attached maps). The Council has to be able to demonstrate how an elevated crossing suitable for horses, cyclists and walkers could be constructed in this limited space retaining privacy and protecting amenity for nearby properties. The Local Plan does not show the correct classification for this Right of Way designation and states nothing about declassifying the current designation. This would have to go via the Secretary of State and be subject to public consultation. A northern bypass is the solution. Daily residential movements can be effectively encouraged with more sustainable transport methods adopted. A sequence of maps are attached defining predictions of how traffic would pan out over the course of time with latter added restrictions imposed to try and control uncontrolled commuter routes.
7.336	PS287	965054	Mr Paul James			No		•	•	•	No	The Rail service would need to be significantly upgraded to meet the needs of the new development and existing town with extra trains providing a more frequent service.
7.336	PS288	965054	Mr Paul James			No	•	•	•	•	No	Plan will divide SWF into two. An outer ring road should be built. Concern for pedestrian safety crossing B1012. SWF is a small town in a rural area with few links by public transport especially bus. The park and ride service penalises car sharing by charging per person rather per car, making it cheaper to drive and park in the city centre. There is no direct bus service to the Dengie and its villages - plan should provide a comprehensive bus service to Wickford, Chelmsford and the towns and villages on the Dengie.
7.336	PS303	1074872	Mrs Donna Eley	No		No	•	•	•	•	No	Town will be split by B1012. An outer ring road should be built. Concern for pedestrian safety crossing the B1012. The park and ride service currently does not encourage use by multiple people in a car, charging per person rather than per car, making it cheaper to drive and park in the city centre. Provide a comprehensive bus service to Wickford, Chelmsford and the towns and villages on the Dengie.
7.336	PS337	1154920	Mr Charles Belgrave			No	•	•	•	•		Town will be split by B1012. Concern for pedestrian safety crossing B1012. SWF has few good public transport links - there is no direct bus service to the Dengie and its villages. Suggest a new outer ring road and provide a comprehensive bus service.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
7.336	PS355	1093079	Mrs Tracy Belgrave			No	•	•	•	•		Town will be split by B1012. Build an outer ring road. Concern for pedestrian safety. SWF has few public transport links. Theres no direct bus service to Dengie and surrounding villages. Suggest providing a comprehensive bus service to SWF.
7.336	PS344	361537	Mr Mike Otter	No		No		•	•	•		Include provision of a suitable safe crossing point over the B1012 to the West of the B1418.
7.336	PS369	1154967	Mrs Dawn James			No		•	•	•		Concern for train provision. Rail service needs significantly upgrading.
7.336	PS396	1096111	Mrs Louise Clarke									traffic volume are already on the limit at peak times. Additional roundabout & crossing will adversely affect the situatio.
7.336	PS398	1096111	Mrs Louise Clarke									no increase to rail services or public parking will negatively impact on the area.
7.336	PS403	1096116	Mr Denzil Clarke									It is already very difficult because of queueing traffic , to get in & out of SWF & to add another roundabout & crossing would cause chaos.
7.336	PS405	1096116	Mr Denzil Clarke									Rail services need to be improved & increased, if more houses built. So too, improved pulic car parking needed with more houses.
7.336	PS388	1075572	Mr David Rey			No	•	•	•	•		The split by the B1012 and its hazardous and dangerous repercussions as mentioned before. Bus routes are already unsatisfactory and no adequate expansion of the services have been planned.
7.336	PS420	1097312	Mr Kenneth Gray			No	•	•	•	•		Town will be divided by B1012. Concern for pedestrian safety crossing the B1012. A ring road is needed.
7.336	PS445	1155148	Mr Jack Avis			No	•	•	•	•		Town will be split by B1012. Concern for pedestrian safety crossing B1012. A new outer ring road should be built.
7.336	PS433	1097313	Mrs Fiona Gray			No	•	•	•	•		Town will be split by B1012. Concern for pedestrian safety crossing B1012. Need an outer ring road.
7.336	PS459	1092909	Mrs Susan Eysers			No	•	•	•	•		Town will be split by B1012. New outer ring road needs to be built. Concern for pedestrian safety crossing the B1012. There is no direct bus service to the Dengie and its villages. Suggest providing a comprehensive bus service to Wickford, Chelmsford and the towns and villages on the Dengie.
7.336	PS493	1097710	Mr Stephen Eley			No	•	•	•	•		Town will be split by B1012. Build an outer ring road. Concern for pedestrian safety crossing B1012. Suggest providing a comprehensive bus service to Wickford, Chelmsford and the towns and villages on the Dengie.
7.336	PS702	1155000	Mrs Claire Thorogood			No	•	•	•			Consider re-routing the B1012 which will make it easier to transit via South Woodham Ferrers from the Dengie Peninsula and also provide safe cycle, footpath and public transport locally as a connection between the existing township and new proposed development. This cannot be left to the developer.
7.336	PS852	1075831	South Woodham Action Group			No	•	•	•	•	Yes	Town will be split by B1012. A new outer ring road should be built. Concern for pedestrian safety crossing the B1012 - particularly children and the elderly.
7.336	PS862	961966	Mr Alan Brunning	No		No	•		•	•		The section must (but doesn't) discuss the problem of 2 towns with poor pedestrian access across the B1012. Elsewhere in the document is describes easy movement of pedestrians / cyclists from N to South but does not provide any viable solutions. Submission does not give any solution to the fact that the B1012 will be retained and cut the town in two It cannot be an integrated community with the plan as written. The roads/rail are at capacity. This is not a sustainable development
7.336	PS1072	1156559	Pauline Gilmore			No			•		No	Burnham Road will separate/divide the new development from the rest of the town and will not enable the two parts to integrate. Plan should divert the Burnham Road to the north of the development.
7.336	PS1084	1075988	Mrs Alisa Abbott			No	•	•	•	•		Town will be split by B1012. Build an outer ring road. Concern for pedestrian safety crossing B1012. CCC should provide a comprehensive bus service to Wickford, Chelmsford and the towns and villages on the Dengie.
7.336	PS1185	1097330	Mr Kyle Jannece									Town will be split by B1012. A new ring road should be built. Concern for pedestrian safety crossing the B1012. Provide a comprehensive bus service to Wickford, Chelmsford and the towns and villages on the Dengie.
7.336	PS1364	1157284	Mr Daniel Baker			No	•	•	•	•		Town will be split by B1012. A ring road should be built. Concern for pedestrian safety crossing B1012. CCC provide a comprehensive bus service to Wickford, Chelmsford and the towns and villages on the Dengie.
7.336	PS1460	1095858	Mr John Gable									How can safe crossing of Burnham Road be effected. There is not sufficient space for a bridge on the southern side and any crossing with traffic lights will cause delays on a major road through to the Dengie.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
7.336	PS1500	1158433	Mr & Mrs Jeffery									How can safe crossing of Burnham Road be effected. There is not sufficient space for a bridge on the southern side and any crossing with traffic lights will cause delays on a major road through to the Dengie.
7.337	PS11	1151466	Mrs Joanne Cooper			No	•					Concerned that the building a new part of town on the other side of Burnham Road will increase the risk of road accidents with people trying to cross in other places than the crossing points. More than one crossing point would have a significant impact on the traffic flow at peak times with the consequence of drivers cutting through local villages. A safer and workable plan would be to divert the road around the northern boundary of the development.
7.337	PS159	1152451	Mr Paul Brunsdon			No		•				Plan is not sound because it is not justified.
7.337	PS189	1153314	Mr P Cooper			No		•				Concern for traffic volume, rail provision, parking provision. Oppose travelling show people site allocation.
7.337	PS310	1074872	Mrs Donna Eley			No	•	•	•	•	No	Plan split by B1012. Consider building outer ring road. Concern for pedestrian safety crossing the B1012. There should be at least 6 crossing points across the B1012 and B1418 as follows: 1. By Shaw Farm roundabout 2. By Hullbridge Road 3. At the base of Bushey Hill 4. By the Hamberts Road roundabout 5. Across the B1012 to the Garden of Remembrance 6. Across the B1418 A new footpath will be required, extending along the length of the development, from the BP garage at Shaw Farm roundabout along to Compass Gardens.
7.337	PS370	1154967	Mrs Dawn James			No						Paragraph 7.337 is not sound.
7.337	PS865	961966	Mr Alan Brunning				•		•	•		The section must (but doesn't) discuss the problem of 2 towns with poor pedestrian access across the B1012. Elsewhere in the document is describes easy movement of pedestrians / cyclists from N to South but does not provide any viable solutions. Submission does not give any solution to the fact that the B1012 will be retained and cut the town in two It cannot be an integrated community with the plan as written. The roads/rail are at capacity. This is not a sustainable development
7.338	PS70	965080	Mr Jonathan Fairclough			No	•	•	•			There is no evidence that reducing land for car parking reduces car ownership - it just creates crowded and dangerous roads. The plan needs to properly consider the infrastructure of SWF and the implications of another 1000 homes and their cars.
7.338	PS160	1152451	Mr Paul Brunsdon			No		•				Plan is not sound because it is not justified.
7.338	PS256	1154483	Mrs Carole Green			No		•	•	•		Town will be split by B1012. Concern for pedestrian safety crossing B1012. Outer ring road should be built. A comprehensive bus service should be provided to Wickford, Chelmsford and the towns and villages on the Dengie
7.338	PS289	965054	Mr Paul James			No	•	•	•	•	No	Concern town will be split. Concern for pedestrian safety crossing B1012.. An outer ring road should be built. SWF is a small town in a rural area with few links by public transport especially bus. The park and ride service penalises car sharing by charging per person rather per car, making it cheaper to drive and park in the city centre. There is no direct bus service to the Dengie and its villages - plan should provide a comprehensive bus service to Wickford, Chelmsford and the towns and villages on the Dengie.
7.338	PS372	1154967	Mrs Dawn James			No		•	•			Town will be divided by B1012. Concern for pedestrian safety crossing B1012. A ring road is needed. Provide a comprehensive bus service to Wickford, Chelmsford and the towns and villages on the Dengie.
7.338	PS703	1155000	Mrs Claire Thorogood		No	No	•	•	•			Residents of the Dengie Peninsula and South Woodham Ferrers are limited by the choices in public transport such as the cost of car parking at South Woodham Ferrers Railway Station which is the same for peak and off peak parking providing no incentive to the public changing their commuting travel times. This has contributed to a very large number of vehicles transiting South Woodham Ferrers via the B1012 towards London.
7.338	PS743	966249	Mr Stephen Hook	Yes	Yes	No		•	•			A car club and public transport will not be sufficient. There will be increased car ownership in the area and a bypass north of SWF is required.
7.338	PS1282	1157173	Mr Barry Parker			No	•		•		No	Travel and access planning should be based on clearly defined and deliverable infrastructure, that is geared to the provision of enhanced and effective transportation rather than more spurious options. Car clubs are not applicable to SWF.
7.339	PS238	961834	Mr Kevin Green			No		•	•		No	The plan for SWF needs to be infrastructure led like Strat. Growth Site 4.
7.339	PS10	1151466	Mrs Joanne Cooper			No	•					The local roads are already at capacity at peak times including Sadler's Farm roundabout. Adding 1000 new homes with only 'possible' road infrastructure improvements does not meet the needs of the town, or support sustainable growth.



Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
7.339	PS24	1092786	Mr Alan Samson			No		•	•			The plan for South Woodham Ferrers needs to be infrastructure led like Strategic Growth Site 4 and new surveys should be carried out to see the congestion.
7.339	PS63	1092842	Mr Noel Taylor	No		No			•			Local infrastructure is not being upgraded consistent with the level of population increase.
7.339	PS92	1074144	Mr Raymond Avis			No		•	•			Concern that development is not "infrastructure led" like Strategic Growth Site 4.
7.339	PS118	1152533	Ms Sophie Avis			No		•	•			Concern for congestion. Concern that SWF development is not "infrastructure led" in contrast to Strategic Growth Site 4.
7.339	PS104	1075729	Mrs Karen Avis			No		•	•			Concern that development is not "infrastructure led" like Strategic Growth Site 4 is.
7.339	PS161	1152451	Mr Paul Brunsdon			No		•				Plan is not sound because it is not justified.
7.339	PS206	1093143	Mr David Pepper			No	•					Inappropriate to hide behind words like "must be mitigated". Detail of the way in which, without investment in Infrastructure, the traffic hiatus will be mitigated.
7.339	PS257	1154483	Mrs Carole Green			No		•	•			The plan for SWF needs to be infrastructure led like Strategic Growth Site 4.
7.339	PS304	1074872	Mrs Donna Eley			No	•	•			No	The plan for SWF needs to be infrastructure led like Strategic Growth Site 4. A comprehensive public transport service to Wickford, Chelmsford and the Dengie needs to be developed.
7.339	PS291	965054	Mr Paul James			No		•	•		No	Concern that SWF development is not infrastructure led like Strategic Growth Site 4.
7.339	PS338	1154920	Mr Charles Belgrave			No		•	•			Plan for SWF needs to be infrastructure led like Strategic Growth Site 4
7.339	PS377	1093079	Mrs Tracy Belgrave			No		•	•			Plan needs to be infrastructure led for SWF like it is for Strategic Growth Site 4.
7.339	PS345	361537	Mr Mike Otter	No			•	•	•	•	No	Proposed scheme will negatively impact on existing residents on Willow Grove due to increased vehicle traffic and associated noise/ pollution.Steps that would mitigate this have not been included. Ensure that new development is not accessed from Willow Grove or provide speed reduction/ traffic calming to Willow Grove. Redirect traffic to new development away from Willow Grove.
7.339	PS373	1154967	Mrs Dawn James			No		•	•			Plan needs to be infrastructure led like Strategic Growth Site 4 is.
7.339	PS395	1096111	Mrs Louise Clarke									traffic volume are already on the limit at peak times. Additional roundabout & crossing will adversely affect the situatio.
7.339	PS402	1096116	Mr Denzil Clarke									It is already very difficult because of queueing traffic , to get in & out of SWF & to add another roundabout & crossing would cause chaos.
7.339	PS389	1075572	Mr David Rey			No		•	•			Need of a dual carriageway on the A132. The plan for SWF needs to be infrastructure led.
7.339	PS421	1097312	Mr Kenneth Gray			No		•	•			The plan for SWF needs to be infrastructure led like Strategic Growth Site 4
7.339	PS446	1155148	Mr Jack Avis			No		•	•			Development for SWF needs to be infrastructure led like it is for Strategic Growth Site 4.
7.339	PS434	1097313	Mrs Fiona Gray			No		•	•			Development at SWF needs to be infrastructure led like Strategic Growth Site 4.
7.339	PS460	1092909	Mrs Susan Evers			No		•	•			Plan for SWF needs to be infrastructure led like Strategic Growth Site 4 is.
7.339	PS494	1097710	Mr Stephen Eley			No		•	•			SWF needs to be infrastructure led like Strategic Growth Site 4 is. A comprehensive public transport service to Wickford, Chelmsford and the Dengie needs to be developed.
7.339	PS633	1095423	Mr & Mrs Andrew & Maureen Moore									We are very concerned that the A132 and B1012 that lead to and past South Woodham Ferrers will be become even more congested and will result in severe delays at peak travelling times. The additional housing will intensify the amount of traffic and the additional junctions, crossings, roundabouts are likely to slow transit times significantly.
7.339	PS704	1155000	Mrs Claire Thorogood		No	No	•	•	•			Further correlation with the Maldon LDP encompassing housing growth in the Dengie Peninsula is essential as well as further traffic flow studies at more relevant times. Also consider re-routing the B1012 Burnham Road.
7.339	PS714	1156537	Mr Colin Reynolds	Yes		No	•	•	•		No	The plan lacks an evidence based assessment on the impact on the strategic road network and there is no positive commitment to alter the existing road network. The A132 is a strategic key route often operated beyond its capacity with no flexibility to deal with emergencies.
7.339	PS723	1096368	Mr Gary Brown	No		No		•	•		No	The proposed road infrastructure improvements do not meet the needs of the town. The proposed improvements to local and road infrastructure are in total contrast to what is proposed at Strategic Growth Site 4 which is infrastructure led.
7.339	PS732	1153391	Mr Colin Stroud			No	•	•	•	•	No	Insufficient road improvements in the area to accommodate the proposed growth of SWF and from Maldon.
7.339	PS821	961966	Mr Alan Brunning			No	•		•			The capacity improvements included in appendix H are trivial and will in one case slow down the traffic on the B1012. The traffic survey shows the road at capacity and well about the max quoted in DMRB standards. These are the only 2 'improvements for SWF. In addition the proposal is to feed traffic from the new estate into the B1012 at the old Wickford roundabout. The fact that this traffic will have priority at the roundabout and will increase congestion on the B1012 is totally ignored. This is not a sustainable development

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
7.339	PS854	1075831	South Woodham Action Group			No		•	•		Yes	The plan for SWF needs to be infrastructure led like Strategic Growth Site 4.
7.339	PS887	1156755	East Hanningfield Parish Council			No			•			There needs to be a commitment to practical measures to discourage commuters using the villages of East Hanningfield, Bicknace and Woodham Ferrers as short cuts to the A12 and Chelmsford.
7.339	PS1004	1096512	Mrs Margaret Dean									A132 is already very busy and additional housing will add to this.
7.339	PS1024	1156972	Mr C A Rose									Traffic using A132 between SWF and Rettendon Turnpike. Concern about the access to Hayes Country Park, with 280 residential park homes. Have carried out their own survey on car movements onto A132 and pedestrian movements. Many people walk to pub/restaurant on other side of A132, but no lighting or pedestrian crossing makes this dangerous. A132 should be increased to a dual carriageway, and the junction of the pub/restaurant and Hayes Country Park should have street lighting and a pedestrian crossing. A No Right Turn Sign, Slip Road Lane into the West Bound traffic from Hayes Country Park, Local Street Lighting and a crossing would be a start.
7.339	PS1028	1156981	Mrs Rose									Traffic using A132 between SWF and Rettendon Turnpike. Concern about the access to Hayes Country Park, with 280 residential park homes. Have carried out their own survey on car movements onto A132 and pedestrian movements. Many people walk to pub/restaurant on other side of A132, but no lighting or pedestrian crossing makes this dangerous. A132 should be increased to a dual carriageway, and the junction of the pub/restaurant and Hayes Country Park should have street lighting and a pedestrian crossing. A No Right Turn Sign, Slip Road Lane into the West Bound traffic from Hayes Country Park, Local Street Lighting and a crossing would be a start.
7.339	PS1012	1093915	Mr Richard Dean									A132 is already very busy and additional housing will add to this.
7.339	PS1085	1075988	Mrs Alisa Abbott			No		•	•			Concern for congestion. Plan for SWF should be infrastructure led like Strategic Growth Site 4 is.
7.339	PS1067	1157055	Mr Phil Barnett	Yes	Yes	No			•		No	Cars provide the majority of transport needs and will continue to do so. Need to consider car park spaces to avoid the current situation as avoiding car parking will just make the roads more crowded and impact on safety. Viability of car clubs need to be considered.
7.339	PS1186	1097330	Mr Kyle Jannece			No		•	•			Plan for SWF needs to be infrastructure led like Strategic Growth Site 4 is.
7.339	PS1365	1157284	Mr Daniel Baker			No		•	•			Plan for SWF should be infrastructure led like Strategic Growth Site 4 is.
7.339	PS1376	1157321	Mrs Linda Hart									Traffic using A132 between SWF and Rettendon Turnpike. Concern about the access to Hayes Country Park, with 280 residential park homes. Have carried out their own survey on car movements onto A132 and pedestrian movements. Many people walk to pub/restaurant on other side of A132, but no lighting or pedestrian crossing makes this dangerous. A132 should be increased to a dual carriageway, and the junction of the pub/restaurant and Hayes Country Park should have street lighting and a pedestrian crossing. A No Right Turn Sign, Slip Road Lane into the West Bound traffic from Hayes Country Park, Local Street Lighting and a crossing would be a start.
7.339	PS1379	1156472	Mrs Christine Rowland									Traffic using A132 between SWF and Rettendon Turnpike. Concern about the access to Hayes Country Park, with 280 residential park homes. Have carried out their own survey on car movements onto A132 and pedestrian movements. Many people walk to pub/restaurant on other side of A132, but no lighting or pedestrian crossing makes this dangerous. A132 should be increased to a dual carriageway, and the junction of the pub/restaurant and Hayes Country Park should have street lighting and a pedestrian crossing. A No Right Turn Sign, Slip Road Lane into the West Bound traffic from Hayes Country Park, Local Street Lighting and a crossing would be a start.
7.339	PS1387	1157361	Mr & Mrs K Petty									Traffic using A132 between SWF and Rettendon Turnpike. Concern about the access to Hayes Country Park, with 280 residential park homes. Have carried out their own survey on car movements onto A132 and pedestrian movements. Many people walk to pub/restaurant on other side of A132, but no lighting or pedestrian crossing makes this dangerous. A132 should be increased to a dual carriageway, and the junction of the pub/restaurant and Hayes Country Park should have street lighting and a pedestrian crossing. A No Right Turn Sign, Slip Road Lane into the West Bound traffic from Hayes Country Park, Local Street Lighting and a crossing would be a start.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
7.339	PS1381	1157330	Mr & Mrs B Scammell									Traffic using A132 between SWF and Rettendon Turnpike. Concern about the access to Hayes Country Park, with 280 residential park homes. Have carried out their own survey on car movements onto A132 and pedestrian movements. Many people walk to pub/restaurant on other side of A132, but no lighting or pedestrian crossing makes this dangerous. A132 should be increased to a dual carriageway, and the junction of the pub/restaurant and Hayes Country Park should have street lighting and a pedestrian crossing. A No Right Turn Sign, Slip Road Lane into the West Bound traffic from Hayes Country Park, Local Street Lighting and a crossing would be a start.
7.339	PS1389	1157373	Mr Mike Horan									Traffic using A132 between SWF and Rettendon Turnpike. Concern about the access to Hayes Country Park, with 280 residential park homes. Have carried out their own survey on car movements onto A132 and pedestrian movements. Many people walk to pub/restaurant on other side of A132, but no lighting or pedestrian crossing makes this dangerous. A132 should be increased to a dual carriageway, and the junction of the pub/restaurant and Hayes Country Park should have street lighting and a pedestrian crossing. A No Right Turn Sign, Slip Road Lane into the West Bound traffic from Hayes Country Park, Local Street Lighting and a crossing would be a start. A workable economic solution should be found for traffic calming.
7.339	PS1461	1095858	Mr John Gable									A major opportunity will be missed to improve the links in this part of Essex to Maldon and the Dengie. Any through road should be sited north of the proposed development and adjacent planning areas should get together to find an effective long term solution to road access in this part of Essex.
7.339	PS1501	1158433	Mr & Mrs Jeffery									A major opportunity will be missed to improve the links in this part of Essex to Maldon and the Dengie. Any through road should be sited north of the proposed development and adjacent planning areas should get together to find an effective long term solution to road access in this part of Essex.
7.339	PS1508	1158528	G Cashmore-Thorley									Traffic using A132 between SWF and Rettendon Turnpike. Concern about the access to Hayes Country Park, with 280 residential park homes. Have carried out their own survey on car movements onto A132 and pedestrian movements. Many people walk to pub/restaurant on other side of A132, but no lighting or pedestrian crossing makes this dangerous. A132 should be increased to a dual carriageway, and the junction of the pub/restaurant and Hayes Country Park should have street lighting and a pedestrian crossing. A No Right Turn Sign, Slip Road Lane into the West Bound traffic from Hayes Country Park, Local Street Lighting and a crossing would be a start.
7.339	PS1510	1158540	Margaret Meech									Traffic using A132 between SWF and Rettendon Turnpike. Concern about the access to Hayes Country Park, with 280 residential park homes. Have carried out their own survey on car movements onto A132 and pedestrian movements. Many people walk to pub/restaurant on other side of A132, but no lighting or pedestrian crossing makes this dangerous. A132 should be increased to a dual carriageway, and the junction of the pub/restaurant and Hayes Country Park should have street lighting and a pedestrian crossing. A No Right Turn Sign, Slip Road Lane into the West Bound traffic from Hayes Country Park, Local Street Lighting and a crossing would be a start.
7.340	PS162	1152451	Mr Paul Brunsdon			No		•				Plan is not sound because it is not justified.
7.340	PS305	1074872	Mrs Donna Eley	No		No	•	•	•	•	No	Plan is not compliant with NPPF with regard to protection of wildlife on Bushy Hill.
7.340	PS495	1097710	Mr Stephen Eley			No	•	•	•	•		Plan does not comply with parts of the NPPF in regards to preservation and protection of priority species. Plan does not identify or explain how ancient woodland and protective species will be protected & considered
7.340	PS587	1096002	Basildon Borough Council									7.340 of the Pre-Submission Document sets out that 'Impacts of development in the adjoining Maldon District' need to be considered. BBC is disappointed that the same regard has not been given to the impacts of development in Basildon Borough. BBC seek the same consideration given to Maldon, and therefore objects, and requests the necessary modification is made to the LP.
7.340	PS705	1155000	Mrs Claire Thorogood			No	•	•	•			Impacts on the River Crouch by development in adjoining districts also need to be part of this consideration. The proposal for South Woodham Ferrers means the town will eventually be built up to and including its parish boundary. Open spaces for recreational use will have to be sought from adjoining districts. Rochford's Issue and Options Document states that: 'The Council will only support options proposed that will protect and conserve the River Crouch and its unique assets.'
7.340	PS1063	1157055	Mr Phil Barnett	Yes	Yes	No			•		No	The development will impact the roads and junctions as cannot be accommodated in the existing road structures. Suggests that prior to development the road infrastructure is increased.
7.341	PS163	1152451	Mr Paul Brunsdon			No		•				Plan is not sound because it is not justified.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
7.342	PS164	1152451	Mr Paul Brunsdon			No		•				Plan is not sound because it is not justified.
7.342	PS307	1074872	Mrs Donna Eley	No		No	•			•	No	The NPPF section 12.132 states " heritage assets are irreplaceable". There are six Grade 2 listed buildings between 16 metres and 500 metres of the proposed site. Fully consider the impact of this development on the listed properties and their surroundings.
7.342	PS496	1097710	Mr Stephen Eley			No		•	•			Plan needs to fully consider the impact of this development on the listed properties and their surroundings.
7.342	PS718	1155000	Mrs Claire Thorogood		No	No	•	•	•			There are six Grade 2 listed buildings between 16 metres and 500 metres of the proposed site. To mitigate any impact on the listed buildings and their settings is paramount. There needs to be plans showing how these important buildings will play their part in any development extending to the sale of the ex Radar Station.
7.343	PS239	961834	Mr Kevin Green					•	•		No	The pylons need to be removed. If not, the site is not suitable for development. Concern for health risks associated with pylons.
7.343	PS15	1092786	Mr Alan Samson			No		•	•			If the pylons are not going to be removed they will present a significant health risk.
7.343	PS93	1074144	Mr Raymond Avis			No		•	•			Concern that not removing the pylons will pose health risks
7.343	PS119	1152533	Ms Sophie Avis			No		•	•			Concern that not removing the pylons poses as a health risk
7.343	PS105	1075729	Mrs Karen Avis			No		•	•			Concern that not removing pylons will pose as a health risk.
7.343	PS165	1152451	Mr Paul Brunsdon			No		•				Plan is not sound because it is not justified.
7.343	PS207	1093143	Mr David Pepper			No			•			The present Town predominately has Utility facilities (including power lines and gas mains) underground.
7.343	PS308	1074872	Mrs Donna Eley			No	•	•	•		No	Remove the pylons and ensure a radiation survey is conducted to ensure the site is safe for development.
7.343	PS422	1097312	Mr Kenneth Gray			No		•	•			Concern for health risks associated with pylons. The pylons need to be removed. If not, the site is not suitable for development.
7.343	PS447	1155148	Mr Jack Avis			No		•	•			Concern for health risks associated with pylons. The pylons need to be removed. If not, the site is not suitable for development
7.343	PS435	1097313	Mrs Fiona Gray			No		•	•			Concern for health risks associated with pylons. The pylons need to be removed. If not, the site is not suitable for development.
7.343	PS497	1097710	Mr Stephen Eley			No		•	•			Concern for health risks associated with pylons. The pylons need to be removed. If not, the site is not suitable for development. A full radiation survey needs to be commissioned to ensure the site is safe for new and existing residents.
7.343	PS717	1155000	Mrs Claire Thorogood	No	No	No	•	•	•	•		The site is limited by multiple factors; 1) Its location is poorly thought through in regards to being separate from the existing town by the B1012 hence appropriate connectivity cannot be provided; 2) Lack of properly planned infrastructure with limited ability to increase train services; 3) Existing utility infrastructure will inhibit the natural spread of the development; 4) The sites' prominent elevation above the existing town and the limitations of the utility structures do not provide potential to create a 'high quality' development with 'connected layout' but potentially only provide for high density pockets of mixed development. Safeguarding the grade II buildings on site is of utmost importance.
7.343	PS724	1096368	Mr Gary Brown	No	No	No		•	•	•	No	Sixteen years ago, the Borough Council proposed a similar development in the same location. One reason that defeated the proposal was the huge cost of the removal of the pylons making the proposed development unfeasible. It the pylons are remaining, they may present a health risk along with the radar dishes at Bushy Hill. A full radiation survey should be commissioned to ensure there is no risk to health for new and existing residents
7.343	PS855	1075831	South Woodham Action Group			No		•	•		Yes	Concern for health risks associated with pylons. The pylons need to be removed to confirm they will not be used in the future. If not, the site is not suitable for development.
7.344	PS166	1152451	Mr Paul Brunsdon			No		•				Plan is not sound because it is not justified.
7.344	PS258	1154483	Mrs Carole Green			No		•	•			The pylons need to be removed. If not, the site is not suitable for development. Concern for health risks to residents from not removing the pylons.
7.344	PS292	965054	Mr Paul James			No		•	•		No	The pylons need to be removed. If not, by the councils own guidelines the site is not suitable for development.
7.344	PS339	1154920	Mr Charles Belgrave			No		•	•			Concern for health risks associated with pylons.
7.344	PS378	1093079	Mrs Tracy Belgrave			No		•	•			Concern for health risks associated with pylons. Suggest removing the pylons.
7.344	PS374	1154967	Mrs Dawn James			No		•	•			Concern for health risks associated with pylons. The pylons need to be removed. If not, the site is not suitable for development.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
7.344	PS390	1075572	Mr David Rey			No		•	•			The pylons need to be removed. If not, the site is not suitable for development.
7.344	PS461	1092909	Mrs Susan Eysers			No		•	•			Concern for health risks associated with pylons. The pylons need to be removed. If not, the site is not suitable for development.
7.344	PS1086	1075988	Mrs Alisa Abbott			No		•	•			Concern for health risks associated with pylons. The pylons need to be removed. If not, the site is not suitable for development.
7.344	PS1187	1097330	Mr Kyle Jannece			No		•	•			Concern for health risks associated with pylons. The pylons need to be removed. If not, the site is not suitable for development
7.344	PS1366	1157284	Mr Daniel Baker			No		•	•			Concern for health risks associated with pylons. The pylons need to be removed. If not, the site is not suitable for development.
7.345	PS167	1152451	Mr Paul Brunsdon			No		•				Plan is not sound because it is not justified.
7.345	PS309	1074872	Mrs Donna Eley			No		•	•		No	It is paramount a full archaeological survey of the proposed development is conducted as per NPPF section 11.109 point 1 "protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, geological conservation interests and soils;"
7.345	PS498	1097710	Mr Stephen Eley			No			•	•		It is paramount a full archaeological survey of the proposed development is conducted as per NPPF section 11.109 point 1 "protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, geological conservation interests and soils;"
7.345	PS667	1155000	Mrs Claire Thorogood			No	•	•	•			I completely agree that any archaeological deposits found will need to be considered by future development proposals, through an archaeological evaluation' The proposed development site north of the B1012 is described as the 'Woodham Escarpment' with Bushy Hill in s strategic position overlooking the estuary. There is evidence of historic settlements to the west of the town as well as in other nearby places.
GROWTH SITE 8 – SOUTH OF BICKNACRE	PS1625	1159753	Mr N Halls			No	•	•		•	Yes	Supportive of broad principles of Spatial Strategy. Object to the small number of homes that have been allocated at Bicknacre. Bicknacre is a highly sustainable location, where residents have access to a good level of services and public transport links. It is considered that the village is capable of accommodating a higher level of growth than 30 dwellings. Promoted site north of Peartree Lane should be allocated for development.
GROWTH SITE 8 – SOUTH OF BICKNACRE	PS1788	1160014	Historic England	Yes	Yes							We are pleased to see that the policy has been amended to address our previous comments and that it requires development to consider the setting of the Grade II Star House.
GROWTH SITE 8 – SOUTH OF BICKNACRE	PS1846	962559	Genesis HA	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	Growth site 8 does not represent sustainable development and would fail to provide for a range and mix of housing types. Land to the east of St Giles, Moor Hall Lane, Bicknacre should be allocated for about 100 units, to include extra care and affordable housing.
GROWTH SITE 8 – SOUTH OF BICKNACRE	PS2085	1161039	Natural England		Yes	No					No	Reference to the RAMS is required for Growth Site Policy 8, not just in supporting text. The policy to be amended to specify needs for contributions from developments towards RAMS. The policy to be rewritten to make sure Thriftwood SSSI is protected and enhanced. The entire rep has been attached for completeness (1161039PS-A).
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 9 – DANBURY	PS52	308617	Colonel Eric Boddye									Any further housing in Danbury will lead to traffic congestion. There should be no more homes here without a by-pass in place.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 9 – DANBURY	PS957	1156740	Mr Matthew Ockendon	Yes	Yes	Yes					No	Support Strategic Growth Site 9 which proposes 100 new homes to be accommodated within or adjoining the Key Service Settlement of Danbury. The site to the east of Riffhams Lane and north of Elm Green Lane (submitted to the Danbury Neighbourhood Plan call for sites and also as a SLAA 2018 submission) should be considered as an appropriate site.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 9 – DANBURY	PS1042	1157033	The National Trust			No			•		No	Protected sites (Blake’s Wood including ancient woodland, Lingwood Common and Danbury Common) already receive high levels of footfall with physical damage occurring from visitors deviating from the PROW. Sites will become more vulnerable from cumulative effect of more visits from the proposed allocation. Increased recreational pressure upon land. The Trust is concerned that the identification of site through the emerging Danbury Neighbourhood Plan may result in a delay between the adoption of the Local Plan and the Neighbourhood Plan resulting in speculative planning applications. Without specific sites identified in the Local Plan it may make such applications on unallocated sites harder to resist. Policy to require major residential planning applications in or adjacent to Danbury to undertake a robust assessment (SSSI Impact Assessment) of the impact of the development on the SSSI’s and mitigation measures where appropriate, including taking account of cumulative development and monitoring any impacts post development.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 9 – DANBURY	PS1671	866429	NHS England, Essex Area Team									NHS England would require mitigation for health from this site allocation.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 9 – DANBURY	PS1789	1160014	Historic England	Yes	Yes	No						There does not appear to be any map showing this site allocation as such it is not possible for us to comment. In the absence of a map showing the location and extent of the site this allocation cannot be said to be sound.
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 9 – DANBURY	PS1939	1160458	Hill	Yes	Yes	No			•		Yes	Allocations in Danbury should be of a sufficient size to ensure affordable housing needs are met, such as promoted site. Need mechanism to review situation should the neighbourhood plan be delayed
STRATEGIC GROWTH SITE 9 – DANBURY	PS2086	1161039	Natural England		Yes	No					No	Reference to the RAMS is required for Strategic Growth Site Policy 9, not just in supporting text. The policy to be amended to specify needs for contributions from developments towards RAMS. Strategic Growth Site 9 – Danbury - Unsound A mitigation strategy will be needed for this site once information is available. The policy needs to include reference to the need to address recreational impacts on SSSIs as well as European protected sites. The entire rep has been attached for completeness (1161039PS-A).
7.356	PS1247	1157193	Woodham Walter Parish Council	No							No	Woodham Walter Parish Council should be included as a key stakeholder regarding Woodham Walter Common.
7.360	PS188	1097102	Danbury Parish Council									Pleased that LP identifies that the Danbury Neighbourhood Plan will be allocating the sites for the 100 properties proposed for Danbury between 2021 and 2036. Disappointed that there was no Green Wedge identified between Danbury and Sandon.
7.360	PS581	873463	Mrs Anne Chambers	Yes	Yes	No		•	•		Yes	Oppose defined settlement boundary around Danbury - particularly around Danecroft land. The review which has been carried out to date the boundary in the vicinity of Danecroft, off Woodhill Road, remains illogical & is neither clear, robust, nor pragmatic. Both the policy governing Strategic Growth Site 9 and the accompanying reasoned justification should refer to the fact that site release through the Neighbourhood Plan process should have regard to the issue of settlement boundary definition given that new boundaries will subsist in the longer term.
EXISTING COMMITMENT EC5 – ST GILES, MOOR HALL LANE, BICKNACRE	PS1845	962559	Genesis HA	Yes	Yes	Yes					Yes	Genesis Housing Association supports policy EC5 - existing commitment, St Giles, Moor Hall Lane, Bicknacre. Nevertheless, it is submitted that policy EC5 should be amended to allow for about 50 (not 32) new units. Policy EC5 should also be amended to specifically allow for an extra care scheme.
7.367	PS1258	1157165	Rosehart Properties LTd	Yes	Yes	No		•			Yes	A new policy should be added below paragraph 7.367 to identify all of the functional employment parts of the BAE Site as an additional 'Special Policy Area'. This will ensure that paragraph 7.367 (and the Special Policy Areas subsection in the Local Plan generally) is justified (i.e. the most appropriate strategy when considered against the reasonable alternatives).
7.367	PS1332	1157251	Chelmsford Civic Society			No		•	•		Yes	To reinforce the VISION and ensure that STRATEGIC PRIORITY 9 ('Capital of Essex') we note that the OMISSION of any special reference to the West End or the City Centre as an area where arts, cultural or creative activities should take place makes the VISION unsound. See rep for suggested text amendment.
POLICY SPA1 – BROOMFIELD HOSPITAL SPECIAL POLICY AREA	PS1250	1157071	Bloor Homes Eastern	Yes	Yes	No		•	•		Yes	Amend policy to remove the need for Site 6 to provide the access road across the hospital site, but for the SPA1 area to provide the road within its site.
POLICY SPA1 – BROOMFIELD HOSPITAL SPECIAL POLICY AREA	PS1476	964426	Mrs Wendy Daden									Hospital approach should remain the preferred access road. A third access road could be created via Woodhouse Lane. The proposed access road will shift existing congestion further north and onto Sheepcoates roundabout which is not sustainable.
POLICY SPA1 – BROOMFIELD HOSPITAL SPECIAL POLICY AREA	PS1910	1097127	Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd			Yes						Endorses the draft Spatial Strategy with specific regard to Countryside Properties' interests in respect of the delivery of the following strategic site by 2036: Policy SPA1 – Broomfield Hospital Special Policy Area

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
POLICY SPA1 – BROOMFIELD HOSPITAL SPECIAL POLICY AREA	PS2096	1161904	Mid Essex Hospital Services NHS Trust									Support appropriate allocation of affordable and key worker housing which are critical for sustainability of healthcare services. Need robust analysis for future healthcare provision needs. Ensure joint dialogue between health partners and planners. Support analysis of strategic infrastructure. From the Council's analysis we see the benefit of this development in improving transport access, and in particular improving the resilience of the site (SGS6). Keen to work with CCC with the development of green travel and public transport opportunities.
POLICY SPA2 – CHELMSFORD CITY RACECOURSE SPECIAL POLICY AREA	PS1528	308172	Braintree District Council									BDC notes the special policy area for Chelmsford racecourse set out in policy SPA2. BDC is particular supportive of the elements of the policy which seek to minimise the individual car travel to and from the site and to minimise the impact of floodlighting on the site. (See also PS1526, PS1527)
POLICY SPA2 – CHELMSFORD CITY RACECOURSE SPECIAL POLICY AREA	PS1790	1160014	Historic England	Yes	Yes							Policy requirements should be amended to ensure that that development in this area would preserve the nearby listed buildings and their settings.
POLICY SPA3 – HANNINGFIELD RESERVOIR SPECIAL POLICY AREA	PS2093	1161039	Natural England		Yes	No					No	Policy rewording is required to ensure compliance with paragraph 118 of the NPPF. Suggested changes refer to the need to avoid impacting upon the nature conservation interests of the reservoir through recreational disturbance. The entire rep has been attached for completeness (1161039PS-A).
POLICY SPA6 – WRITTLE UNIVERSITY COLLEGE SPECIAL POLICY AREA	PS1768	489452	Writtle University College	Yes	Yes	Yes					Yes	We welcome the amendments from the former iterations of the plan, specifically to include Sturgeons Farm as part of the SPA. The boundary should be redrawn to cover further land holdings within Writtle University College's ownership including Land at Lawford Lane and Land at Daws Farm to give capacity for the college to achieve its aims and ambitions and for Writtle to develop necessary housing. We do not consider that coalescence with Writtle would be detrimental to the aim of the relevant policies. The Policy should include reference to an agreed Master Plan for the development of the site. See also attachments for background/introduction and additional land holdings.
POLICY HO1 – SIZE AND TYPE OF HOUSING	PS1217	1097127	Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd	Yes	Yes	No		•			Yes	Reference to a minimum requirement of 5% self build/custom homes to be removed from the Policy in favour of an amendment that would require up to 1% self-build/custom homes, depending on evidence of local need, provided that the Council can provide evidence that major development sites of 100+ homes are the types of locations that those aspiring to self-build plots are seeking. Requirements for M4(2) and M4(3) should be removed unless specific evidence can be provided to support the suggested policy requirements.
POLICY HO1 – SIZE AND TYPE OF HOUSING	PS593	1155779	Countryside Zest (Beaulieu Park) LLP			No	•	•	•		Yes	Paragraph 8.2 should clarify that the requirement to review the percentage of self/custom build plots against the latest housing need will not apply to reserved matters applications where outline consent has already been given.
POLICY HO1 – SIZE AND TYPE OF HOUSING	PS1118	973857	Persimmon Homes Essex	Yes	Yes	No		•	•		No	Convincing evidence is required to justify the 100% need to meet Part M4(2) and 5% to meet M4(3). The requirement regarding self and custom house building is not sufficiently justified or consistent with national policy. See also attachment which contains all the representations from this consultee.
POLICY HO1 – SIZE AND TYPE OF HOUSING	PS1546	1158676	Crest Strategic Projects Ltd	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	(A)(ii) The requirement to construct all houses to meet M4(2) is unnecessary and costly. (C)(i) There is no evidence that potential self builders wish to acquire a plot on a strategic development. Suggest limiting (A)(ii) to “a proportion of dwellings meeting M4(2) of the Building Regulations”, and deleting (C)(i) entirely and add a freestanding paragraph at the end of Policy HO1 stating: “The inclusion of self build and custom build plots will also be encouraged”.
POLICY HO1 – SIZE AND TYPE OF HOUSING	PS1662	1159875	Home Builders Federation			No		•	•	•	Yes	No evidence provided to justify all new homes being built to optional standard M4(2). Self-build housing requirement is not consistent with national policy. Council have not looked at sufficient options for providing plots, such as using their own land. Policy should be replaced by one that encourages the provision of self-build plots.
POLICY HO1 – SIZE AND TYPE OF HOUSING	PS1639	1159743	Gladman Developments Ltd	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	Gladman object to the proposed policy with regards the use of the optional technical standards as it is unclear whether this has been robustly justified as required by national policy. Gladman do not consider the self-build element of the policy to be effective. There needs to be a policy mechanism to ensure that if the self build plots are not taken up within a given time period then they revert back to market housing as part of the wider scheme.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
POLICY HO1 – SIZE AND TYPE OF HOUSING	PS1681	1159923	Police, Fire & Crime Commissioner for Essex	Yes	Yes	No		•	•	•	Yes	The justification for requiring M4(2) does not meet evidential requirements set out in the PPG and there is no specific evidence as to where the 5% comes from. The SHMA doesn't provide any evidence to support this 5%. Suggest 5% self build/custom homes to be amended to "up to 1%", depending on evidence of local need
POLICY HO1 – SIZE AND TYPE OF HOUSING	PS1716	872952	Mrs Mary Rance	Yes	Yes	Yes					No	Support the encouragement for specialist residential accommodation within Policy HO1. Promoted site, Chantry Farm (CFS81/17SLAA32), should be allocated for specialist residential accommodation.
POLICY HO1 – SIZE AND TYPE OF HOUSING	PS1731	973829	Scott Properties			No				•	Yes	Some smaller settlements would be well placed to provide such accommodation and that Specialist Residential Accommodation should also be considered as an acceptable rural exception.
POLICY HO1 – SIZE AND TYPE OF HOUSING	PS1776	1160028	Seven Capital Plc	No		No	•		•		Yes	Objection is raised to Draft Policy HO1 as it fails the test of soundness on the basis that it is not positively prepared and will not be effective. The policy does not deliver sufficient flexibility to allow for site specific circumstances, i.e. habitability; type of development (i.e. housing; apartments) which may come forward. It is therefore requested that the draft policy be amended to allow for flexibility.
POLICY HO1 – SIZE AND TYPE OF HOUSING	PS1957	927695	Redrow Homes								Yes	Referring to the specification of units in compliance with Building Regulations is not considered necessary as the matter is governed by other legislation. The provision of a percentage of self-build homes (5%) and Specialist Residential Accommodation on sites of more than 100 dwellings is unjustified by any evidence. There may not be a desire for self-homes to be built and the policy as worded does not allow for flexibility in this regard and poses risks in terms of deliverability.
8.6	PS1717	872952	Mrs Mary Rance	Yes	Yes	Yes					No	Support the encouragement for specialist residential accommodation within Policy HO1. Promoted site, Chantry Farm (CFS81/17SLAA32), should be allocated for specialist residential accommodation.
8.6	PS1727	973829	Scott Properties			No	•	•	•	•	Yes	Amend paragraph to include reference to age restricted housing.
8.7	PS1718	872952	Mrs Mary Rance	Yes	Yes	Yes					No	Support the encouragement for specialist residential accommodation within Policy HO1. Promoted site, Chantry Farm (CFS81/17SLAA32), should be allocated for specialist residential accommodation.
8.8	PS1719	872952	Mrs Mary Rance	Yes	Yes	Yes					No	Support the encouragement for specialist residential accommodation within Policy HO1. Promoted site, Chantry Farm (CFS81/17SLAA32), should be allocated for specialist residential accommodation.
8.9	PS1720	872952	Mrs Mary Rance	Yes	Yes	Yes					No	Support the encouragement for specialist residential accommodation within Policy HO1. Promoted site, Chantry Farm (CFS81/17SLAA32), should be allocated for specialist residential accommodation.
POLICY HO2 – AFFORDABLE HOUSING AND RURAL EXCEPTION SITES	PS1221	1097127	Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd	Yes	Yes	No			•		Yes	The policy should recognise that viability may impact on affordable housing delivery in some cases. Furthermore, the SHMA states that the actual need for affordable housing in Chelmsford district is 23%, and although the SHMA suggests that “other evidence” supports an overall target of 30%, it fails to properly explain or justify the upward adjustment to 30%. Suggest: Amend the first sentence to state "The Council will require, subject to viability, the provision of ..." Amend the policy requirement to 23% in the absence of any clear justification for an uplift to 30%.
POLICY HO2 – AFFORDABLE HOUSING AND RURAL EXCEPTION SITES	PS1116	1097139	Mr J Hart & Mr G Moss	Yes	Yes	No		•	•		Yes	General support for Policy HO2. However, object to the omission of Galleywood from the list of settlements set out in paragraph 8.16, to which the policy applies. No justification as to why some settlements have been omitted. Part B) of Policy HO2 should be reworded to state: “Planning permission will be granted for affordable housing on small sites within the settlements listed in paragraph 8.16, which would not otherwise be released for housing.....”
POLICY HO2 – AFFORDABLE HOUSING AND RURAL EXCEPTION SITES	PS1121	973857	Persimmon Homes Essex	Yes	Yes	No		•		•	No	We concur with the HBF that the requirement for 35% affordable housing does not appear to be supported by the Council’s evidence in relation to the SHMA (30%) or the identified need for 179 affordable dpa. It should be reduced to reflect the actual needs for affordable homes rather than set an ‘aspirational target’ that will threaten viability and lead to applications being delayed . See also attachment which contains all the representations from this consultee.
POLICY HO2 – AFFORDABLE HOUSING AND RURAL EXCEPTION SITES	PS1265	1157185	Bressole Ltd	Yes	Yes	Yes					Yes	Supports Policy HO2. Land east of Vicarage Lane, Great Baddow, could provide approximately 45 new starter homes. There will be a strong local demand and need for “starter homes” in Chelmsford. The site is well located to local services and the strategic highway network. Its Green Belt location should not preclude its delivery. It can provide good site access.



Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
POLICY HO2 – AFFORDABLE HOUSING AND RURAL EXCEPTION SITES	PS1539	1158676	Crest Strategic Projects Ltd	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	Crest Strategic supports the provision of on-site affordable housing on strategic development sites but it is considered that the 35% figure is not justified by the Council’s own evidence. Modify the first line of HO2(A) as follows: “The Council will require the provision of 30% of the total number ....” (rest of policy unchanged).
POLICY HO2 – AFFORDABLE HOUSING AND RURAL EXCEPTION SITES	PS1667	1159875	Home Builders Federation			No		•			Yes	To conclude on affordable housing provision we do not consider the current policy to be justified when considered against the Council’s own evidence. The affordable housing contribution set out in the policy should be reduced to reflect the actual needs for affordable homes in the Borough rather than be seen as an exercise in land value capture.
POLICY HO2 – AFFORDABLE HOUSING AND RURAL EXCEPTION SITES	PS1778	1160028	Seven Capital Plc	No		No		•	•		Yes	Objection is raised to Draft Policy HO2 on the basis that it is neither justified nor effective. The policy requires further flexibility to allow for the level of affordable housing provision to be determined on a site by site basis with reference to viability and, where there is a departure from policy, for adequate justification and evidence to be submitted as part of individual planning applications.
POLICY HO2 – AFFORDABLE HOUSING AND RURAL EXCEPTION SITES	PS1958	927695	Redrow Homes								Yes	Full affordable housing provision can often render development sites unviable and it is considered that the proposed policy should include a clause for the submission of viability statements where full provision is deemed unviable. Accordingly, the policy at present is considered “unsound”.
POLICY HO2 – AFFORDABLE HOUSING AND RURAL EXCEPTION SITES	PS2066	1098405	The North East Chelmsford Garden Village Consortium	Yes	Yes	Yes					Yes	Lowering the affordable housing policy requirement to 25% would deliver an estimated 4,166 affordable homes, still above the Council’s assessment of needs. Even at the SHMA’s recommended 30% target, the policy would be expected to deliver 4,620 units; again well above the Council’s estimate of needs. The Consortium considers that the affordable housing policy requirement is therefore not fully justified by the evidence to the PSLP and this will require further clarification as the Plan proceeds.
8.16	PS1117	1097139	Mr J Hart & Mr G Moss	Yes	Yes	No		•	•		Yes	Object to the omission of Galleywood from the list of settlements set out in paragraph 8.16, to which the policy applies. No justification as to why some settlements have been omitted. Paragraph 8.16 should be reworded to state: “For the application of this policy, the settlements are the Parishes of Bicknacre; East Hanningfield; Galleywood; Good Easter; Great Leighs; Great Waltham; Highwood; Little Baddow; Little Waltham; Margaretting; Mashbury; Rettendon; Roxwell; Sandon; South Hanningfield; Stock; West Hanningfield and Woodham Ferrers”.
8.16	PS1266	1157185	Bressole Ltd	Yes	Yes	No		•	•	•	Yes	Amend Paragraph 8.16 to include “Great Baddow” in the list of Parishes that fall within the definition of a Designation Rural Area.
POLICY HO3 – GYPSY, TRAVELLER AND TRAVELLING SHOWPEOPLE SITES	PS1495	972052	Mr John Whitlock			No				•	No	Such sites where exceptionally justified should be kept to a minimum size without further subdivision to lessen the impact on the rural countryside and local environs.
POLICY HO3 – GYPSY, TRAVELLER AND TRAVELLING SHOWPEOPLE SITES	PS1536	1158676	Crest Strategic Projects Ltd	Yes	Yes	No			•		Yes	1st paragraph fails to explain that sites will be brought forward in two ways - through strategic sites and on unallocated sites through DM process. Text amendment to first paragraph: “... who meet the national Planning Policy for Travellers Sites (PPTS) definition. This provision will be met through sites within the master plan areas of the Strategic Sites listed in Policy S9 and on other sites which meet the criteria set out below”.
POLICY EM1 – EMPLOYMENT AREAS	PS513	1146480	Aquila Developments Ltd	Yes	Yes	No		•			Yes	Whilst the flexibility to include some non B Class uses within employment areas is welcome, the effective exclusion of retail is considered unduly onerous. National and local retail policy tools are available to avoid proliferation of retail uses. Suggested amendment to criteria i. provided.
POLICY EM1 – EMPLOYMENT AREAS	PS1122	973857	Persimmon Homes Essex	Yes	Yes	No	•			•	No	This policy is unduly restrictive. To make this policy sound the Council need to set out the circumstances against which the loss of employment land will be considered appropriate. Such a policy may seek a period of marketing for employment uses. See also attachment which contains all the representations from this consultee.
POLICY EM1 – EMPLOYMENT AREAS	PS1678	1159875	Home Builders Federation			No				•	Yes	Suggest that in order to make this policy sound the Council sets out the circumstances against which the loss of employment land will be considered appropriate.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
POLICY EM1 – EMPLOYMENT AREAS	PS1859	312409	Strutt & Parker (Farms) Ltd			No	•	•	•		Yes	Support provision of Rural Employment Areas. Where allocations have been made, the allocation boundaries are drawn very tightly around existing premises and parking areas. This restricts opportunities for enhancement and expansion of the Rural Employment Areas. Greater flexibility afforded to Rural Employment Areas such as Old Park Farm, through the relaxation of the proposed allocation boundaries and inclusion of potential areas for future expansion, such as a small parcel of land to the north east of the current office buildings.
POLICY EM1 – EMPLOYMENT AREAS	PS1879	312409	Strutt & Parker (Farms) Ltd			No	•	•	•		Yes	Support provision of Rural Employment Areas. Boundaries drawn very tightly around sites. On behalf of our client, we propose that there should be greater flexibility afforded to Rural Employment Areas such as Whitbreads Business Centre, through the relaxation of the proposed allocation boundaries and inclusion of potential areas for future expansion, such as a small parcel of land to the north east of the current office buildings.
POLICY EM1 – EMPLOYMENT AREAS	PS1911	312377	Miscoe Enterprises Ltd			No	•	•	•		Yes	Support provision of Rural Employment Areas. Land north of Brooklands site should be allocated as a Rural Employment Area. Selection criteria for Rural Employment Areas is too restrictive.
POLICY EM1 – EMPLOYMENT AREAS	PS1932	1101991	Hill Farm Chelmsford Ltd			No	•	•	•		Yes	The methodology used to include or exclude sites as set out in the Rural Employment Area Technical Note (January 2018) is weak and not robustly justified. Do not agree with the proposed exclusion of the Old Coal Yard as a Rural Employment Area. Concerned that Policy EM1 confirms that planning permission will be granted for the change of use for non-Class B uses where the use does not fall within Class A Use Classes unless limited small-scale and ancillary. This contradicts the methodology that rules out the allocation or Rural Employment Areas where Class B Use Classes are not the majority use on the site.
POLICY EM1 – EMPLOYMENT AREAS	PS1898	1097460	Legal & General			No		•		•	Yes	In summary, the proposed designation of the site within an Employment Area does not provide flexibility to adapt to change and is not consistent with Paragraph 22 of the NPPF which seeks to avoid the unnecessary blanket protection of sites. In addition, the Council's assessment of local housing need is not justified and results in a housing target which is not positively prepared. Overall the Plan is not considered to be consistent with national policy and is therefore considered to be unsound. We consider that additional housing supply will need to be identified and, in this regard, consider that the site at Bilton Road Industrial Estate could make a significant contribution to meeting local housing needs and should therefore be identified accordingly within the Plan. Whilst it is considered that, in light of the above, the Plan should not proceed to Examination in its current form, should the examination proceed, we reserve the right to appear at the Examination in Public should we wish to do so.
POLICY EM1 – EMPLOYMENT AREAS	PS1989	873301	Cliffords Ltd	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•		Yes	Taken with the changes brought about by the planning permission for a Mill and Traveller Sites along with the existing business areas in this location, it is considered that the employment opportunities offered by the site would be entirely appropriate between Drakes Lane and Cranham Road. An employment development would also have the opportunity to link to the wider proposals for North East Chelmsford Garden Village and contribute to the growth of the area. Site CFS125 should be considered in the Rural Employment Area Technical Note.
POLICY CO1 – GREEN BELT, GREEN WEDGES, GREEN CORRIDORS AND RURAL AREAS	PS508	1146480	Aquila Developments Ltd	Yes	Yes	No		•		•	Yes	The principle of Green Corridors is not resisted but the way the concept is being applied which restricts development. The Green Corridor designation is intended to apply to river valleys. The land north of Main Road Boreham does not fall within this category, as is evidenced by the consultants' own assessment . This is an attempt to provide a further layer of control which is inconsistent with the NPPF. Land at Generals Farm satisfies no Green Corridor criteria and should be included in Chelmsford Urban Area boundary.
POLICY CO1 – GREEN BELT, GREEN WEDGES, GREEN CORRIDORS AND RURAL AREAS	PS620	1155857	Environment Agency	Yes	Yes	Yes						Policy part B) should identify the important function of green wedges in terms of flood protection provision
POLICY CO1 – GREEN BELT, GREEN WEDGES, GREEN CORRIDORS AND RURAL AREAS	PS735	952361	Mrs Laura Dunne	Yes	Yes	Yes						Support given to the rural environment being recognised and protected.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
POLICY CO1 – GREEN BELT, GREEN WEDGES, GREEN CORRIDORS AND RURAL AREAS	PS1204	1097080	Ms Shyy Sachdev	Yes	Yes	No		•	•			The Plan as currently drafted is neither justified or effective as it includes sites within the Green Wedge designation that do not perform the functions of the Green Wedge and should be allocated for residential development. The site at Rembrandt House (see attached refs. Map 19 Annotated (3) and Site Location Plan (7) ) should, as a consequence be removed from the Green Wedge and included as a residential allocation.
POLICY CO1 – GREEN BELT, GREEN WEDGES, GREEN CORRIDORS AND RURAL AREAS	PS1313	872955	Hammonds Estates LLP	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	Whilst HEst broadly supports the identification of Green Wedges and Green Corridors in the emerging plan the plan fails to be clear on the value that such spaces bring to Chelmsford, or indeed their purpose. The boundaries of green corridors should be carefully considered and should be justified and logical to ensure that only land that is truly valued and fulfills the purposes of these designations is designated in the local plan. HEst strongly objects to the proposed boundaries of the green corridor extending east from Chelmsford as these are ill-considered, not justified and are not supported by evidence. This is explained in detail in HEst's representation to the Preferred Options consultation (see appendix 6 - attachment Review of Green Wedges and Green Corridors: Defining Chelmsford's river valleys report). No change has been made to this designation following HEst's previous concerns.
POLICY CO1 – GREEN BELT, GREEN WEDGES, GREEN CORRIDORS AND RURAL AREAS	PS1260	1100910	Anglian Water Services Ltd	Yes	Yes	No		•		•	Yes	Object to the designation of land in Anglian Water's ownership as a green wedge. Do not consider that the land in Anglian Water's ownership performs a green wedge function as defined in part b) of Policy CO1. The proposed designation could result in in an unintended barrier to water recycling investment and operation which is contrary to Paragraph 156 of the NPPF. (Attachment refs. Landscape Partnership report (1) ) and Landscape Partnership report - Appendix 1 appendices)
POLICY CO1 – GREEN BELT, GREEN WEDGES, GREEN CORRIDORS AND RURAL AREAS	PS1384	1102437	The Russell Family	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•		Yes	Lack of development within the Green Belt will not meet the development requirements of these settlements, as set out in Policy CO1. There will be a need for development in these locations to improve affordability and to support local services and facilities. Promoted site could provide this development.
POLICY CO1 – GREEN BELT, GREEN WEDGES, GREEN CORRIDORS AND RURAL AREAS	PS1640	1159743	Gladman Developments Ltd	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	Object to this policy, in particular part D 'Rural Area' which seeks to protect the rural area for its intrinsic character and beauty. Instead, the impacts on the rural area should be considered in the planning balance exercise.
POLICY CO1 – GREEN BELT, GREEN WEDGES, GREEN CORRIDORS AND RURAL AREAS	PS1697	1101771	Mr Paul Hopkins	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	CFS272 should be removed from Green Wedge designation and allocated for development.
POLICY CO1 – GREEN BELT, GREEN WEDGES, GREEN CORRIDORS AND RURAL AREAS	PS1712	866622	Stonebond Properties Ltd			No	•	•	•	•	Yes	Object to Policy CO1. Promoted site should not be within the Green Wedge.
POLICY CO1 – GREEN BELT, GREEN WEDGES, GREEN CORRIDORS AND RURAL AREAS	PS1784	1160059	Mr David Bolton			No		•		•	Yes	Object to Green Wedge and Green Corridor designations. Places restrictions akin to Green Belt, contrary to national policy. Local Plan and supporting evidence does not provide justification for this.
POLICY CO1 – GREEN BELT, GREEN WEDGES, GREEN CORRIDORS AND RURAL AREAS	PS1812	1160052	North West Parishes Group									Concern that green belt review has not been undertaken. Concern for loss of high grade agricultural land. South of Chelmsford is more physically sustainable for development. Opening of the Crossrail should be considered.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
POLICY CO1 – GREEN BELT, GREEN WEDGES, GREEN CORRIDORS AND RURAL AREAS	PS1839	476873	Little Waltham Parish Council			No					Yes	Building in South Chelmsford would be preferable as land is of poorer quality. There is better infrastructure in the south too. Cannot understand why CCC did not undertake green belt review. (For breakdown of North West Parishes Group response see PS1808 - PS1832 and PS SA45 - PS SA49)
POLICY CO1 – GREEN BELT, GREEN WEDGES, GREEN CORRIDORS AND RURAL AREAS	PS1854	1160357	Brentwood Borough Council	Yes	Yes	Yes						Support Strategic Priority 7, CO1-CO7. Unlikely that Brentwood will be able to accept unmet housing need from adjoining areas as their plans involve allocating GB land.
POLICY CO1 – GREEN BELT, GREEN WEDGES, GREEN CORRIDORS AND RURAL AREAS	PS1867	873321	Eastern Approaches Investments Ltd			No	•	•	•			Our client objects to Policy CO1 (Green Belt, Green Wedges, Green Corridors and Rural Areas) and subsequent Green Wedge Policies; CO3, CO5 and CO7 in so far that the policies affect their land interests and the soundness of the Local Plan. Our client also objects to the Green Wedge Review (2017) which accompanies the Pre-Submission Document. Promoted site should not be within the Green Wedge. Is adjacent to existing industrial area and is in private ownership, with no public access.
POLICY CO1 – GREEN BELT, GREEN WEDGES, GREEN CORRIDORS AND RURAL AREAS	PS1906	312377	Miscoe Enterprises Ltd			No	•	•	•		Yes	Green Wedge locations should not be given the same level of protection as Green Belt, and should not be prematurely discounted. On behalf of our client, we propose that the removal of land north of Brooklands from the Green Wedge, and designation as a Rural Employment Area, would help to ensure a ‘sound’ Chelmsford City Council Local Plan.
POLICY CO1 – GREEN BELT, GREEN WEDGES, GREEN CORRIDORS AND RURAL AREAS	PS1931	1101991	Hill Farm Chelmsford Ltd			No	•	•	•		Yes	The Green Wedge is not a statutory designation and potential development in such areas should not be prematurely discounted. It is not appropriate for non-Green Belt areas to be subject to the same level of protection as Green Belt land. Should Policy CO1 form part of the Local Plan, then sites such as Hill Farm, Essex Regiment Way should be removed from the Green Wedge so that protection is proportionate to the individual characteristics and environmental value of the site. The site does not contribute to the value of the Green Wedge and its designation is unjustified.
POLICY CO1 – GREEN BELT, GREEN WEDGES, GREEN CORRIDORS AND RURAL AREAS	PS1943	873301	Cliffords Ltd			No		•	•	•	Yes	Land at Saxon Way, Broomfield is situated on land currently allocated as Green Wedge. It is not appropriate for policies from the existing Local Plan to be simply carried forward into the new Local Plan without due consideration. It is overly restrictive not to allow any development in the Green Wedge especially given much land is within proximity to Chelmsford City. Land at Saxon Way does not perform any of the specified roles of Green Wedge land and its removal will not cause material harm to the role, function, character and appearance of this part of the landscape. A new park is proposed associated with the Saxon Burial Ground. The proposal will enhance connectivity to Chelmer Valley footpath network. See also attachments including a concept plan for the above site (873301PS-B) and an appeal statement concerning a housing site on farmland in Tendring allowed on appeal (873301PS-A).
POLICY CO1 – GREEN BELT, GREEN WEDGES, GREEN CORRIDORS AND RURAL AREAS	PS1959	927695	Redrow Homes								Yes	This policy is generally considered in compliance with the NPPF. The revised Green Wedge boundary is supported confirming that SGS 3b/3d only makes a limited contribution to the river corridor and is thus proposed to be removed. SGS 3b/3d can therefore make a contribution to the overall comprehensive scheme delivering employment and residential development.
POLICY CO1 – GREEN BELT, GREEN WEDGES, GREEN CORRIDORS AND RURAL AREAS	PS1971	1160476	Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd									Chelmsford City Council have decided not to undertake a Green Belt review for this Local Plan as they consider that they will be able to provide the growth needed in non-green belt areas of the City limits, however at the first review of the Local Plan following adoption a Green Belt Review should take place. Lathcoats Farm site is a sustainable site and would be a low impact urban extension to the south of the settlement of Chelmsford. It benefits from close proximity to a number of schools, existing neighbourhood centres and community infrastructure in the immediate area as well as public transport routes and therefore should be strongly considered for residential development.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
POLICY CO1 – GREEN BELT, GREEN WEDGES, GREEN CORRIDORS AND RURAL AREAS	PS2025	1105298	Mrs Claire Benbrook			No				•		Our client's site is located in a sustainable location, there are no constraints on the developable area of the site and it would logically follow on from the existing development surrounding the site. In conclusion, it is considered that there is no principle reason for land north of Mill Road, North End to not be included as an allocation for housing in the emerging local plan as it would provide an appropriate and defensible boundary to the urban edge in this location. In order to enable its allocation, it is considered that the site should be removed from the proposed Green Corridor as it doesn't meet the requirements for inclusion.
POLICY CO1 – GREEN BELT, GREEN WEDGES, GREEN CORRIDORS AND RURAL AREAS	PS2041	1097203	Bovis Homes Ltd	Yes	Yes	No		•		•	Yes	The Council's decision to not undertake a comprehensive Green Belt Review, has resulted in a constrained approach that is heavily focussed on the continuation of Chelmsford City Council's long-term strategy of directing new residential growth to the northern part of Chelmsford. Contribution can be made by land to the west of Chelmsford and south of Writtle, which is considerably closer to the city centre than allocations proposed in the Local Plan to the north of Chelmsford. See Appendix 3.1 to our representation on Policy S9 - Vision Document - provides further detail on compelling and robust proposals for a comprehensive and landscape-led development to the West of Chelmsford and South of Writtle. Challenge the City Council's proposal to define a Green Wedge across an extensive area of land between Chelmsford and Writtle. Our representation is supported by a review carried out by EDP of the evidence base document which provides the City Council's rationale for the identification of Green Wedge boundaries. The Policies Map should be amended to show a revised Green Wedge boundary which accords with that proposed on Plan EDP4, found in Appendix 4.1.
POLICY CO1 – GREEN BELT, GREEN WEDGES, GREEN CORRIDORS AND RURAL AREAS	PS2050	312318	Cogent Land	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	The Council's designation of a 'Green Corridor' on Cogent's land interests to the south east of The Lion Inn are unjustified and substantiated. The land currently makes no contribution to the function of the Green Corridor designation, with abrupt built edges to Boreham, one public footpath and limited landscape character. The Council has a unique opportunity as part of the local plan process to consider the benefits of a design-led scheme for up to 70 units on land which currently does not contribute to key objectives.
POLICY CO1 – GREEN BELT, GREEN WEDGES, GREEN CORRIDORS AND RURAL AREAS	PS2072	965497	New Hall Properties (Eastern) Ltd			No	•	•			Yes	NHP's Site at land to the west of Seven Ash Green should be allocated for development. The Site does not currently meaningfully contribute to the Green Wedge but development of the site could improve the wider Green Wedge and its roles. The miscategorisation of the Site as 'Accessible Natural Green Space' by CCC may have resulted in an incorrect Green Wedge boundary.
8.43	PS750	1149637	CPREssex	Yes	Yes	No		•	•		Yes	CPREssex supports the Spatial Principles but considers Location 2, West Chelmsford should be removed from the Plan as it is on Grade 1 farmland and would be contrary to Green Wedges / Green Corridors landscape protectionist aims of Policy CO1.
8.44	PS708	1156528	Mrs Claire Birks	Yes	Yes	Yes					No	Empty rep (support)
POLICY CO2 – NEW BUILDINGS AND STRUCTURES IN THE GREEN BELT	PS1119	1097139	Mr J Hart & Mr G Moss	Yes	Yes	Yes						Policy CO2 is supported as it states that limited affordable housing for local needs in accordance with Policy HO2, is appropriate development in the Green Belt. This reflects the exception criteria as set out at paragraph 89 of the NPPF and the Plan is considered sound in this regard. Policy CO2 is supported and it is considered that a small scheme of affordable housing on land at Newells could provide much needed affordable or starter homes accommodation for local needs within a highly sustainable location, whilst having no detrimental impact on the appearance or function of the Green Belt.
POLICY CO2 – NEW BUILDINGS AND STRUCTURES IN THE GREEN BELT	PS1297	1157108	Campden Hill Limited	Yes	Yes	No			•	•	Yes	Amend part B in line with the revised NPPF consultation document to "Planning permission will be granted where the proposed development: would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing use and / or development; or, would re-use previously developed land and contribute to meeting an identified local affordable housing need, while not causing substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt. The Council will assess the development based on the following: ..." Five Tree Works, Great Baddow could deliver a comprehensive mixed-use housing and employment development with significant environmental improvements and have a lesser impact on the openness of the Green Belt.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
POLICY CO2 – NEW BUILDINGS AND STRUCTURES IN THE GREEN BELT	PS1257	1157165	Rosehart Properties LTd	Yes	Yes	No			•	•	Yes	Section B of Policy CO2 should be amended to read: “Planning permission will be granted where the proposed development: would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing use and / or development; or, would re-use previously developed land and contribute to meeting an identified local affordable housing need, while not causing substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt. The Council will assess the development based on the following: ...” This will ensure that Policy CO2 is effective (i.e. deliverable over its period) and consistent with national policy (i.e. the permitted “exceptions” to Green Belt policy contained in the NPPF and its revised draft).
POLICY CO2 – NEW BUILDINGS AND STRUCTURES IN THE GREEN BELT	PS1730	973829	Scott Properties			No				•	Yes	Policy CO2 could be amended to more explicitly weigh the enhancement of education establishments as a significant benefit to a community, in accordance with paragraph 72 of the NPPF.
POLICY CO2 – NEW BUILDINGS AND STRUCTURES IN THE GREEN BELT	PS1973	865003	Larmar Engineering			No	•	•	•		Yes	We support Policy CO2 and its recognition of the potential for the redevelopment of previously developed land in the Green Belt, subject to an assessment of impact on openness of the Green Belt based on a number of criteria set out within the policy.
POLICY CO2 – NEW BUILDINGS AND STRUCTURES IN THE GREEN BELT	PS2051	312318	Cogent Land	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	The Council’s designation of a ‘Green Corridor’ on Cogent’s land interests to the south east of The Lion Inn are unjustified and substantiated. The land currently makes no contribution to the function of the Green Corridor designation, with abrupt built edges to Boreham, one public footpath and limited landscape character. The Council has a unique opportunity as part of the local plan process to consider the benefits of a design-led scheme for up to 70 units on land which currently does not contribute to key objectives.
8.46	PS712	1156528	Mrs Claire Birks	Yes	Yes	Yes						Empty rep (support)
POLICY CO3 – NEW BUILDINGS AND STRUCTURES IN GREEN WEDGES AND GREEN CORRIDORS	PS983	311148	Essex County Council	Yes	Yes	No			•		No	To provide flexibility the definition of ‘essential infrastructure....as that proposed by statutory undertakers’ in paragraph 8.55 should include infrastructure required by the Waste Disposal Authority, namely small waste facilities and waste recycling centres.
POLICY CO3 – NEW BUILDINGS AND STRUCTURES IN GREEN WEDGES AND GREEN CORRIDORS	PS1314	872955	Hammonds Estates LLP	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	Policy CO3 should include some flexibility to enable proposals that are of wider benefit to Chelmsford to come forward in appropriate circumstances. A further element should be added to the policy that considers appropriate uses of land within green wedges and green corridors, as such uses are not currently adequately covered by the proposed policy wording. HEst suggests a further sub-section be added to the end of the policy as follows: E) Planning permission will be granted for uses of land which do not impact on the purposes of the Green Wedge or Green Corridor designation Without this change the plan is not positively prepared or justified
POLICY CO3 – NEW BUILDINGS AND STRUCTURES IN GREEN WEDGES AND GREEN CORRIDORS	PS1245	1100910	Anglian Water Services Ltd	Yes	Yes	No			•		Yes	Propose that the wording of Policy CO3 be amended as follows: ‘A) New buildings or structures Planning permission will be granted for new buildings where the development does not conflict with the purposes of the Green Wedge or Green Corridor designation, and is for: i. a local community facility where there is a demonstrated need; or ii. a local community facility that supports the role and function of the Green Wedge or Green Corridor; or iii. agriculture and forestry or where it supports the sustainable growth and expansion of an existing, authorised and viable business where it can be demonstrated that there is a justified need; or iv. local transport infrastructure and other essential infrastructure or development which supports existing or potential utility infrastructure where a Green Wedge or Green Corridor location is appropriate and the benefits of which override the impact on the designation; or’
POLICY CO3 – NEW BUILDINGS AND STRUCTURES IN GREEN WEDGES AND GREEN CORRIDORS	PS1698	1101771	Mr Paul Hopkins	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	CFS272 should be removed from Green Wedge designation and allocated for development.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
8.55	PS1235	1100910	Anglian Water Services Ltd	Yes	Yes	No		•			Yes	Paragraph 8.55 should be amended as follows: 'Essential infrastructure is defined as being infrastructure that must be situated in the location proposed for connection purposes and the benefits of which override the impact on the designation e.g. sewage or water connections, on-site sewers and off-site reinforcements to the existing sewerage network, power sources, waste water recycling/treatment sites, electricity substations, emergency services or telecommunications.'
POLICY CO4 – NEW BUILDINGS AND STRUCTURES IN THE RURAL AREA	PS886	961966	Mr Alan Brunning				•		•			The shape and design of the new home proposed on site area 7 must match that of the housing that was added to SWF in 1978. The policy confirms this but the planning document has no requirement for the developers to conform to an appearance standard for the new homes that will fit in the 'Essex design' that was used for all the new houses in SWF.
POLICY CO4 – NEW BUILDINGS AND STRUCTURES IN THE RURAL AREA	PS1027	963512	Mr Keith McMullon	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•	•	No	Land at Broadacres (15SLAA11) should be included within the Woodham Ferrers DSB. Would allow a small amount of development within the village.
POLICY CO4 – NEW BUILDINGS AND STRUCTURES IN THE RURAL AREA	PS1137	965985	Mrs Sue Dobson	Yes	Yes	No	•				Yes	Policy CO4 A New Buildings point viii: - This criterion will open up the floodgates for development in rural areas. If this Policy criterion remains, there should be a separate list of 'exceptional quality or innovative nature' examples, or clarification within the Policy, where new buildings in rural areas would be allowed under this criterion. It needs to be far more robust and specific otherwise the Council runs the risk of having to allow spurious development within our rural landscape which would therefore subsequently be eroded.
POLICY CO4 – NEW BUILDINGS AND STRUCTURES IN THE RURAL AREA	PS1483	958103	Mr D Bishop	No	Yes	No		•		•	Yes	Plan 25 'Rettendon Common' should be amended to include the land to the north of Bell Court within the Defined Settlement Boundary, as is the case on the extant Plan 24 of the 2012 Site Allocation Document.
POLICY CO4 – NEW BUILDINGS AND STRUCTURES IN THE RURAL AREA	PS1641	1159743	Gladman Developments Ltd	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	Gladman object to policy CO4 which seeks to protect the rural area for its intrinsic character and beauty. Instead, the impacts on the rural area should be considered in the planning balance exercise.
8.88	PS752	1149637	CPREssex	Yes	Yes	No			•	•	Yes	The Plan does not appear to consider impacts on soils in accordance with paragraph 109 of the NPPF. This omission is of particular significance given the predominance of high quality agricultural land in the Plan area. CPRE would like to see a stronger expressed presumption against development on BMV farmland except in very exceptional circumstances and then only on a small scale.
8.92	PS1334	1157251	Chelmsford Civic Society			No			•		Yes	Policies HE1 and HE2 are inadequate to ensure that Chelmsford's heritage is enhanced in future. The following statement is weak and offers no commitment to the future enhancement of assets. 'The Council will take account of the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities, local character and distinctiveness.' See rep for text amendment suggestions.
POLICY HE1 – DESIGNATED HERITAGE ASSETS	PS984	311148	Essex County Council	Yes	Yes	No			•		No	Change D) Registered Parks and Gardens as follows: '...unless the harm is outweighed by public benefit.'
POLICY HE1 – DESIGNATED HERITAGE ASSETS	PS985	311148	Essex County Council	Yes	Yes	No			•		No	Change E) Scheduled Monuments as follows: '...unless the harm is outweighed by public benefit.'
POLICY HE1 – DESIGNATED HERITAGE ASSETS	PS1456	1156704	South Woodham Ferrers Town Council	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•	•		The closeness of the site to 6 Grade II listed buildings within 500 m of the site contravenes Policy HE1 and the NPPF para 132.
POLICY HE1 – DESIGNATED HERITAGE ASSETS	PS1642	1159743	Gladman Developments Ltd	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	Gladman note and support the changes made to this policy as the policy now makes the necessary distinction between the tests in relation to substantial and less than substantial harm to designated heritage assets.
POLICY HE1 – DESIGNATED HERITAGE ASSETS	PS1791	1160014	Historic England	Yes	Yes							We are pleased to see a standalone policy on designated heritage assets. This policy reflects our previous comments and we welcome the wording of the policy and supporting text. The policy is clear and accords with the NPPF.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
POLICY HE1 – DESIGNATED HERITAGE ASSETS	PS1960	927695	Redrow Homes								Yes	The policy is considered to be overly prescription and not in compliance with the NPPF.
POLICY HE2 – NON-DESIGNATED HERITAGE ASSETS	PS1792	1160014	Historic England	Yes	Yes							We very much welcome a separate policy for non-designated heritage assets. The policy is clear and accords with the NPPF.
POLICY HE2 – NON-DESIGNATED HERITAGE ASSETS	PS1961	927695	Redrow Homes								Yes	Policy HE2 – Non-Designated Heritage Assets is considered compatible with para 135 of the NPPF.
POLICY HE3 – ARCHAEOLOGY	PS1794	1160014	Historic England	Yes	Yes							We very much welcome a separate policy for archaeology. The policy is clear and accords with the NPPF.
POLICY NE1 – ECOLOGY AND BIODIVERSITY	PS1175	714889	Essex Wildlife Trust	Yes	Yes	No			•			Policy has omitted to mention protected species. Policy should include a statement clarifying that any development proposals with the potential to impact on protected species will require relevant surveys and mitigation plans in accordance with Natural England's standing advice.
POLICY NE1 – ECOLOGY AND BIODIVERSITY	PS1452	1156704	South Woodham Ferrers Town Council	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•	•		The closeness of the site to a variety of designated sites, the condition of the Crouch and Roach Estuaries which is also a core area of biodiversity and ecological importance contravenes Policy NE1 and the NPPF paras 9 and 118..
POLICY NE1 – ECOLOGY AND BIODIVERSITY	PS1643	1159743	Gladman Developments Ltd	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	Gladman note that this policy differentiates between the hierarchy of designated assets, which accords with paragraph 113 of the Framework.
POLICY NE1 – ECOLOGY AND BIODIVERSITY	PS1962	927695	Redrow Homes								Yes	Emerging Policies NE1 – Ecology and Biodiversity and NE2 – Trees, Woodland and Landscape Features are broadly considered to be consistent with the NPPF.
POLICY NE1 – ECOLOGY AND BIODIVERSITY	PS2079	1161039	Natural England		Yes	No					No	As currently worded Policy NE1 is not compliant with the Habitats Regulations and is unsound due to non compliance with paras 114 and 118 of the NPPF. The reference and commitment to the RAMS is currently in supporting text only and as such it is our view that the Plan would fail legal and procedural compliance. The policy to be amended to specify needs for contributions from developments towards RAMS. Additional suggestions included for how the policy can be reworded to comply with the NPPF. Proposals should contribute to the UKBAP, priority habitats and species in Chelmsford and other BAPs. The entire rep has been attached for completeness (1161039PS-A).
8.101	PS631	1074334	Mrs Mary Dove									Concern for habitats of badgers, deer, bats, rabbits, monkjacks if relief road around Broomfield Hospital is developed.
8.106	PS625	1155857	Environment Agency	Yes	Yes	Yes						Policy could be enhanced further by acknowledging that for sites adjacent to main rivers, principles around improving water related biodiversity should be included. Developers should consider contributing to the achievement of WFD objectives.
POLICY NE2 –TREES, WOODLAND AND LANDSCAPE FEATURES	PS1795	1160014	Historic England	Yes	Yes							Advise that the policy is amended in order to ensure that it provides adequate coverage of designed landscapes such as Registered Parks and Gardens.
POLICY NE3 – FLOODING/SUDS	PS626	1155857	Environment Agency	Yes	Yes	Yes						Reference should be made towards the SFRA as a key document supporting the policy.
POLICY NE3 – FLOODING/SUDS	PS894	961966	Mr Alan Brunning			No	•		•			There is no policy or proposals in document for CCC provide a single fluvial run off damping solution for the whole of Area7. The fluvial run off scheme has to be provided for the whole site by CCC before development starts.
POLICY NE3 – FLOODING/SUDS	PS1234	1100910	Anglian Water Services Ltd	Yes	Yes	No		•	•		Yes	Support Policy NE3 but suggest additional wording as follows: ‘D) All development will be required to demonstrate that adequate foul water treatment and disposal already exists or can be provided in time to serve the development’
POLICY NE3 – FLOODING/SUDS	PS1445	1156704	South Woodham Ferrers Town Council	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•	•		The details set out in para 5.4.23, Appendix D and G of the SA regarding the location of part of Site 7 within Flood Zone 2/3, contravenes Policy NE3 as well as NPPF para 7, the environmental role.
POLICY NE3 – FLOODING/SUDS	PS1963	927695	Redrow Homes								Yes	Proposed Policy NE3 – Flooding/SUDS is considered to be broadly consistent with the NPPF.
8.115	PS627	1155857	Environment Agency	Yes	Yes	Yes						Reasoned justification to include text related to compensatory storage and suggested wording provided. Consideration should also be given to displaced floodwaters.



Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
8.116	PS628	1155857	Environment Agency	Yes	Yes	Yes						Consider enhancing policy based upon a flood alleviation scheme being built and also a policy for pre-alleviation scheme to protect against scheme not going ahead. Consider an SPD to guide the future development with regard to flood risk and the new Chelmsford alleviation scheme.
8.117	PS630	1155857	Environment Agency	Yes	Yes	Yes						Para 8.117 could be enhanced by adding additional suggested wording.
POLICY NE4 – RENEWABLE AND LOW CARBON ENERGY	PS893	961966	Mr Alan Brunning			No	•		•			There must be a clear statement that no fluvial run off will be piped into the sewage system. There is no policy or proposals in document for CCC provide a single fluvial run off damping solution for the whole of Area7. CCC to install flood damping systems for the developers to use that will absorb the run off for the whole site. It must not be left to the developers.
POLICY NE4 – RENEWABLE AND LOW CARBON ENERGY	PS1796	1160014	Historic England	Yes	Yes							We note that our previous comments have been addressed and we welcome reference to the historic environment in this policy.
8.121	PS751	1149637	CPREssex	Yes	Yes	No			•	•	Yes	Some important issues related to protecting the environment, are not given sufficient prominence in the Plan - ie Tranquillity, Water Resources, Light and Air Pollution.
8.122	PS1335	1157251	Chelmsford Civic Society			No	•		•		Yes	The two policies CF1 and CF2 are inadequate to ensure the delivery and protection of these larger scale facilities, which 'shape' the city and transform it. They are only effective if they refer only to smaller local facilities. The policies should make this clear.
POLICY CF1 – DELIVERING COMMUNITY FACILITIES	PS538	664147	Sport England	Yes	Yes	Yes						The policy is welcomed as it takes a positive approach towards the principle of proposals for new or extended community facilities which are defined in the reasoned justification to include indoor and outdoor sports facilities.
POLICY CF1 – DELIVERING COMMUNITY FACILITIES	PS874	961966	Mr Alan Brunning			No	•		•			The section must (but doesn't) discuss the problem of 2 towns with poor pedestrian access across the B1012. Elsewhere in the document is describes easy movement of pedestrians / cyclists from N to South but does not provide any viable solutions. Submission does not give any solution to the fact that the B1012 will be retained and cut the town in two It cannot be an integrated community with the plan as written. The roads/rail are at capacity. This is not a sustainable development
8.124	PS877	961966	Mr Alan Brunning	No								The section must (but doesn't) discuss the problem of 2 towns with poor pedestrian access across the B1012. Elsewhere in the document is describes easy movement of pedestrians / cyclists from N to South but does not provide any viable solutions. Submission does not give any solution to the fact that the B1012 will be retained and cut the town in two It cannot be an integrated community with the plan as written. The roads/rail are at capacity. This is not a sustainable development
8.124	PS878	961966	Mr Alan Brunning	No		No	•		•	•		The proposals will not align with the declared objectives in policy CF1 The section must (but doesn't) discuss the problem of 2 towns with poor pedestrian access across the B1012. The detail in the submission does not give any solution to the fact that the B1012 will be retained and divide the town. It cannot be an integrated community with the plan as written. The roads are already at capacity as is the railway
POLICY CF2 – PROTECTING COMMUNITY FACILITIES	PS540	664147	Sport England	Yes	Yes	Yes						The policy is welcomed as it seeks to protect community facilities which includes sports facilities that are required for meeting current and future needs.
POLICY CF2 – PROTECTING COMMUNITY FACILITIES	PS1003	1156883	Theatres Trust	Yes	Yes	Yes					No	The Trust welcomes the emphasis on retaining and protecting facilities.
POLICY CF2 – PROTECTING COMMUNITY FACILITIES	PS2028	1160633	Genesis Housing Association	Yes	Yes	No		•				Policy CF2 is supported insofar as it seeks to safeguard against the loss of open space unless replaced by equivalent or better in terms of quality. We agree that important public open spaces should be protected, enhanced and easily accessible via safe, convenient and well-lit routes. The evidence base confirms that the site does not currently perform an important open space function, nor does it identify significant potential for improvement in itself. Completion of City Park West Phase 2 would likely lead to increased footfall, elevating its potential importance. GHA's proposals seek to retain, reconfigure and enhance public open space on the site alongside significant improvements to its connectivity with Central Park. See complete rep by Bidwells (1160633PS-A) and Development Appraisal (1160633PS-B).
8.134	PS127	1150704	Mr Nick Whymark	Yes	Yes	No			•		No	Policy CF2 8.134 should in addition explicitly refer to development of the plot of a public house. In other words development that affects the garden and/or car park.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
8.134	PS1002	1156883	Theatres Trust	Yes	Yes	Yes					No	The insertion of specific evidence criteria for pubs is welcomed. To further strengthen this policy, the Trust recommends "Proposals for the change of use of public houses will need to be accompanied by evidence to show that its existing use as a public house is not economically viable and is no longer required to meet the needs of the local community" is elevated into policy either as a third criteria under part A of CF2, or as a separate third part of CF2.
POLICY CF3 - EDUCATION ESTABLISHMENTS	PS170	973177	Anglia Ruskin University	Yes		Yes					No	The policy is justified through its support for sustainable growth of the identified higher education establishments, which is required in order to meet wider strategic aspirations for improved education opportunities and skills. The policy is considered positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy and therefore sound and suitable for adoption.
POLICY CF3 - EDUCATION ESTABLISHMENTS	PS1728	973829	Scott Properties			No				•	Yes	Policy CF3 could be amended to more explicitly weigh the enhancement of education establishments as a significant benefit to a community, in accordance with paragraph 72 of the NPPF.
9.1	PS2087	1161039	Natural England		Yes	No					No	Light pollution can have a negative impact on local amenity and nature conservation yet there is no policy statement describing light pollution. Policies (such as design policies) should address impacts on natural environment. The entire rep has been attached for completeness (1161039PS-A).
POLICY MP1 - HIGH QUALITY DESIGN	PS1644	1159743	Gladman Developments Ltd	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	Gladman remind the Council that the various considerations highlighted through this policy should be weighed in the overall planning balance against the benefits the proposal would deliver.
POLICY MP1 - HIGH QUALITY DESIGN	PS1964	927695	Redrow Homes								Yes	Emerging Policy MP1 – High Quality Design is considered consistent with the NPPF.
POLICY MP2 – DESIGN AND PLACE SHAPING PRINCIPLES IN MAJOR DEVELOPMENTS	PS1220	1097127	Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd	Yes	Yes	No			•		Yes	The opening sentence of Policy MP2 refers to all new major development achieving "the highest" standards of design. This term is not consistent with the treatment of design in the NPPF (which refers to "good" design or "high" quality design), and the use of superlative language should be avoided because lacks precision and fails to convey clearly what an applicant needs to do in order to achieve planning permission. A development that might otherwise be approved because it secures a high quality of design could be refused under the terms of this policy because some alternative design, which is not part of the scheme under consideration, might be considered to offer an even higher quality. Suggest: Amend to state:"The Council will require all new major development to be of a high standard of design. Accordingly, all new major development should, where relevant, reflect the following principles: ..."
POLICY MP2 – DESIGN AND PLACE SHAPING PRINCIPLES IN MAJOR DEVELOPMENTS	PS541	664147	Sport England	Yes	Yes	Yes						The policy is supporting in that it encourages development to provide opportunities to promote healthy living and improve health and well-being. This would be consistent with the local plan's strategic objectives and section 8 of the NPPF as well as Sport England's wider objectives. The reference in paragraph 9.13 of the reasoned justification to Sport England's Active Design guidance is particularly welcomed in this context.
POLICY MP2 – DESIGN AND PLACE SHAPING PRINCIPLES IN MAJOR DEVELOPMENTS	PS741	966249	Mr Stephen Hook	Yes	Yes	No				•		Site 7 does not meet the requirements of this policy as the new development will be divided from the existing community of SWF by the existing road, there will be increased pollution due to the traffic, communities to the East of SWF will suffer increasing travel delays.
POLICY MP2 – DESIGN AND PLACE SHAPING PRINCIPLES IN MAJOR DEVELOPMENTS	PS882	961966	Mr Alan Brunning			No	•		•			SWF was and still is held up as a benchmark development and how new town should be created and implemented. The policy confirms this but the planning document has no requirement for the developers to conform to an appearance standard for the new homes that will fit in the 'Essex design' that was used for all the new houses in SWF.
POLICY MP2 – DESIGN AND PLACE SHAPING PRINCIPLES IN MAJOR DEVELOPMENTS	PS875	908048	Essex Bridleways Association	Yes	Yes	No	•				Yes	Access to green infrastructure and open spaces for as many user groups as possible is embedded within this Policy.
POLICY MP2 – DESIGN AND PLACE SHAPING PRINCIPLES IN MAJOR DEVELOPMENTS	PS986	311148	Essex County Council	Yes	Yes	No			•		No	Make reference to the need for developers to have regard to the revised Essex Design Guide by adding the following sentence: 'The Council will require developers to have regard to the design principles set out in the Essex Design Guide.'

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
POLICY MP2 – DESIGN AND PLACE SHAPING PRINCIPLES IN MAJOR DEVELOPMENTS	PS1135	965985	Mrs Sue Dobson	Yes	Yes	No	•			•	Yes	Policy does not contain any aspirations to include renewable energy within new developments. Whilst it refers to specifics within Policy MP3 (see comments PS1136) and ‘minimising use of natural resources’ -the inclusion of renewable energy is extremely important. Minimising use of resources is a little different to actually taking the opportunity to generate those resources and this aspiration should be embedded within this Plan to safeguard our future.
POLICY MP2 – DESIGN AND PLACE SHAPING PRINCIPLES IN MAJOR DEVELOPMENTS	PS1125	973857	Persimmon Homes Essex	Yes	Yes	No					No	The Government have been clear that it considers improvements in energy efficiency and carbon reduction should be achieved through Building Regulations. The Council should not ask for consideration to be given to measures to minimise energy consumption. The policy also does not contain a standard so cannot be assessed or monitored. A further criterion refers to Policy MP3, this is superfluous. See also attachment which contains all the representations from this consultee.
POLICY MP2 – DESIGN AND PLACE SHAPING PRINCIPLES IN MAJOR DEVELOPMENTS	PS1645	1159743	Gladman Developments Ltd	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	Gladman consider MP2 is too prescriptive in that it requires all new major development to reflect the principles listed. Gladman recommend the inclusion of the phrase ‘Where possible’ within this policy as it would provide the necessary flexibility for instances where it is not appropriate or necessary for the principles to be met.
POLICY MP2 – DESIGN AND PLACE SHAPING PRINCIPLES IN MAJOR DEVELOPMENTS	PS1797	1160014	Historic England	Yes	Yes							We are pleased to see specific reference to the need to have regard for the historic environment, and that all new development should respond positively to local character and context to preserve and enhance the quality of existing communities.
POLICY MP2 – DESIGN AND PLACE SHAPING PRINCIPLES IN MAJOR DEVELOPMENTS	PS1965	927695	Redrow Homes								Yes	MP2 requires all new major development to meet the highest standards of built and urban design. It is acknowledged that the NPPF seeks to achieve high quality design, however the policy is considered overly aspirational by seeking the ‘highest quality’ and is thus not in compliance with the NPPF.
9.9	PS542	664147	Sport England	Yes	Yes	Yes					No	As a minor modification to the reasoned justification, it is requested that developments are advocated to use the Essex Design Guide. The latest review of the guide is particularly relevant to major developments and has embedded the Active Design principles into all relevant aspects. Its use would provide more detailed guidance to complement the implementation of policy MP2.
9.9	PS883	961966	Mr Alan Brunning			No	•		•			SWF was and still is held up as a benchmark development and how new town should be created and implemented. The policy confirms this but the planning document has no requirement for the developers to conform to an appearance standard for the new homes that will fit in the 'Essex design' that was used for all the new houses in SWF.
9.9	PS900	961966	Mr Alan Brunning			No	•		•	•		SWF was and still is held up as a benchmark development and how new town should be created and implemented. The policy confirms this but the planning document has no requirement for the developers to conform to an appearance standard for the new homes that will fit in the 'Essex design' that was used for all the new houses in SWF. New buildings must adhere to the same design and appearance guidelines used for the existing town
POLICY MP3 – SUSTAINABLE BUILDINGS	PS1219	1097127	Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd	Yes	Yes	No		•	•		Yes	PPG acknowledges that LPAs may bring forward policies requiring different standards to those applied nationally on matters relating to water efficiency and accessibility, but only where there is clear local evidence to justify a departure to national standards. The Inspector will need to decide whether or not sufficient evidence has been put forward to justify the alternative approach to water efficiency and energy efficiency in non-residential buildings. The first sentence of the policy state that the Council will "expect" residential buildings to incorporate sustainable design features and reduce emissions, but this approach is not consistent with the PPG, and no evidence is put forward to support the application of alternative standards for residential buildings. It is unclear how this opening sentence to the policy is to be applied, because it provides no guidance as to what applicants would need to do to comply. The inclusion of the reference to new dwellings in the opening sentence is unjustified, and is likely to be ineffective, because it provides no clarity as to what the Council is seeking to achieve or what it is that is "expected" of new development. If the opening sentence had stated that the Council will "encourage" sustainability measures in residential development, then it would be clearer as to what the purpose of the policy is in this respect, but the use of the word "expect" implies that applicants are required to do something to satisfy the policy, but without any justification or explanation as to what that is. Suggest: Reference to new dwellings should be removed from the opening sentence, or the policy wording amended to substitute the word "expect" for "encourage applicants for".

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
POLICY MP3 – SUSTAINABLE BUILDINGS	PS740	966249	Mr Stephen Hook			No				•		Concern the plan is inconsistent in how it deals with BREEAM requirements and building regulations for residential and non-residential buildings.
POLICY MP3 – SUSTAINABLE BUILDINGS	PS1136	965985	Mrs Sue Dobson	Yes	Yes	No	•			•	Yes	Reducing carbon emissions is required within this Policy is a little different to ensuring renewable energy generation is required. More emphasis should be on the need to include renewable energy generation where practicable within new developments and this Policy should take the opportunity to do this. (See comments PS1135)
POLICY MP3 – SUSTAINABLE BUILDINGS	PS1126	973857	Persimmon Homes Essex	Yes	Yes	No				•	No	The policy is unsound and not consistent with national policy. The Government have been clear that it considers improvements in energy efficiency and carbon reduction should be achieved through Building Regulations. We do not support the expectation in para 9.18 that all new development should apply the energy hierarchy. The costs of EV charging points have not been fully factored into the viability assessment. See also attachment which contains all the representations from this consultee.
POLICY MP3 – SUSTAINABLE BUILDINGS	PS1646	1159743	Gladman Developments Ltd	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	Given the Council are proposing this policy introduces the optional water efficiency standard they will need to be able to demonstrate through robust evidence that this requirement is justified.
POLICY MP3 – SUSTAINABLE BUILDINGS	PS1672	1159875	Home Builders Federation			No				•	Yes	Improvements in energy efficiency and carbon reduction will be achieved through changes to the Building Regulations. To expect applicants to incorporate features above and beyond what is required by building regulations is clearly not consistent with national policy. To make this policy consistent with national policy we would suggest the that “expect” is replaced with “encouraged”.
POLICY MP3 – SUSTAINABLE BUILDINGS	PS1966	927695	Redrow Homes								Yes	MP3 requires all new dwellings and non-residential buildings to incorporate sustainable design features to reduce carbon dioxide and nitrogen dioxide emissions and that all new dwellings provide EV charging point infrastructure. We support the aspiration of this policy however such requirements may need to be the subject of viability considerations and which in our view needs to be factored in to the policy.
POLICY MP4 - DESIGN SPECIFICATION FOR DWELLINGS AND HOUSES IN MULTIPLE OCCUPATION	PS1127	973857	Persimmon Homes Essex	Yes	Yes	No		•			Yes	The policy is unsound and unjustified. The NPPG sets out clear criteria which councils must satisfy to adopt national space standards. Initially they must demonstrate clearly evidenced need. Once this has been demonstrated should the LPA test if the enhanced standards are viable. It is not clear the costs have been applied as part of the plan's viability assessment and no need has been identified. See also attachment which contains all the representations from this consultee.
POLICY MP4 - DESIGN SPECIFICATION FOR DWELLINGS AND HOUSES IN MULTIPLE OCCUPATION	PS1674	1159875	Home Builders Federation			No		•			Yes	It is incumbent on the Council to provide a local assessment evidencing the specific case for Chelmsford which justifies the inclusion of the NDSS as a Local Plan policy. Not clear how space standards have informed viability assessments. The land deals underpinning the majority of identified sites will have been secured prior to any proposed introduction of NDSS. These sites should be allowed to move through the planning system before any proposed policy requirements are enforced.
POLICY MP5 - PARKING STANDARDS	PS594	1155779	Countryside Zest (Beaulieu Park) LLP			No	•	•	•		Yes	The Essex Parking Standards do not represent an up-to-date basis to support a policy within the new LP which is intended to be adopted until 2036.
9.27	PS738	966249	Mr Stephen Hook	Yes	Yes	No			•			Current parking standards are out of date and the Plan does not deal with overnight parking of commercial/business vehicles in residential areas.
POLICY MP6 – TALL BUILDINGS	PS1799	1160014	Historic England	Yes	Yes							Some concern regarding the implications of the text in paragraph 9.31 which suggests that tall buildings may be acceptable around transport interchanges of train and bus services. This sweeping approach does not reflect local specifics. Chelmsford train station for example, sits within the West End Conservation Area (a conservation area on the National at Risk Register) and adjacent to the Central Chelmsford Conservation Area, the Grade II listed Law Library is also opposite the station. The station is therefore in a sensitive location surrounded by designated heritage assets. To reduce ambiguity we recommend that reference to the suitability of tall buildings around the train station is removed from the text or that the text is amended to better reflect the local conditions of Chelmsford City.
POLICY MP6 – TALL BUILDINGS	PS2029	1160633	Genesis Housing Association	Yes	Yes	Yes						Policy MP6 is supported. It enables the construction of appropriately designed buildings in the most sustainable locations. City Park West is a successful example of a development which integrates tall buildings into the scheme’s design. The initial proposals for Phase 3 would have a 5-storey continuous height with an overstepping 7-storey volume according with this policy. See complete rep by Bidwells (1160633PS-A) and Development Appraisal (1160633PS-B).

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
POLICY MP7 – PROVISION OF BROADBAND	PS1128	973857	Persimmon Homes Essex	Yes	Yes	No				•	No	Council's should not seek higher standards than Building Regulations on any standard relating to the construction, internal layout or performance of new dwellings. It is not clear what the requirements of this policy are but if the intention is to seek higher standards than Building Regulations Part R1 the policy is contrary to national policy. If no increase in relation to Part R1 is required, the policy is redundant and should be deleted. See also attachment which contains all the representations from this consultee.
POLICY MP7 – PROVISION OF BROADBAND	PS1679	1159875	Home Builders Federation			No		•		•	Yes	Not clear if policy seeks higher standard than in Building Regulations. If no increase in the technical standard is expected then the policy is redundant and should be deleted. Similarly if the objective is to seek a higher standard this is not consistent with Government policy and will require MP7 to be deleted.
POLICY PA1 – PROTECTING AMENITY	PS897	961966	Mr Alan Brunning			No	•		•	•		Area 7 SWF The plan as written will seriously affect commuters living standards of existing residents and those on the Dengie. The minimal changes to the B1012 with none proposed for the rail network will 'crash' a system that is already at capacity.
POLICY PA2 – CONTAMINATION AND POLLUTION	PS682	830229	Mrs Helen Sadler									Adaptations to improve air quality do not reach the standard of national guidelines and do not address the issues that the proposed developments will bring. Stansted Airport also affects the air quality and should be considered in any calculations for air quality to this area. No consideration given to the cumulative amount of houses in the area and the impact this will have on roads.
9.41	PS629	1155857	Environment Agency	Yes	Yes	Yes						
10.3	PS1800	1160014	Historic England	Yes	Yes							There is concern that the monitoring indicators are too general and do reflect the specific objectives of the plan. Strategic Policy S5: Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment seeks to ensure a review of conservation areas over the plan period but this does not appear as a monitoring indicator. If Strategic Policy S5 seeks to undertake a review of the conservation this should surely be highlighted as monitoring indicator in order to compel this useful work to be done. There is no monitoring indicator to reflect Heritage at Risk. The West End Conservation Area is on the National at Risk register; it is also a central area in the city and contains the train station. There is an opportunity to enhance and improve the condition of the conservation area through new development and it is therefore unclear why there is (no?) monitoring indicator to reflect this.
Table 5: Monitoring Framework - Strategic Policies	PS902	961966	Mr Alan Brunning	No		No	•		•			S3 the strategic policy document ignores fluvial flooding in SWF S11 the infrastructure requirements for area 7 SWF on transport are grossly underestimated. The Cil Funding will not provide the cash to resolve these issues in SWF. CCC need to review the flood risk of SWF. CCC must provide the infrastructure before building on the site.
Table 5: Monitoring Framework - Strategic Policies	PS906	961966	Mr Alan Brunning			No	•		•			S9 The masterplan will set the targets but there is no masterplan so CCC can do anything they like S11 Milestones and proposals have not been met. Policy wording does not meet what has to be delivered on site. Appendix H in the traffic survey for roads in area 7 show it is already over capacity and the text says the roads are under capacity. S12, Funding from CIL 90% less than required. S14 For SWF the proposal for this development is unsustainable and not in line with the declared policy. A sustainable set of targets is required before the plan can be considered sustainable
Table 7: Monitoring Framework - Protecting and Securing Important Assets Policies	PS907	961966	Mr Alan Brunning			No	•		•			CO4 the table addresses the number of buildings not the design of the homes. The policy declares an architectural need to fit with the existing developments but this has been conveniently forgotten. NE3 The permissions have been granted on a document that does not consider fluvial flooding in area 7 SWF and its near neighbours. CF1 intent to link the two communities in area 7 and provide access to pedestrians and cyclists cannot be met whilst the B1012 remains dividing the communities. CF3 the proposals for area 7 do not include a primary school for 1000 + new homes. This is not a sustainable development
Table 7: Monitoring Framework - Protecting and Securing Important Assets Policies	PS987	311148	Essex County Council	Yes	Yes	No				•	No	To be consistent with that identified in the DEFRA Single Data List (00 – 160) change the 'key indicator' as follows: • Local sites in positive conservation management

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
Table 8: Monitoring Framework - Making High Quality Places Policies	PS909	961966	Mr Alan Brunning			No	•		•			MP1/MP2 no control over architecture and house design - its left to the developers. CCC have to ensure the new houses fit with the Essex design standard implemented in SWF. The presence of the B1012 in its current location will ensure there will be 2 communities and as such this contradicts the intent of the policy and stated objectives for the development. This is not sustainable development PA1 Area 7 SWF cannot be progressed until infrastructure is suitable. The proposals in this planning document are inadequate and the statements in the summaries are grossly misleading as to the level of transport infrastructure needed for a sustainable development.
A.2	PS1044	963136	Mrs Sarah Clark	No		No	•	•	•	•	Yes	This developers guide is non compliant with the Climate Change Act 2008 in regard to renewable energy targets and the Passivhaus standard. It is also breaching the Natural Environment and Biodiversity Act as it does not identify biodiversity targets.
Table 18: Housing Number Breakdown	PS230	1096766	Mr Ken Wilkinson	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•		No	You should rely not only on elected people but also of the local opinion. If the local opinion is clearly against a development, further investigation is required. Greenfield development should be considered last, before all brownfield locations are used. Concern about impact on existing road infrastructure and loss of open spaces. Adequate parking provision required for new houses, everyone won't cycle or use public transport.
Table 18: Housing Number Breakdown	PS733	952361	Mrs Laura Dunne									Blank rep.
Table 18: Housing Number Breakdown	PS1208	1097080	Ms Shyy Sachdev	Yes	Yes	No		•	•		Yes	The Draft Local Plan fails to identify sufficient small sites for development in accordance with NPPF changes and is not justified or effective as it has a strategy that has an over-reliance on larger site. The Green Wedges and Green Corridors Review Report is unsound as it was not subject to public consultation to test changes to boundaries. Land at Rembrandt House, Broomfield does not perform the functions of the Green Wedge and should be removed and allocated for development. Including it means the Plan is not justified or effective.
C.1	PS1648	1159743	Gladman Developments Ltd	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	Questions the delivery rates applied to strategic sites, especially North East Chelmsford. Suggests more small/medium sites should be allocated to assist with delivery should there be any slippage.
C.2	PS1315	872955	Hammonds Estates LLP	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	Strategy places an over-reliance on delivering development at North East Chelmsford. Urban extension that has failed to deliver housing in significant numbers to date. One third of all new housing allocations to be provided in a single location - approach to delivery of development is neither justified or effective. Limits choice for home buyers and renters. North East Chelmsford has various landowners, complex negotiations both within and outside the consortium, poses significant risk to delivery of the site in the timescales suggested. There is no evidence of a collaborative agreement. Difficult to deliver and are often delayed due to landowner disputes and lack of agreement. North East Chelmsford would comprise an extension to Beaulieu Park and Channels, neither of which have yet delivered either significant levels of housing or the infrastructure required to support it. Allocating development at Hammonds Farm would reduce risk, by distributing development around the city at a location that requires significantly less infrastructure to enable it to be delivered. Beaulieu Park and Channels – delays in completion rates, development is significantly behind schedule and as a consequence development at Beaulieu Park and Channels will overlap with development at North East Chelmsford for a considerable period of time. Timescales for planning applications are optimistic particularly given the complexities associated with large-scale sites in multiple and fragmented ownership. No planning application to rephase minerals extraction at the site has been submitted. Build out rates identified are unrealistic and undeliverable given that all of this housing would be delivered in the same area and is likely to saturate the market. In contrast Hammonds Farm would be brought forward at more realistic annual delivery rates, with a maximum of 200 units per year, delivered by a number of housebuilders, including small and medium size companies, as well as volume housebuilders. Significant concerns that a number of sites in the Plan are promoted by the same developer - does not provide choice in the market, as required by the NPPF. HEst has reviewed completions on sites in Chelmsford, from information provided by CCC and ECC. This confirms that with the exception of sites at the University Campus and former Marconi Works, annual delivery rates have generally been significantly lower. HEst has reviewed delivery rates on a number of large scale sites to provide a comparison, Table (table 5) provided as attachment in Response to Pre-Submission Document.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
C.2	PS2067	1098405	The North East Chelmsford Garden Village Consortium		Yes	Yes					Yes	Housing trajectory should show an increase in delivery in 2023/24 from 100 units to 150 units and in 2024/25 from 150 units to 200 and a corresponding reduction of 100 units 2026 – 2036. This is on the basis of the successful build out rates at Beaulieu and Channels and the proven track record of the delivery of homes and supporting infrastructure. The Consortium are confident that more homes could come forward in the first four years after commencement of development.
C.3	PS9	1096916	Mr Paul Marshall	Yes	Yes						Yes	Site 3c Land south of Maldon Road, is not suitable for housing due to its closeness to the electricity pylons and the substation. The pylons were placed at a safe distance from the houses in Molrams Lane. The site will also suffer traffic noise from nearby A12.
C.3	PS1218	1097127	Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd	Yes	Yes	No		•			Yes	The housing trajectory suggests that the strategic growth site to the north of South Woodham Ferrers will start to deliver new homes in 2021/22, and will complete 1000 homes by 2030/31, a period of 10 years. However, see no need to alter the housing trajectory. trajectory is pessimistic - an average of 150 units per annum appears realistic (market and affordable), and on that basis, the development would be complete within 8 years rather than 10, complete by 2028/29. The housing trajectory should not be used to constrain housing delivery (or used to support arbitrary site phasing), and it should be recognised that there is flexibility to exceed the delivery rates suggested. Suggest: Amend the trajectory to bring the completion date forward to 2028/29.
C.3	PS1927	927695	Redrow Homes								Yes	The Sedgefield methodology has been used to assess current OAN figures. The 805dpa figure meets the 5 year housing supply but does not provide much flexibility if sites fail to come forward. Plan should consider additional sites (such as land east of 3c).
E.1	PS677	970996	Highways England									Satisfied that Model Validation Report is an appropriate tool for assessing the impact of development on the highway network. Consider the transport modelling evidence base to be ‘sound’ and, therefore, fit for purpose and, I consider, in transport terms that the Draft Local Plan is also ‘sound’.
E.1	PS685	830229	Mrs Helen Sadler									The lack of scope and robustness with the evidence base indicates the plan has not been positively prepared and is not consistent with national framework (NPPF).
E.1	PS876	908048	Essex Bridleways Association	Yes	Yes	No	•				Yes	The Rights of Way Improvement Plan should be included within this evidence base to ensure that the network improves in a planned way.
E.1	PS1206	1097080	Ms Shyy Sachdev	Yes	Yes	No		•	•		Yes	The Green Wedges and Green Corridors Review Report is unsound as it was not subject to public consultation to test changes to boundaries. Land at Rembrandt House, Broomfield does not perform the functions of the Green Wedge and should be removed and allocated for development. Including it means the Plan is not justified or effective.
E.1	PS1316	872955	Hammonds Estates LLP	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	Hammonds Farm have produced own evidence base documents. See Appendix 2 (see attachment Chelmsford Housing Need) which provide commentary on the Council's proposed housing requirement and suggests that the proposed OAN should be increased. Appendix 3 (see attachment Review of Landscape Capacity, March 2018) which suggests the Council has incorrectly assessed the landscape capacity for a number of sites and puts forward an alternative assessment. Appendix 6 (see attachment Review of Green Wedges and Green Corridors: Defining Chelmsford's river valleys report) which reviews the assessment of Green Wedges and Green Corridors and in particular focuses on the area around Hammonds Farm.
E.1	PS1361	1102437	The Russell Family	Yes	Yes	No			•		Yes	A Green Belt Review should have been undertaken.
E.1	PS1472	1101449	Ms Linda Beard	No		No	•	•	•	•	Yes	The Brownfield Register should have been updated prior to this consultation so that additional sites could have been commented on as part of the Local Plan.
E.1	PS1874	1160384	Mrs Anne Graystone									Requests a review of the DSB relating to own property - Southwood House, North Court Road. Report states it's South Woodhouse, Woodhouse Lane, which is incorrect. Please include Southwood House in DSB. Queries the 25m distance from property - currently shown as 11.5m.
E.1	PS1893	1101348	Education & Skills Funding Agency									It would be useful if the IDP could be expanded to set out more clearly how the forecast housing growth at allocated sites (and the likely scale and distribution of growth of non-allocated sites) has been translated (via an evidence based pupil yield calculation) into an identified need for specific numbers of school places (primary, secondary, sixth form, SEND) and new schools over the plan period.
11.2	PS48	930213	C L H Pipeline System Ltd									Checking if development overlaps pipeline

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
11.2	PS507	1146480	Aquila Developments Ltd	Yes	Yes	No		•		•	Yes	The Green Corridor designation is intended to apply to river valleys. The land north of Main Road Boreham does not fall within this category, as is evidenced by the consultants' own assessment . This is an attempt to provide a further layer of control which is inconsistent with the NPPF. Land at Generals Farm satisfies no Green Corridor criteria and should be included in Chelmsford Urban Area boundary.
11.3	PS1212	1157030	Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	Amendment sought to the Green Belt Boundary to the south of Galleywood Road. Allocation of land at Galleywood Road, Great Baddow as a sustainable urban extension. See Appendix 1 and Appendix 3 in the attachment (Representations to the Chelmsford Local Plan Submission Draft by RPS).
11.3	PS1733	1160014	Historic England	Yes	Yes							It is disappointing to see that inset maps have been removed from this draft of the plan and we recommend that they are reintroduced.
Map 1	PS592	1155779	Countryside Zest (Beaulieu Park) LLP	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•		Yes	Concern that Beaulieu Park Employment Site is still allocated as employment land as inclusion of an employment allocation within the Beaulieu Outline Planning Consent area is not effective. EM1 should not apply to this site. Blue coloured New Hall School designation should be removed from area North of Bulls Lodge Farm and area immediately west of New Hall School as the areas form important parts of Beaulieu's open space and would prejudice the delivery of the consented Beaulieu development. (See also PS593, PS594)
Map 1	PS1226	961998	Essex County Council	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	Representations made on behalf of Property and Facilities at Essex County Council (as landowner). 1. Essex County Council object to the allocation of land to the north of Cuton Hall Lane/Chelmer Village Way as open space. Springfield area is currently very well served by open space provision. This land is owned by Essex County Council, and public access is not encouraged. Planning permission was granted on part of land for a nursery, Chelmsford City Council acknowledged that the value of this land as open space had significantly reduced since 2007. 2. The proposed allocation is not deliverable in planning terms. In the SCG to a current appeal for a Care Home on the site, Chelmsford City Council acknowledged that the 1999 Section 106 agreement on the site (reference 97/CHL/1186/OL), which designated this land as open space is no longer in force. The site is not widely used by the public, it is of very little amenity value and is within an area that is very well served by accessible green space, so we do not consider that the designation of this area as open space is justified in planning terms. 3. Due to its sustainable location within the Urban Area of Chelmsford, close to services and facilities, the south- east proportion of the site (approximately 0.8 hectares) should be proposed for a Care Home Development. To assist in meeting the identified need within Chelmsford City Council's own Strategic Housing Market Assessment for Elderly Care; make efficient use of land and protect further release of land from areas outside the DSB; meet the objective to focus elderly care on Urban Areas of Chelmsford and South Woodham Ferrers. This amendment is required in order for the plan to be sound in planning terms. So: Remove proposed allocation of Cuton Hall Lane/Chelmer Village Way as Open Space. Allocate land at Cuton Hall Lane/Chelmer Village Way to allow development of a Care Home.
Map 1	PS1246	1100910	Anglian Water Services Ltd	Yes	Yes	No		•		•	Yes	Object to the designation of land in Anglian Water's ownership as a green wedge. Do not consider that the land in Anglian Water's ownership performs a green wedge function as defined in part b) of Policy C01. Disagree with the findings of 'Green Wedges and Green Corridors: Defining Chelmsford's River Valleys report'. The proposed designation could result in in an unintended barrier to water recycling investment and operation which is contrary to Paragraph 156 of the NPPF. (Attachment refs. Landscape Partnership Report (1) ) and Landscape Partnership report - Appendix 1 (figures) )
Map 1	PS1216	1157030	Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	Amendment sought to the Green Belt Boundary to the south of Galleywood Road. Allocation of land at Galleywood Road, Great Baddow as a sustainable urban extension. See Appendix 1 and Appendix 3 in the attachment (Representations to the Chelmsford Local Plan Submission Draft by RPS).
Map 1	PS1268	1157185	Bressole Ltd	Yes	Yes	No		•	•	•	Yes	Amend Map 1 to show a "Starter Home Exception Site" designation on the land east of Vicarage Lane, Great Baddow.



Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
Map 1	PS1449	873380	Mr Peter Todd	Yes	Yes	Yes					No	Our Client agrees with the principle of the Strategic Growth Site Location 4 in North East Chelmsford so long as the area of land comprising the residential properties in Domsey Lane - shown on the Policies Map 1 Chelmsford Urban Area as 'white land' without notation but proposed to be included within the urban area of Chelmsford - would allow for appropriate development within the area to be treated on its individual merits in accordance with normal development management policies. This is because the 'white land', that is currently subject to restrictive countryside policies, will be surrounded by the proposed Garden Community but will not be subject to the overall comprehensive masterplan process being led by the promoters. It would be unreasonable and inequitable for properties, such as 'Greenacres' and other large residential properties in Domsey Lane to be restricted from appropriate development potential that is sympathetic to its surroundings and neighbouring character.
Map 1	PS1721	872952	Mrs Mary Rance	Yes	Yes	Yes					No	Support the encouragement for specialist residential accommodation within Policy HO1. Promoted site, Chantry Farm (CFS81/17SLAA32), should be allocated for specialist residential accommodation.
Map 1	PS2042	1097203	Bovis Homes Ltd	Yes	Yes	No		•		•	Yes	The Council's decision to not undertake a comprehensive Green Belt Review, has resulted in a constrained approach that is heavily focussed on the continuation of Chelmsford City Council's long-term strategy of directing new residential growth to the northern part of Chelmsford. Contribution can be made by land to the west of Chelmsford and south of Writtle, which is considerably closer to the city centre than allocations proposed in the Local Plan to the north of Chelmsford. See Appendix 3.1 to our representation on Policy S9 - Vision Document - provides further detail on compelling and robust proposals for a comprehensive and landscape-led development to the West of Chelmsford and South of Writtle. Challenge the City Council's proposal to define a Green Wedge across an extensive area of land between Chelmsford and Writtle. Our representation is supported by a review carried out by EDP of the evidence base document which provides the City Council's rationale for the identification of Green Wedge boundaries. The Policies Map should be amended to show a revised Green Wedge boundary which accords with that proposed on Plan EDP4, found in Appendix 4.1.
Map 1	PS2069	1098405	The North East Chelmsford Garden Village Consortium	Yes	Yes	Yes					Yes	Changes to Proposals Map: Area of land at Channels defined as being future Open Space is based in part upon an existing and/or unimplemented land use for a private golf club. The area shown is inaccurate and contains land in its northern area which has not been previously used for such recreational activities. Suggest removal of this notation. proposed Country Park (on the Bulls Lodge Quarry site post-restoration) should be shown as being part of Site Allocation 4. The proposed Country Park should be shown as comprising an integral part of Strategic Growth Site 4 on the Policies Map. The symbolic presentation of RDR2 is unclear - greater clarity is necessary to show the proposed alignment. Suggest align the Policies Map more closely to the NE Masterplan.
Map 2	PS922	1156796	Tesco Stores Ltd			No	•	•			Yes	Letter attached questioning why the retail frontage at Tesco's Superstore at Springfield Road has been changed from primary to secondary frontage given its size and high quality retail offer, extensive opening hours, size of the car park and excellent links to the High Street via Springfield Road and Bond Street.
Map 2	PS1019	1156949	Aldi Stores Ltd	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•	•	No	Question the removal of opportunity sites, particularly site 25 in the current LDF, TCAAP. The unjustified removal of allocations is contradictory to national and local policy as well as the Council's evidence base (2015 Retail Capacity Study) and Strategic Priority 4 (para 3.12)
Map 2	PS1683	1159923	Police, Fire & Crime Commissioner for Essex	Yes	Yes	No		•	•	•	Yes	Amend the policies map 2 for the Chelmsford City Centre proposes to remove the open space designation on the Essex Police Headquarters site. There is no opportunity for shared use of a school playing field given that a school is not achievable on this site. The land is currently required for use by Essex Police for training and sport and cannot serve a public purpose
Map 2	PS2040	1160633	Genesis Housing Association	Yes	Yes	No		•				The map should be amended to include a site allocation for residential development at City Park West Phase 3.
Map 2	PS2074	965497	New Hall Properties (Eastern) Ltd			No		•			No	Land to the West of Seven Ash Green should be removed from the Green Wedge and Open Space designations currently shown on the Policies Map and should be allocated for residential use. The Open Space designation of the Site is therefore unsound as it is not 'justified' by the Local Plan evidence base.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
Map 3	PS343	361537	Mr Mike Otter	No				•	•	•	No	Include provision of a suitable safe crossing point over the B1012 to the West of the B1418 and reduce the speed limit and introduce traffic calming on Willow Grove or ensure that the new developments are not accessed from Willow Grove.
Map 6	PS1311	1157209	Mr John W T Riches									Comment on a SLAA site - wish to understand why part of a site has not been included in the LP. Asking CCC to reconsider. Blatch Cote, White Elm Road.
Map 6	PS1626	1159753	Mr N Halls			No	•	•		•	Yes	Supportive of broad principles of Spatial Strategy. Object to the small number of homes that have been allocated at Bicknacre. Bicknacre is a highly sustainable location, where residents have access to a good level of services and public transport links. It is considered that the village is capable of accommodating a higher level of growth than 30 dwellings. Promoted site north of Peartree Lane should be allocated for development.
Map 6	PS1847	962559	Genesis HA	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	Genesis Housing Association (GHA) supports the proposal map identifying the full extent of site EC5 at St Giles, Moor Hall Lane. GHA also supports the inclusion of additional land to the north and south of Priory Lane within the defined settlement boundaries (sites 3 and 4 identified by the enclosed St Giles brochure).
Map 8	PS505	1155291	Mr Stan Collins									Good farmland should be preserved. Concern that with current congestion, the roads will not cope with additional development. If the proposed bypass is not built in time, congestion and associated health issues will worsen. A mini village off of the A12 or A130 would be a better area for development.
Map 8	PS756	1156616	Mrs C Munday	No	No	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	The green boundary between Broomfield and Little Waltham has vanished and green belt, farm land and area for enhancing wildlife has been lost. New approach road needs to be from the Great Waltham approach. Hospital cannot cope with more buildings or traffic The boundary line for Little Waltham will destroy 8 protected trees and start a line of building which will have no end. Woodhouse Lane is a protected lane Impact on neighbourhood and wildlife
Map 8	PS1205	1097080	Ms Shyy Sachdev	Yes	Yes	No		•	•		Yes	The Draft Local Plan fails to identify sufficient small sites for development in accordance with NPPF changes and is not justified or effective as it has a strategy that has an over-reliance on larger sites. The Green Wedges and Green Corridors Review Report is unsound as it was not subject to public consultation to test changes to boundaries. Land at Rembrandt House, Broomfield does not perform the functions of the Green Wedge and should be removed and allocated for development.
Map 9	PS1878	312409	Strutt & Parker (Farms) Ltd			No	•	•	•		Yes	On behalf of our client, we propose that there should be greater flexibility afforded to Rural Employment Areas such as Whitbreads Business Centre, through the relaxation of the proposed allocation boundaries and inclusion of potential areas for future expansion, such as a small parcel of land to the north east of the current office buildings.
Map 11	PS300	964929	Mr David Rackham	Yes	No	No	•				No	The site between Old Church Road and Back Lane should continue to be shown as a dotted line as a potential extension to the DSB solely for the provision of 10 affordable dwellings or it would open up the possibility of a future planning application without any affordable dwellings or a much lower percentage.
Map 11	PS884	1156755	East Hanningfield Parish Council					•				The plot between Back Lane and Old Church Road adjacent to Blackthorne, Old Church Road and Arlberg, Back Lane should be excluded from the Defined Settlement until such time as the affordable housing for local people has been built. The delineation of the Open Space at the playground between Filliol Close and Catherine Close should include the whole of the land purchased as open space by the Parish Council. The designation of Protected Lane should extend to its junction with Old Church Road.
Map 14	PS1395	1096887	Marie Wallis	No								Map 14 is not clear and lacks road names.
Map 16	PS182	961061	Mr Nigel Booley	No	No	No	•	•	•		No	Only the inclusion of area 5a is supported. For 5b and 5c, the plan does not comply as it does not support SA Objectives 5,11 and 14. Values of listed buildings will be adversely affected as will views from the rear of my property. Funding shortfall for CNEB will lead to excessive congestion in Great Leighs. My house is outside the DSB and was heavily restricted on height when built, this setting has not changed. Safety concerns about using Banters Lane for access to 5c, it cannot be widened to provide a second lane, walkways and cycleways (see attachments, the first attachment has not been made public since it contains confidential information).
Map 16	PS681	830229	Mrs Helen Sadler									Pond View has not been considered in regard to DSB. It should be within DSB as it is brownfield land and mixed use of residential and commercial use. it's classification as garden land is against policy S1.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
Map 16	PS1525	309149	Black Notley Parish Council									No consideration for the impact on the infrastructure of the adjoining Parish of Black Notley Braintree, especially with the 1750 dwellings proposed by Braintree District Council at Black Notley. London Road and Bakers Lane already suffer extreme congestion at peak times, which will be made worse by proposed development. Link road should be built between Notley Road and London Road. No green buffer between Great Leighs and Black Notley
Map 16	PS1897	1101627	Gateway 120, Cirrus Land LLP, and L & Q Homes	Yes	No	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	As currently drafted, the plan fails to deliver on its Strategic Priorities, nor Strategic Policy S1 which forms the basis on which the plan is founded. Land east of Braintree offers an opportunity to meet the strategic objectives of both CCC and the north Essex region as a whole, delivering a comprehensively planned urban extension to Braintree with appropriate supporting infrastructure provided on-site in combination with housing delivery. Rather than representing an isolated development with a reliance on private vehicle movements, the site represents the best opportunity to utilise both an existing principle service centre, as well as linking in to the planned spatial growth strategy for the region. In order to be considered effective in delivering its strategic objectives, the plan should be amended to consider more appropriate ways the objectively assessed needs of the region can be accommodated. A suitable alternative exists. With the Braintree District Council Section 2 Local Plan yet to undergo its Examination in Public, the Councils should take the opportunity to reassess whether the strategic development sites of both plans will effectively deliver the objectives of allocating them.
Map 16	PS2034	308541	Great & Little Leighs Parish Council									Feel they were not consulted about Settlement Boundary review. Oppose inclusion of Willows, Maric, Gables, Woodlands and Rosylea in the revised DSB. Feel CCC are trying to join Notley with Gt. Leighs to accommodate the LP. Banter's Lane should be a boundary. Feel changes to DSB do not account for "DSB should exclude houses and buildings in an area with a predominately rural character outside the built up area to avoid giving rise to pressure to develop adjoining land". Concern that inclusion of Sandylay and Moat woods will cause damage to them.
Map 21	PS376	965124	Mr Gerald Malton								Yes	No. 23 The Street Little Waltham should be included within the DSB. Its proposed exclusion from the DSB and inclusion in the green wedge does not represent a rational approach to the DSB and is not in line with the criteria set out to justify changes to the DSB. See also attached file.
Map 21	PS1694	1101771	Mr Paul Hopkins	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•	•	Yes	Service Settlements outside the Green Belt should also be provided with housing to meet local needs. Site CFS272 should be allocated for development. CFS272 should be removed from Green Wedge designation.
Map 25	PS1484	958103	Mr D Bishop	No	Yes	No		•		•	Yes	Plan 25 'Rettendon Common' should be amended to include the land to the north of Bell Court within the Defined Settlement Boundary, as is the case on the extant Plan 24 of the 2012 Site Allocation Document.
Map 33	PS1477	312418	Essex & Suffolk Water			No		•			No	The open space designation covering the land owned by Essex & Suffolk Water in West Hanningfield should be removed.
Map 34	PS1029	963512	Mr Keith McMullon	Yes	Yes	No	•	•	•	•	No	Land at Broadacres (15SLAA11) should be included within the Woodham Ferrers DSB. Would allow a small amount of development within the village.
Map 35	PS624	1155336	Mr Ian Buick			No	•	•	•	•		Development will cause major traffic issues in the Writtle area. In short not enough consideration as been given for the need for sufficient infrastructure, the need to minimise traffic in our towns and cities, the effect on public health and to reduce pollution. The proposed housing development could be located to the east of Chelmsford where there are better transport links, particularly the A12 and the proposed NE bypass and new rail station at Boreham.
Map 35	PS905	1156774	Mrs Sheila Young			No	•	•	•		No	Move the proposed site to the East of Chelmsford closer to the A12. Concern for congestion. Access to most of the amenities fall short of the 2km walk criteria resulting in additional car usage. Bus service is limited. Doctors and schools cannot cope. The roads need to be a main concern of the planners to make the site 'sound'. More attention needs to be paid to the essential infrastructure, traffic management and local people
Map 35	PS1032	1156985	Mr John Young			No	•	•	•		No	Concern about congestion, particularly on Ongar Road and Lordship Road. Amenities are too far to walk to, buses are limited, there are no cycle lanes or pedestrian crossings. Would need additional doctor's surgery. Move the proposed site to the East of Chelmsford closer to the A12. Cost of upgrading the A12 should be met by building of new houses. Concern about safety of residents and local traffic management for the new site and existing residents.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
Map 35	PS1502	1096774	Mrs Sophie Jackson			No	•	•	•	•		Existing road system would not be able to support the increase in traffic caused by new development. Proposed transport plans would do little to overcome traffic problems. Services and facilities would be unable to cope with proposed development. Need to protect villages from merging with Chelmsford. Development should be located to the east of Writtle with Green Belt land replaced at Warren Farm.
Map 35	PS1504	1158459	Mrs Elaine Crook	No	No	No	•	•	•		No	Key links, in and around Writtle, comprising Chignal Road, A1060 Roxwell Road, Lordship Road and The Green, which already experience congestion, will experience higher levels of congestion and journey-time delay. Roxwell Road would be undesirable walking route to reach city centre. Limited bus service and improvements unlikely. Individual personal transport plans proposed by CCC will not overcome these traffic congestion problems. Development should be located to the east of Chelmsford.
Map 35	PS1506	964909	Mr Graeme Crook	No	No	No	•	•	•		No	Key links, in and around Writtle, comprising Chignal Road, A1060 Roxwell Road, Lordship Road and The Green, which already experience congestion, will experience higher levels of congestion and journey-time delay. Roxwell Road would be undesirable walking route to reach city centre. Limited bus service and improvements unlikely. Individual personal transport plans proposed by CCC will not overcome these traffic congestion problems. Development should be located to the east of Chelmsford.
Map 35	PS1538	1099195	Mr William Jackson			No	•	•	•	•		Existing road system would not be able to support the increase in traffic caused by new development. Proposed transport plans would do little to overcome traffic problems. Services and facilities would be unable to cope with proposed development. Need to protect villages from merging with Chelmsford. Development should be located to the east of Writtle with Green Belt land replaced at Warren Farm.
Map 35	PS1591	963039	Mr Andrew Brewster			No	•	•	•	•	No	Concern around findings in traffic report and future congestion in Writtle. For the size of development the site would require more than one vehicular access. Predominant pedestrian route is the A1060 which is undesirable due to the traffic. Bus services are limited. Development at EC2 is unsustainable. Concern for unsuitable access roads. Concern for how Broomfield hosp will cope, how schools will cope, pollution, flooding. E Chelmsford is more preferable for development
Map 35	PS1653	1152098	Mr Ralph Bray			No	•	•	•		No	Development would cause traffic congestion in and around Writtle. The Travel Plan would be unlikely to overcome the traffic problems. Insufficient attention has been paid to essential infrastructure, traffic management and danger to people. Development should be located to the east of Chelmsford. If development goes ahead, CCC should work with Writtle and Chignal Parishes to resolve congestion.
Map 35	PS1723	1099197	Mr Charles Jackson			No	•	•	•	•		Traffic is already an issue and will be made worse by proposed development. Transport plan will do little to overcome the traffic problems. Services and facilities are already at capacity. Instead of Warren Farm, development should be located to the east side of Writtle, with Green Belt allocation switched to Warren Farm site.
Map 35	PS1798	1096374	Ms Julia McClure			No	•	•	•			Development will increase traffic in the area. Proposed mitigation measures unsuitable. Development should be allocated to the east of Chelmsford.
Map 35	PS2043	1097203	Bovis Homes Ltd	Yes	Yes	No		•		•	Yes	The Council's decision to not undertake a comprehensive Green Belt Review, has resulted in a constrained approach that is heavily focussed on the continuation of Chelmsford City Council's long-term strategy of directing new residential growth to the northern part of Chelmsford. Contribution can be made by land to the west of Chelmsford and south of Writtle, which is considerably closer to the city centre than allocations proposed in the Local Plan to the north of Chelmsford. See Appendix 3.1 to our representation on Policy S9 - Vision Document - provides further detail on compelling and robust proposals for a comprehensive and landscape-led development to the West of Chelmsford and South of Writtle. Challenge the City Council's proposal to define a Green Wedge across an extensive area of land between Chelmsford and Writtle. Our representation is supported by a review carried out by EDP of the evidence base document which provides the City Council's rationale for the identification of Green Wedge boundaries. The Policies Map should be amended to show a revised Green Wedge boundary which accords with that proposed on Plan EDP4, found in Appendix 4.1.

Consultation Point	Rep ID	Person ID	Name/Organisation	1. Is the Plan legally compliant?	2. Does the Plan comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	3. Is the Plan sound?	If no, this is because the Local Plan is not:				4. Do you wish to speak at the Examination?	Summary of Rep
							Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with National Policy		
Map 37	PS1855	312409	Strutt & Parker (Farms) Ltd			No	•	•	•		Yes	To ensure that the Plan is sound, we propose that the Rural Employment Area allocations should allow for more flexibility in terms of expansion to ensure that successful business centres have an opportunity to maximise their contribution to the local economy and recognised employment needs within Chelmsford.
Map 43	PS1471	1101449	Ms Linda Beard	No		No	•	•	•	•	Yes	Map 43 shows South Woodham Ferrers as a Designated Neighbourhood Plan Area. This is incorrect, there is no adopted Neighbourhood Plan.

Rep ID	Consultation Point (where stated)	Person ID	Name/Organisation	Representation added to Pre-Submission representations	Summary of Rep
PS SA20	Non Technical Summary - Table NTS 3	1157030	Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land		Spatial strategy underestimates the Plan's housing needs and the ability for the allocated brownfield sites to meet the need. Plan does not recognise that there are exceptional circumstances which require the amendment of Green Belt boundaries to accommodate the housing needs - including the allocation of a sustainable urban extension to the south of Chelmsford at land to the south of Galleywood Road that would help meet need. Table NT3 housing spatial strategy does not a significant positive affect to SA strategic objective 2 and should be amended to a significant negative effect. Plan is not positively prepared because it fails to adequately assess both housing need and infrastructure needs to implement its strategy. Spatial strategy is not justified by failing to adequately consider alternatives to the preferred strategy as given in Appendix F. Plan is not consistent with NPPG paragraphs 14; 47, 85 and 154 and 159.
PS SA21	Non Technical Summary - Table NTS 4	1157030	Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land		Spatial strategy underestimates the Plan's housing needs and the ability for the allocated brownfield sites to meet the need. Plan does not recognise that there are exceptional circumstances which require the amendment of Green Belt boundaries to accommodate the housing needs - including the allocation of a sustainable urban extension to the south of Chelmsford at land to the south of Galleywood Road that would help meet need. Table NT3 housing spatial strategy does not a significant positive affect to SA strategic objective 2 and should be amended to a significant negative effect. SA does not recognise a developable sustainable urban extension to the south of Chelmsford. Plan is not positively prepared because it fails to adequately assess both housing need and infrastructure needs to implement its strategy. Spatial strategy is not justified by failing to adequately consider alternatives to the preferred strategy as given in Appendix F. Plan is not positively prepared because it fails to adequately assess both housing need and infrastructure needs to implement its strategy. Spatial strategy is not justified by failing to adequately consider alternatives to the preferred strategy as given in Appendix F. National policy also consider there is no need to include land in the Green Belt which is unnecessary to keep permanently open and also where necessary identify in their plans areas of safeguarded land between the urban area and the Green Belt. Plan is not consistent with NPPG paragraphs 14; 47, 85 and 154 and 159.
PS SA8	Figure NTS 2. Paragraphs 3.6.9 , 3.6.12 and 3.6.13	1155451	Great Waltham Parish Council		Measures to provide sustainable non-car transportation are assumed in the plan to reduce the road infrastructure needed for the planned developments in the growth areas. The adequacy of the road infrastructure as planned will depend on achieving these reductions.
PS SA22	Section 3: Baseline Analysis - 3.4:6 Housing Key sustainability Issues	1157030	Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land		Spatial strategy underestimates population growth and housing needs over the plan period. Plan does not recognise that there are exceptional circumstances which require the amendment of Green Belt boundaries to accommodate the Local Plan's housing needs - including the allocation of a sustainable urban extension at land to the south of Galleywood Road would help meet that need. SA does not recognise a developable sustainable urban extension to the south of Chelmsford. Plan is not positively prepared because it fails to adequately assess both housing need and infrastructure needs to implement its strategy. Spatial strategy is not justified by failing to adequately consider alternatives to the preferred strategy as given in Appendix F. National policy also consider there is no need to include land in the Green Belt which is unnecessary to keep permanently open and also where necessary identify in their plans areas of safeguarded land between the urban area and the Green Belt. Plan is not consistent with NPPG paragraphs 14; 47, 85 and 154 and 159.

Rep ID	Consultation Point (where stated)	Person ID	Name/Organisation	Representation added to Pre-Submission representations	Summary of Rep
PS SA25	Section 4 Section 5 Appendix B Appendix G – specifically pG31, p38/39	872955	Hammonds Estates LLP		Concerns over the SA process. Review undertaken (attachment Sustainability Appraisal Review) which states CCC's approach cannot be considered to be appropriate given the reasonable alternatives as the SA process has failed to comply with the necessary guidance and regulations. The SA process is considered not to be legally compliant for the following reasons: Deficient consultation process, failure to assess the options with consideration of mitigation measures, lack of objectivity and justification in the assessment, failure to test the evidence underpinning the plan, has been based on predetermined decision by the Council. Representation also considered previous SA iterations as looking at the process as a whole. Issues and Options - The Council discounted the option of a Large New Settlement at Hammonds Farm and Bull's Lodge Quarry Farm because it was considered that a large settlement was not suitable, justified or reasonable. This decision was made without assessing the options against the SA Framework; and verification for the decision to discount a large settlement option is therefore not evident. The SA should be used to inform the Local Plan (NPPG SEA/SA 001 and 017). Preferred Options - hybrid option includes Bulls Lodge Quarry Farm site, which was previously discounted. The inclusion of this area of land raises fundamental issues with regard to deliverability, which have not been addressed in the SA. It is not known why the inclusion of Bulls Lodge Quarry has been retained in the option. Assessment of the alternative spatial strategies fails to take into account the cumulative effects of the different options, which could have a significant bearing on the decision-making process and is contrary to the regulations (Sch. 1 (2b); Sch. 2 (6)). Not assessed the alternative spatial strategies in the same level of detail. Assessment of Hammonds Farm has not used the information submitted to the Council in support of the proposal. Pre-Submission – Failure to show how the findings of the consultations have been considered or influenced the plan, discrepancies in the accuracy of the evidence raised at PO stage have not been addressed, failure to show that the SA has been used to test the evidence underpinning the Local Plan, selection of the Preferred Option was made prior to consultation on the two alternative spatial strategies, failure to assess the alternatives in the same level of detail, mitigation measures of the alternative option have not been considered, failure to consider information provided by the site promoter, cumulative impacts of the alternative spatial strategy have not been considered and failure to demonstrate that the SA has informed the development of the Local Plan.
PS SA23	Table 5.2: Compatibility Matrix 2 Housing – to meet the housing need of the Chelmsford City Area and deliver decent homes	1157030	Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land		Spatial strategy underestimates population growth and housing needs over the plan period. Plan does not recognise that there are exceptional circumstances which require the amendment of Green Belt boundaries to accommodate the Local Plan's housing needs - including the allocation of a sustainable urban extension at land to the south of Galleywood Road would help meet that need. SA does not recognise a developable sustainable urban extension to the south of Chelmsford. Plan is not positively prepared because it fails to adequately assess both housing need and infrastructure needs to implement its strategy. Spatial strategy is not justified by failing to adequately consider alternatives to the preferred strategy as given in Appendix F. National policy also consider there is no need to include land in the Green Belt which is unnecessary to keep permanently open and also where necessary identify in their plans areas of safeguarded land between the urban area and the Green Belt. Plan is not consistent with NPPG paragraphs 14; 47, 85 and 154 and 159.

Rep ID	Consultation Point (where stated)	Person ID	Name/Organisation	Representation added to Pre-Submission representations	Summary of Rep
PS SA24	5. Appraisal of the Pre-Submission Local Plan - Table 5.3: Summary of the Appraisal of the development requirements	1157030	Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land		Spatial strategy underestimates population growth and housing needs over the plan period. Plan does not recognise that there are exceptional circumstances which require the amendment of Green Belt boundaries to accommodate the Local Plan's housing needs - including the allocation of a sustainable urban extension at land to the south of Galleywood Road would help meet that need. SA does not recognise a developable sustainable urban extension to the south of Chelmsford. Plan is not positively prepared because it fails to adequately assess both housing need and infrastructure needs to implement its strategy. Spatial strategy is not justified by failing to adequately consider alternatives to the preferred strategy as given in Appendix F. National policy also consider there is no need to include land in the Green Belt which is unnecessary to keep permanently open and also where necessary identify in their plans areas of safeguarded land between the urban area and the Green Belt. Plan is not consistent with NPPG paragraphs 14; 47, 85 and 154 and 159.
PS SA46	5.3	1160052	North West Parishes Group		Concerns relating to the loss of higher grade agricultural land. CCC should have undertaken a green belt review. Without mitigation, the impact of the proposed growth could place pressure on key services and facilities. Concern for adverse effects identified that will impact the environment. Concern as to whether housing numbers are right or will need to be altered.
PS SA51	Paragraph 5.3.2	1099175	North Chelmsford Villages Community Group		The GTAA 2016 that the figures are based upon fails to demonstrate up to date cross-authority target setting. The data and the report cannot be fully relied upon and does not satisfy PPTS requirements.
PS SA63	Objective 7 Section 3.14 Table 4.1	1161039	Natural England		Natural England broadly supports the methodology used in the SA and is generally supportive of the proposed indicators for monitoring purposes, acknowledging the positive amendments made in line with its previous consultation response dated. Recommends that a further indicator is added to the monitoring framework. The following wording is suggested 'Number of planning approvals leading to loss of 'best and most versatile' (BMV) agricultural land (i.e. that classified as Grades 1, 2 and 3a land within the Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) system.1 Advises that the Key Sustainability Issues for Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure should include the need to protect designated sites from increased recreational pressure. Proposes an additional guide question and an amendment to an existing guide questions under the Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure SA objective.
PS SA32	5.3.13	972052	Mr John Whitlock		I&O housing targets of option 2 - 775hpy & option 3 -930hpy can be expected to offer the greatest benefits in terms of housing delivery & economic growth, the lower to options 1 - 657hpy & option 2 - 775hpy are preferable in terms of lower negative effects across a number of environmental S/A objectives.
PS SA17	para 5.4.7	965747	Ms Angela Thomson		Para 5.4.7 The substantial area of greenfield land needed should be Grade 4 & 5 farm land not Grade 2 & 3 farm land
PS SA45	5.4.7	1160052	North West Parishes Group		Paragraph identifies greenfield land will be required to accommodate strategic growth sites but this will have an overall negative impact on the land/landscape/townscape. Particularly relevant to extension of West Chelmsford (SGS2). There will also be a negative effect on waste and resources due to the location being within a minerals safeguarding area.
PS SA47	5.4.12	1160052	North West Parishes Group		Concerns for development in NE Chelmsford (SGS4) in terms of the scale and nature of development and the delivery challenges of this. Concern for sustainability impacts of the development as the site is located within a minerals safeguarding area. Concern for impact on cultural heritage. There are considerable impacts as a result of this proposed development, which are not reflected in the Plan.
PS SA16	5.4.12 and 5.4.14	1095466	Dr Simon Heffer	Yes	Development at Moulsham Hall is separated from Great Leighs Village. Effect on the environment, ecology and heritage and impact on landscape, economy, ancient parkland and wildlife habitat. Detached from a local village, and removed from established amenities. Traffic Congestion on by-pass. Development at Hammonds Farm as alternative location.



Rep ID	Consultation Point (where stated)	Person ID	Name/Organisation	Representation added to Pre-Submission representations	Summary of Rep
PS SA56	Appendix 1 I33 TRAVELLERS SITE GT1 – DRAKES LANE GYPSY AND TRAVELLER SITE	1099175	North Chelmsford Villages Community Group		I33 demonstrates that in appraising the site the proposal will create a number of minor negative effects and significant negative effects. The report confirms that there is no way of mitigating these effects. We query whether the sustainable living and revitalisation, Health and well-being, and Transport scoring of the site will fall further if the complete absence of public transport following the closure of the Gravel Pit Bus stop and service is taken into account.
PS SA55	Appendix B B83 Ref 61	1099175	North Chelmsford Villages Community Group		It is not apparent within the Sustainability Appraisal that it has been updated to take account of the fact that the Gravel Pit Bus Stop is no longer present and there is no bus service. The nearest one being 3.5 kilometres away.
PS SA52	Appendix F F50	1099175	North Chelmsford Villages Community Group		The GTAA 2016 that the figures are based upon fails to demonstrate up to date cross-authority target setting. The data and the report cannot be fully relied upon and does not satisfy PPTS requirements.
PS SA48	Appendix F	1160052	North West Parishes Group		Consider alternative options such as Hammonds Farm, Howe Green, Rettendon and Boreham. Suggest that development at Hammonds could be in addition to that at NE Chelmsford rather than instead of to spread the burden of the growth. Hammonds Farm is close to the proposed train station and this fact has not been adequately reflected in terms of sustainability. Do not support rejection of Hammonds Farm site.
PS SA57	Appendix G G14 Site ID GT1	1099175	North Chelmsford Villages Community Group		G14 demonstrates that in appraising the site the proposal will create a number of minor negative effects and significant negative effects. The report confirms that there is no way of mitigating these effects. We query whether the sustainable living and revitalisation, Health and well-being, and Transport scoring of the site will fall further if the complete absence of public transport following the closure of the Gravel Pit Bus stop and service is taken into account.
PS SA49	Appendix G	1160052	North West Parishes Group		Oppose reasons for Hammonds Farm being rejected from the LP. Issues listed for the site can be resolved. Site should be reconsidered as a sustainable location for growth which would reflect the wider aspirations of the plan.
PS SA53	G36 - 5A Great Lieghs - Land at Moulsham Hall	976073	Bellway Homes		SA rationale is unsupported and inaccurate. Site does not conform or align well with the Strategic Priorities, Vision, Spatial Principles and Spatial Strategy. Site is divorced from the settlement and development requires additional vehicle/pedestrian connections. Site at Moulsham Hall is not considered to comply with the strategic priorities, vision, principles or spatial strategy of the local plan.
PS SA42	Appendix G -38 Boreham CFS81 (17SLAA32)	872952	Mrs Mary Rance		Site is well located for specialist residential use.
PS SA54	G40 - Great Leighs CFS120	976073	Bellway Homes		Conclusion to reject CFS120 is unsupported and inaccurate
PS SA30	Appendix G Page 78 Table 3.1	1156704	South Woodham Ferrers Town Council		The entry for Strategic Growth Site 7 in Appendix G under PF36 should be re-worded.
PS SA2	West Chelmsford	307680	Mr Derek Cooley	Yes	Concern of dividing town - better to develop between A414 and current village
PS SA27	Strategic Growth Site 2 - West Chelmsford	511765	Ms N Pippen		I do not consider that the effects upon traffic volume and assumption that residents will follow transport plans not persona cars are realistic. Concerned about lack of secondary school plans (Writtle).
PS SA33	Site 2	1094033	Mr Michael Petty		The development of the Warren Farm site will generate pollution, noise and traffic congestion issues

Rep ID	Consultation Point (where stated)	Person ID	Name/Organisation	Representation added to Pre-Submission representations	Summary of Rep
PS SA40	Appendix G pages 36, 40 and 41	312407	Tritton Family Trust		G36 - 5A Great Leighs - Land at Moulsham Hall The site fails to conform with the priorities, vision, principles and strategy stated . The site fails to represent sustainable development. It encroaches into the rural landscape and is located on the other side of a major bypass route which severs it from the existing community of Great Leighs. There is no easy and sustainable access to existing community activity, and proposed new primary school, will be accessed across a major road, using an underpass or footbridge. G40 - Great Leighs - 17SLAA21, 17SLAA22, 17SLAA23, 17SLAA24, 17SLAA26 The rationale made for rejection of these sites is significantly flawed. They are in close proximity to the existing village center of Great Leighs and are on the eastern side of the by-pass complies better with the Spatial Principles and Spatial Strategy. Development on these sites is not isolated development in the rural area. It is contained in landscaping terms and due to the proximity of the sites to the existing village facilities, its bus routes and the direct link to the A131 (via the proposed new spine road), it has better access and connectivity to existing village facilities and governance. The comparison should be to site 5a, not 5b and 5c. No assessment appears to have been made of the supporting information on ecology, landscaping and transport matters submitted as part of the development of these sites. No consideration has been given to the fact that these sites plan for an extension along the principles of a Garden village i.e. with a new primary school, neighbourhood facilities and new spine road to Boreham Road and the village.
PS SA26	Strategic Growth site 6 (North Broomfield)	310089	Mr Peter Marriage	Yes	The housing allocation here has been cut but the boundary of the village envelope has not been reduced accordingly. This should be reduced from the west to the line shown for the new hospital approach road to avoid damage to the very important landscape / Pleshey Plateau to the west.
PS SA3	Site 7	1075372	Mrs F L Emmett	Yes	South Woodham Ferrers positioned in the bottom of the Crouch Valley. Built on a peninsula, surrounded on three sides by a tidal main river. Frequent tidal surges in the north sea, which can cause serious flooding, protected only by man made sea walls, Any further large scale development, on land north of the B1012 the Burnham Road would in my view exacerbate an already serious local flood risk problem that exists today. A geographical situation.
PS SA4	Strategic Growth Site 7 - North of South Woodham Ferrers	1095562	Mr Michael Benning		Sustainability Appraisal consultation document includes policies which are purely speculative and based upon the supposition that your proposals would improve the infrastructure to cope with the increase
PS SA5	Location 7 North of South Woodham Ferrers.	1094388	Mrs Linda Morgan	Yes	Infrastructure non existent to provide this kind of development especially when taken into account with Tabrums Farm. Concern for lack of crossing from town centre to health; lack of public transport; flood risk; lack of school funding. See PS638.
PS SA6	Location 7 - North of South Woodham Ferrers	1094388	Mrs Linda Morgan	Yes	Infrastructure doesn't exist for any development of this size. There is overwhelming support for no further development in the town or surrounding area. See PS640.
PS SA10	Page 136, Growth Area 3: South and East Chelmsford Strategic Growth Site 7 - North of South Woodham Ferrers	1094382	Mrs Carol McMaster	Yes	Development will have a negative affect on biodiversity. Concern that site will not integrate sustainably. Concern for parking provision, GP/healthcare provision, lack of public transport, flooding. Not convinced that development will attract sustainable investment to regenerate SWF. Assumption that improving cycle/walk routes will improve congestion is wrong.
PS SA1	Not specified	1097348	Mr Stephen Parker	Yes	I object to the proposal on grounds of traffic congestion, loss of habitat for local wild life, parking and the merging of Writtle into westlands and the city centre. The traffic is almost at a stand still at the moment another 2000 houses will bring this city to a stop.
PS SA7	Paragraph 4.10 - The Chelmsford Local plan (Pre-submission document, Jan 2018)	960850	Dr Reza Hossain	Yes	The council states that it wishes to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and congestion in the Chelmsford Local Plan. But this will be very difficult in the centre of Chelmsford. Perth imposed very high car parking charges in the centre of Perth . People who resided in the centre of Perth didn't have to pay the charge, but anyone coming to work or shop or visit had very high car parking charges. We would like to encourage to try to use a Perth model of transportation to really reduce congestion, and increase public transport and cycling/walking . See PS646.

Rep ID	Consultation Point (where stated)	Person ID	Name/Organisation	Representation added to Pre-Submission representations	Summary of Rep
PS SA9	Not specified	961749	Mr Keith Francis		Feel LP will fail to satisfy an overall Sustainability Appraisal Test that is vital for the future of the Plan Area and the Regional context in which it is situated
PS SA11	Not specified	1096002	Basildon Borough Council		Basildon Borough Council has reviewed the contents and can confirm that on this occasion, it has no comments to make.
PS SA12	Not specified	347754	Castle Point Council		CPBC confirms that there are no issues it wishes to raise
PS SA13	Not specified	1074334	Mrs Mary Dove	Yes	Traffic concerns with increase of people travelling to Broomfield School and the station. Alternative site at Hammonds Farm infrastructure (A12) already in place, better to have a big build in one place rather than causing congestion in Chelmsford where there is no infrastructure and no space for improvement.
PS SA14	Not specified	1156835	Mr Peter Wyatt	Yes	Plan is not sustainable. No guarantee of any significant infrastructure to support the number of houses that are proposed. The new development will be separated from the Town of South Woodham Ferrers. Road will need to be crossed by children attending the school. Lack of public transport with no improvements. Fluvial flooding and sewerage leakage in parts of the Town which have not been investigated. Plan should not be considered until more concrete information is available.
PS SA15	Not specified	308038	Mr Paul Grundy	Yes	See response of the North West Parishes Group
PS SA18	3a	1095844	Mrs Gillian Ketland	Yes	Development divides the community. Traffic issues. Proposed infrastructure does not meet or support the need of the plan. No proposed improvements to existing rail service. Limited information provided at the exhibition. Consideration not taken of the impact on the environment and quality of life of residents.
PS SA19	Not specified	1157118	Rochford District Council		Rochford District Council has no comments to make
PS SA28	Not specified	963136	Mrs Sarah Clark		There is no Local Plan provision option that is alternative to pro-growth and it is therefore not legally compliant
PS SA29	Not specified	963136	Mrs Sarah Clark		The plan is contrary to NPPF14. The B1008 cannot accommodate the population growth and the SA report uses inaccurate population data to make predictions of road capacity which invalids Broomfield as an option.
PS SA34	Not specified	1158785	Burnham-on-Crouch Town Council		Rail section of SA doesn't cover finite sustainable capacity of CVL Railway
PS SA35	Not specified	1158855	Miss Jessica Davis		Traffic impact concerns, and concern whether new services will be provided, when services are currently being cut
PS SA36	Not specified	309828	Mrs Teresia Gibson	Yes	The proposed cycling route from City Centre to Great Waltham is a great idea, but is more to be seen as a leisure route (not a route to relieve the traffic load on the Main Road). The proposed 450 houses in Broomfield should not be increased. In fact the Main Road as it is, is already at a standstill daily. There seems to be a better and more appropriate solution to expanding Chelmsford by developing potential larger sites near the A12 south of Chelmsford to avoid clogging up the Main Road and City Centre by commuters north of Chelmsford. Car sharing schemes to be promoted (when there was a petrol shortage the Main Road was not too busy). Schools to educate parents and children to walk to school.
PS SA37	Not specified	1159743	Gladman Developments Ltd		The results of the SA process must clearly justify Local Plan policy choices. In meeting the development needs of the area, it should be clear from the results of the assessment why some policy options have been progressed and others have been rejected. Undertaking a comparative and equal assessment of each reasonable alternative, the CLP's decision making and scoring should be robust, justified and transparent.
PS SA38	Reasonable Alternatives	1157068	Croudace Homes		The SA fails to assess all reasonable alternatives and therefore an adequate SA has not been prepared. In order to make the Local Plan legally compliant, a new SA which addresses these failures and thoroughly assesses the land to the north and east of Rettendon Place is required.
PS SA39	Not specified	866622	Stonebond Properties Ltd		Promoted site (CFS154) should be considered as a reasonable alternative in the SA.

Rep ID	Consultation Point (where stated)	Person ID	Name/Organisation	Representation added to Pre-Submission representations	Summary of Rep
PS SA41	Not specified	925768	Mr Edward Baldock		The Plan fails to consider the effects of the increasing use of electrically powered vehicles well within its timeframe. Although there is a firm expectation that driverless vehicles will be fully available well within the timeframe of this Plan, the expected radical changes wrought by this innovation go unconsidered within this Plan.
PS SA43	Not specified	1160028	Seven Capital Plc		The Sustainability Appraisal has not taken account of all available and relevant information and therefore cannot have soundly assessed the Council's Local Plan strategy to promote development of previously developed land against the reasonable alternatives. It is contended that the principles of lawfulness and soundness cannot have been adhered to without a proper assessment of all reasonable alternatives.
PS SA44	Not specified	1160014	Historic England		HE has published guidance which may be helpful. Objectives and questions are generally appropriate. Welcome particularly SA Objective 13 and 14.
PS SA50	Not specified	873321	Eastern Approaches Investments Ltd		Site CFS137 should be assessed as a reasonable alternative for employment allocation within the SA.
PS SA58	Not specified	873301	Cliffords Ltd		Site CFS212/Land at Saxon Way, Broomfield, has not been appraised as a reasonable alternative. There are other sites that have not been assessed whereas a number of discounted sites in Broomfield have been assessed. The site has been rejected without a reasonable justification raising concerns about the soundness of the Local Plan and its legal compliance. The Green Wedge is a policy designation not a physical constraint and it is not supported by national policy. See also attachment (873301PS-B), a concept plan for the above site and the appeal decision in respect of Sladbury's Lane, Clacton (873301PS-A) which is located in a Green Gap.
PS SA59	Not specified	873301	Cliffords Ltd		Site CFS125 should be assessed as a reasonable alternative for employment allocation as it is considered a sustainable location for employment development.
PS SA60	Not specified	308541	Great & Little Leighs Parish Council		Refers to PO sustainability. Concern for pedestrian safety, impossible improvements, public transport plans, healthcare facilities, impact on nature reserves, road narrowness, impact of drainage/water treatment on listed buildings, traffic, impact on landscape, proximity of facilities and air/noise pollution.
PS SA61	Not specified	312318	Cogent Land		Relates to alternative site at Boreham (Land SE of Lion Inn). A Sustainable Development Scorecard Report has been produced to summarise the analysis and demonstrate that the proposals show a high level of agreement with the NPPF, aiding the case for the allocation of the site. This will contain additional background on the Scorecard methodology and assessment process to ensure the analysis is given due weight by Chelmsford City Council. Added as attachment.
PS SA62	Not specified	1098405	The North East Chelmsford Garden Village Consortium		Supports iterative process and notes the assessment. Continuing Masterplanning work will be able to mitigate the potentially Significant Negative Effects identified in the SA Report regarding Objectives 13 (Cultural Heritage) and 14 (Landscape and Townscape). Compares well to other major strategic allocations; also agrees that Hammonds Farm compares less well than SGS4.

Rep ID	Consultation Point (where stated)	Person ID	Name/Organisation	Representation added to Pre-Submission representations	Summary of Rep
PS HRA13	Table 5.1	1161039	Natural England		Request explicit reference to “the RAMS” (Recreational disturbance Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy) in the text of certain policies (notably S6, S11, NE1, SGS 3a, 3c, 3d, 7, 8 and 9). Request that Policy SGS7 include specific reference to the need for project-level HRA due to the proximity of this allocation to the Crouch and Roach Estuary SPA and Ramsar site. Raise concerns regarding treatment capacity at Great Leighs and South Woodham Ferrers and identified increased risks at South Woodham Ferrers due to the proximity of the European sites at this location. Request policy amendment stating that “new development post 2024 will not be given planning permission unless the required capacity is available at South Woodham Ferrers and Great Leighs waste water treatment works...”
PS HRA4	7.330	1095423	Mr & Mrs Andrew & Maureen Moore	Yes	We are concerned over the proposal to construct a travelling show people site for heavy goods vehicles within the new development for South Woodham Ferrers and question what benefit it will bring to our community. Locating the site near a major road network would be more appropriate. See PS635.
PS HRA3	7.335 & 7.336	1095423	Mr & Mrs Andrew & Maureen Moore	Yes	Concern for train provision in SWF.
PS HRA2	7.336 & 7.339	1095423	Mr & Mrs Andrew & Maureen Moore	Yes	We are very concerned that the A132 and B1012 that lead to and past South Woodham Ferrers will be become even more congested and will result in severe delays at peak travelling times. The additional housing will intensify the amount of traffic and the additional junctions, crossings, roundabouts are likely to slow transit times significantly. See PS633
PS HRA5	8.101	1074334	Mrs Mary Dove	Yes	Relates to Pre-Submission, not HRA. See PS Concern for habitats of badgers, deer, bats, rabbits, monkjacks if relief road around Broomfield Hospital is developed.
PS HRA1	Not specified	1097348	Mr Stephen Parker	Yes	I object to the proposal on grounds of traffic congestion, loss of habitat for local wild life, parking and the merging of Writtle into westlands and the city centre. The traffic is almost at a stand still at the moment another 2000 houses will bring this city to a stop.
PS HRA6	Not specified	1096002	Basildon Borough Council		The assessment identifies the potential for growth in Chelmsford City to cause recreational disturbance to European sites on the Essex Coast. CCC, like Basildon Borough Council, has signed the Memorandum of Understanding for the Essex Coast Recreation Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy (RAMS), and is therefore actively engaged in the Essex wide project to address this issue.
PS HRA7	Not specified	1155942	Mr David Taylor	Yes	See representation PS645

Rep ID	Consultation Point (where stated)	Person ID	Name/Organisation	Representation added to Pre-Submission representations	Summary of Rep
PS HRA8	Not specified	347754	Castle Point Council		The content of the HRA has been reviewed, and CPBC notes that the assessment does identify the potential for growth in Chelmsford to cause recreational disturbance to European Sites on the Essex Coast. Both CCC and CPBC have signed the Memorandum of Understanding for the Essex Coast Recreation Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy (RAMS), and CPBC welcomes this positive working arrangement to address this issue.
PS HRA9	Not specified	1157118	Rochford District Council		Rochford District Council has no comments to make
PS HRA11	Not specified	1158855	Miss Jessica Davis	Yes	Is a green field site, development would destroy the local habitats. Campaigns by RSPB and Essex Wildlife asking to give nature a home - so would be better to build new homes where the impact is less substantial.
PS HRA12	Not specified	1098405	The North East Chelmsford Garden Village Consortium		The Consortium has no comments to make on the Habitats Regulations Assessment and notes that the assessment of Strategic Growth Site 4 concludes that there is a low risk of any significant effects on their own or 'in combination' effects (regional visitor pressure issues).





This publication is available in alternative formats including large print, audio and other languages

Please call 01245 606330

Planning and Housing Policy  
Directorate for Sustainable Communities  
Chelmsford City Council  
Civic Centre  
Duke Street  
Chelmsford  
Essex  
CM1 1JE

Telephone 01245 606330  
[planning.policy@chelmsford.gov.uk](mailto:planning.policy@chelmsford.gov.uk)  
[www.chelmsford.gov.uk](http://www.chelmsford.gov.uk)

Document published by  
Planning and Housing Policy  
© Copyright Chelmsford City Council