

## CHELMSFORD POLICY BOARD – 16 January 2025

### PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND STATEMENTS

#### Item 5 - Chelmsford Local Plan – Regulation 19 Pre-Submission Consultation Documents

##### 1) Question from Mrs B

Within the letter from Welbeck Strategic Land V Limited (Appendix 4, pages 249 and 250) it is mentioned that the company demonstrated 'alternative access points are available from Priory Road.' Can the Board please tell me what were the alternative options and why they have been dismissed in preference to Barbrook Way as the preferred option?

Also, the letter mentions that the alternative options were enclosed with the correspondence. I cannot find them in the agenda document. Can they be shared with the public please?

##### 2) Question from Mr C

#### STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF OWNERS OF THE FOLLOWING SITES

PID 311097 (1330674) BECHERS GALLEYEND  
PID1358377 LAND AT MAYES LANE SANDON

I request the Board to reconsider the Presubmission Plan as presented, and delay its publication, in order to allow for the provisions of the new NPPF to be taken into account, and not the old provisions of the 2023 NPPF.

There are so many material objections to the Presubmission Plan that it is likely to be delayed in any event. For instance objections to the 'Garden Community' next to the A12 road, with its extreme noise and air pollution. Overall bringing the provisions of the new NPPF into account, I suggest, will not materially delay the final approval of the Plan

Meeting the 'required' housing targets is not likely to be met by the Plan, if met at all. The problem can be alleviated by considering suitable land in the Green Belt, as per the new NPPF, particularly 'Grey Land', and many small sites in the SHEELA assessments, all of which do not need major infrastructure, and are generally available without delay.

The Presubmission Plan places too much reliance on major site releases which have too long a time scale.

One of my client sites comprises 'Grey Land' which they wish to develop for 'Specialist Residential Accommodation', and which I am pleased to see the Council now recognises as having an importance in the City. There is a great need now, and not later in the Plan period. The site has only been excluded from housing allocation because it is just in the Green Belt boundary.

Finally if the Board should consider that the Presubmission Plan should go forward now, could Planning Officers nevertheless be instructed to look further into 'Grey Land' (particularly) and suitable sites which are available for early development from the SHEELA assessments. The

Plan will be stronger with more housing land released and with a better balance especially in South Chelmsford, with early 'Specialist Residential Accommodation'.

### 3) Question from Mrs C

Please can I ask a question relating to Barbrook Way, Bicknacre:

1. Appendix 4 - please can I ask what is the s38 agreement for Barbrook Way?

### 4) Question from Mr P

I feel the Council have based all their reasoning for not allocating my brownfield site at Chatham Green for 8 to 10 dwellings, on two extremely large greenfield sites, put forward situated close by for 3000 dwellings.

My site has not even been mentioned in the pre submission consultation document.

I find it concerning that the Council is ignoring small sustainable brownfield sites in favour of greenfield sites.

At a recent appeal decision for one dwelling on my site, the appeal Inspector said there would be an economic, social and environmental benefits and gave it modest weight. He didn't dispute the good frequency bus service next to my site on the A131, even though the Council keep referring to it as limited. He said my appeal site may well be closer to services and facilities than existing homes within the defined settlement boundary of Chatham Green and other developments in rural parts of the Council's area. The Council is aware of this.

Regarding being tested Chatham Green performs better than many other villages including Great Leighs, Bicknacre and even Hammonds Farm in the Essex Highway Sustainable Accessibility Mapping Appraisal document.

Because Chatham Green has been included with Howe Green and Rettendon Common which score badly, the overall score goes drastically down.

I did highlight this concern to the Council and was assured that the three villages will not be assessed as one group of locations combined together, which unfortunately doesn't seem to be the case.

Finally Chatham Greens settlement boundary was drastically reduced in size in 2010. It previously included the Windmill pub, and three dwellings next to the village green. If the boundary was reinstated to include these properties, which going by the latest settlement boundary review criteria, should be included, as they are part of the main built up extent of the settlement, then it would also mean my brownfield site Pondsider Nursery and Yard, still close to the main settlement and being opposite the village green, would also be included under part 2 and 3 of the settlement boundary review table.

Can I please ask Councillors and the planners to review the boundary and my site before this goes to the consultation in February and make the necessary changes.

5) Question from Mr P

In the responses to Growth Sites 11b and 11c it mentions 'minor policy amendments made in respect to requirements for education provision'. What does this mean? Thank you.

6) Question from Mr C

With regard to Growth Site 11c, the rating of the SHELAA was disagreed with.

Can the CCC please respond to this as I can't see any response recorded? Will the rating be altered?