

24/PC.11.2 23/00868/FUL (Garage conversion with internal alterations) to that the loft conversion granted approval under reference 23/01672/CLOPUD should be allowed to be implemented in conjunction with the garage conversion granted permission under 23/00868/FUL – **No Comments**
 24/00047/CLEUD - 19 Mashie Link, Chelmsford Garden Community – Certificate of lawfulness to regularises a loft conversion – **agreed to object** on the basis that the loft conversion is out of keeping with the street scene in the area.

24/PC.11.3 22/01950/FUL - Zone 1 Chelmsford Garden Community - Application for hybrid planning permission, seeking outline planning permission with all matters reserved, except means of access at Essex Regiment Way (including pedestrian and cycle bridge) and Belsteads Farm Lane (road to Park Farm), for a mixed use scheme comprising up to 1,500 new homes (use Class C3); a primary school including co-located early years nursery provision and associated playing fields (Use Class F1 and E(f)); employment areas (Use Class Ec, Eg (i)(ii)(iii) and associated ancillary uses); a mixed use neighbourhood centre (Use Classes Ea,b,c,d,e,f,g(i), and F1(e), F2(b); and associated green infrastructure, including public open space, formal and informal play and recreation areas; drainage features, and other associated works; and, diversion of public rights of way. Detailed planning permission is sought for the initial phase of on-site highway works comprising the east to west main street; north to south main street, including bus gates; and associated strategic ground re-profiling and strategic surface water attenuation and associated landscaping – upon discussing this application at length it was **agreed to comment** as follows:

There is no mention of the arrangements for stewardship and land management in the proposals which will be important to know.

In relation to parking it is noted that there is a wish to reduce the use of cars and that there are measures proposed for mobility hubs, buses and the park and ride, however it is considered that these measures will not reduce the use of cars and that unless suitable parking provision is provided it will simply mean that the roads will become congested with parked cars so more suitable parking provision needs to be made available. Even if areas are put aside that could be landscaped in years to come if there is less of a demand for vehicles this would at least make suitable provision.

It is considered that the proposal for a 15 minute neighbourhood is unrealistic.

It is noted that there is mention of active travel routes but no clarification of how they would be enforced. Also people will only be happy to walk if they feel safe and there is no clarification as to how that would be achieved or clarification on lighting for the routes to support safety.

It is noted that there is no means of parking in the vicinity of the proposed school and it is unrealistic to expect all children to travel to school on foot or bike so some provision needs to be made. It would be desirable to have a formal drop off arrangements.

Regarding highways, Councillors would wish to see traffic calming measures put in place. Also the roads do not seem to be sufficiently connected and appear simply to lead either in the direction of Essex Regiment Way or in the vague direction of the rest of the Garden Community proposed development and bearing in mind that the Chelmsford North East bypass may never be connected to the A131 at Great Leighs this appears to simply increase congestion and does not demonstrate achievable connectivity to the surrounding areas.

The travel strategy seems to be pinned on a high frequency bus service and the roads are designed with many bus gates to accommodate this. However, the experience at Beaulieu and Channels has been that once the Section 106 money has been spend and the operator has to run the buses on a commercial basis the services are reduced or changed which will result in a return to car use thus this suggestion is not workable and will do little to reduce congestion in the area.

There is a lack of detail regarding the mobility hubs. The mention of a car club proposes suggests that 60% of journeys will be non-car but is not supported by any evidence and it is not clear if this includes the car club journeys and it considered to be an unachievable goal.

It is noted that there is a proposal for a pedestrian bridge over Essex Regiment Way but it does not appear to lead to anywhere and whereas a crossing is desirable it must be connected and useful and Councillors do not consider that it will be an effective use of money to build a bridge when a road crossing such as a Pegasus crossing would be sufficient and also less visually obtrusive.

In relation to Domsey Lane it is noted the road will cut through the lane which will also be part of the bus route. It was considered that there needs to be protection for Domsey Lane so that people cannot use the existing single track lane to cut through to other parts of the development. There is mention of the Lane being part of an active travel route and there may need to be some form of barrier to prevent the road continuing to be used as a cut through.

It is noted that there is a proposal to provide 1 job per resident but it is not clear what kind of jobs this would be. Also there is no detail of the proposals for the innovation hub.

There is no mention in the proposals for health care provision including GPs, pharmacies or dentists and this is vital to know when looking at the scale of the development.

There is mention of the development being sustainable but there are no proposals including in the application to includes sufficient electric

chargers not any reference to solar panels or heat pumps therefore the proposals do not support the suggestion of the development being truly sustainable.

The housing proposed in the Belstead area will be close to Essex Regiment Way and would suffer from noise from the roads but there are no proposals for noise attenuation measures.

Unlike proposals for other zones there is no mention of the density of planting. For example Zone 3 suggests 1.5 trees for each property and Councillors would wish to see appropriate planting and landscaping in the area.

There does not appear to be any provision for services for teens and elderly residents.

Regarding the height of housing there is mention of protecting Domsey Lane and a suggestion of only having 2 storey housing in the area but on the plan there are blank unshaded areas on the plan which suggest the possibility of higher storey houses. Councillors consider that housing in the area should be no more than 2 storeys to protect the existing residents of Domsey Lane.

At this stage of the meeting Councillor Jeapes left the meeting.

24/PC.11.4

CC/CHL/110/23 - Chelmer Valley Park and Ride - Expansion and enhancement of Chelmer Valley Park and Ride, including an expansion of the car parking area to the north and east, pedestrian and cyclist improvements and the construction of a new substation. Together with other associated development, works and landscaping – **agreed to comment** that the additional pollution which will arise by increasing the parking area by one third will need to be offset by additional planting in the area. Also the lighting proposals for 8 meter tall columns would be extremely obtrusive for future surrounding properties and exacerbate light pollution and should be no more than 5-6 meter tall.

24/PC.11.5

24/00072/FUL - 16 Linge Avenue, Chelmsford Garden Community - Retrospective application for the conversion of the garage and approval of the internal layout changes and new window- **agreed to comment** that the extension will result in a very large property and whether there will then be sufficient parking for a property of that size.

24/PC.11.6

24/00126/FUL - 6 Grantham Drive, Chelmsford Garden Community - First floor side extension above existing garage – **agreed to comment** that as this will result in a very large property whether there is then sufficient parking.

24/PC.11.7

24/00787/HNC - 1-20 Lakeview Terrace, Chelmsford Garden Community – renaming application – **No Comments.**

24/PC.12: To note the following planning results

The following planning results were **noted**:

- 24/PC.12.1 23/01875/FUL - 11 Louvain Drive, Chelmsford Garden Community - Single storey lean to side extension and alterations to fenestration – **Refused**
- 24/PC.12.2 23/01884/FUL - The Willows, Domsey Lane - Single storey rear extension, new driveway and formation of access – **Granted**
- 24/PC.12.3 23/05244/TPO - Land at Power's Farm, Cranham Road - T4 Oak-Fell to ground level and remove stump. Reason - in advance of planning permission (current application for CGC OPA3 in progress) to avoid bird nesting season – **Granted**
- 24/PC.12.4 23/01918/FUL - 66 Edward Harvey Link, Chelmsford Garden Community – first floor side extension above parking area – **Refused**
- 24/PC.12.5 23/01893/FUL - 6 Albert Bauser Close, Chelmsford Garden Community – Install PV panels – **Granted**

Meeting concluded at 6.40pm