



Report on the Boreham Neighbourhood Development Plan 2025 – 2041

An Examination undertaken for Chelmsford City Council with the support of Boreham Parish Council on the December 2025 regulation 15 submission version of the Plan.

Independent Examiner: Andrew S Freeman BSc(Hons) DipTP DipEM FRTPI

Date of Report: 12 May 2026

Intelligent Plans and Examinations (IPE) Ltd, Office 10, 5 Argyle Street, Bath BA2 4BA

Registered in England and Wales. Company Reg. No. 10100118. VAT Reg. No. 237 7641 84

Contents

Main Findings - Executive Summary	4
1. Introduction and Background	4
Boreham Neighbourhood Development Plan 2025 - 2041	4
The Independent Examiner	5
The Scope of the Examination	5
The Basic Conditions	6
2. Approach to the Examination.....	7
Planning Policy Context	7
Submitted Documents.....	7
Site Visit	8
Written Representations with or without Public Hearing.....	8
Modifications	8
3. Procedural Compliance and Human Rights.....	8
Qualifying Body and Neighbourhood Plan Area.....	8
Plan Period	8
Neighbourhood Plan Preparation and Consultation.....	9
Development and Use of Land.....	10
Excluded Development.....	10
Local Nature Recovery Strategy.....	10
Climate Change	10
Human Rights.....	10
4. Compliance with the Basic Conditions	10
Assimilated Obligations	10
Main Issues	11
Issue 1 – Historic Environment.....	12
Issue 2 – Natural Environment.....	12
Issue 3 – Built Environment.....	13
Issue 4 – Infrastructure	14
Issue 5 – Communications.....	15
Issue 6 – Traffic and Transportation.....	15
Other Policies	15
Other Matters	15
5. Conclusions	16
Summary.....	16
The Referendum and its Area	16

Intelligent Plans and Examinations (IPE) Ltd, Office 10, 5 Argyle Street, Bath BA2 4BA

Registered in England and Wales. Company Reg. No. 10100118. VAT Reg. No. 237 7641 84

Overview 16

Appendix: Modifications 17

Main Findings - Executive Summary

From my examination of the Boreham Neighbourhood Development Plan (the Plan) and its supporting documentation, including the representations made, I have concluded that subject to the policy modifications set out in this report, the Plan meets the Basic Conditions.

I have also concluded that:

- the Plan has been prepared and submitted for examination by a qualifying body – Boreham Parish Council;
- the Plan has been prepared for an area properly designated – Figure 3.2 on Page 13 of the Plan;
- the Plan specifies the period to which it is to take effect – 2025 - 2041; and
- the policies relate to the development and use of land for a designated neighbourhood area.

I recommend that the Plan, once modified, proceeds to referendum on the basis that it has met all the relevant legal requirements.

I have considered whether the referendum area should extend beyond the designated area to which the Plan relates and have concluded that it should not.

1. Introduction and Background

Boreham Neighbourhood Development Plan 2025 - 2041

- 1.1 Boreham is a village and civil parish in Essex, just under 4 miles to the northeast of the centre of Chelmsford. It falls within the administrative area of Chelmsford City Council. The parish is broadly pear-shaped and straddles the main A12 dual carriageway. The village and main built-up area lie to the south of the A12.
- 1.2 The parish was first designated as a neighbourhood area in January 2017. However, the current designation dates from May 2024 and reflects changes made to the boundary of the parish.
- 1.3 Preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan has been progressed under the auspices of a steering group made up of local residents and others who work or do business in the area. Information and data collected by the steering group has guided and influenced preparation of the Plan. The views of local residents have been gained by way of questionnaire surveys, public events and written contributions. The resultant Plan has an overarching vision, 23 objectives and 10 policies.

The Independent Examiner

- 1.4 As the Plan has now reached the examination stage, I have been appointed as the examiner of the Boreham Neighbourhood Development Plan by Chelmsford City Council, with the agreement of Boreham Parish Council.
- 1.5 I am a chartered town planner and former government Planning Inspector with over fifty years' experience. I have worked in both the public and the private sectors. I am an independent examiner and do not have an interest in any of the land that may be affected by the draft Plan.

The Scope of the Examination

- 1.6 As the independent examiner I am required to produce this report and recommend either:
- (a) that the neighbourhood plan is submitted to a referendum without changes; or
 - (b) that modifications are made and that the modified neighbourhood plan is submitted to a referendum; or
 - (c) that the neighbourhood plan does not proceed to a referendum on the basis that it does not meet the necessary legal requirements.
- 1.7 The scope of the examination is set out in Paragraph 8(1) of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) ("the 1990 Act"). The examiner must consider:
- Whether the plan meets the Basic Conditions;
 - Whether the plan complies with provisions under Section 38A and Section 38B of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) ("the 2004 Act"). These are:
 - it has been prepared and submitted for examination by a qualifying body, for an area that has been properly designated by the local planning authority;
 - it sets out policies in relation to the development and use of land;
 - it specifies the period during which it has effect;
 - it is the only neighbourhood plan for the area and does not relate to land outside the designated neighbourhood area;
 - it does not include provisions and policies for "excluded development";

- it is designed to secure that the development and use of land in the neighbourhood area contribute to the mitigation of, and adaptation to, climate change¹; and

- it takes account of any local nature recovery strategy, under Section 104 of the Environment Act 2021, that relates to all or part of the neighbourhood area.²

- Whether the referendum boundary should be extended beyond the designated area, should the plan proceed to referendum.
- Such matters as prescribed in the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended) (“the 2012 Regulations”).

1.8 I have considered only matters that fall within Paragraph 8(1) of Schedule 4B to the 1990 Act, with one exception. That is the requirement that the Plan is compatible with the Human Rights Convention.

The Basic Conditions

1.9 The “Basic Conditions” are set out in Paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4B to the 1990 Act. In order to meet the Basic Conditions, the neighbourhood plan must:

- have regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State;
- contribute to the achievement of sustainable development;
- not result in the development plan for the area of the authority proposing that less housing is provided by means of development taking place in that area than if the neighbourhood development plan were not to be made³;
- be compatible with, and not breach, assimilated obligations⁴; and
- meet prescribed conditions and comply with prescribed matters.

¹ This additional requirement was commenced on 25 March 2026 by virtue of *The Levelling-up and Regeneration Act 2023 (Commencement No. 11 and Saving and Transitional Provisions) Regulations 2026*, which brought into force Section 98 of the Levelling-up and Regeneration Act 2023.

² See footnote above.

³ This Basic Condition applies from 25 March 2026 by virtue of *The Levelling-up and Regeneration Act 2023 (Commencement No. 11 and Saving and Transitional Provisions) Regulations 2026*, which brought into force section 99 of the Levelling-up and Regeneration Act 2023. This replaces the former Basic Condition which required a neighbourhood plan to be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the development plan for the area.

⁴ See: *The Retained EU Law (Revocation and Reform) Act 2023 (Consequential Amendment) Regulations 2023*, which replaced the previous reference to ‘EU’ obligations.

- 1.10 Regulation 32 of the 2012 Regulations prescribes a further Basic Condition for a neighbourhood plan. This requires that the making of the Neighbourhood Development Plan does not breach the requirements of Chapter 8 of Part 6 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017.⁵

2. Approach to the Examination

Planning Policy Context

- 2.1 The Development Plan for this part of Chelmsford City Council, not including documents relating to excluded minerals and waste development, is the Chelmsford Local Plan 2013 – 2036 (adopted May 2020). In addition, the City Council is reviewing the Local Plan. Consultation on a Submission final draft has been carried out. The Submission version of the Plan, and the representations received, are due to be sent to the Planning Inspectorate for examination.
- 2.2 The planning policy for England is set out principally in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) offers guidance on how this policy should be implemented.

Submitted Documents

- 2.3 I have considered all policy, guidance and other reference documents I consider relevant to the examination, including those submitted which comprise:
- the draft Boreham Neighbourhood Development Plan 2025 -2041, December 2025;
 - a map which identifies the area to which the proposed Neighbourhood Development Plan relates;
 - the Consultation Statement, December 2025;
 - the Basic Conditions Statement, December 2025;
 - all the representations that have been made in accordance with the Regulation 16 consultation;
 - the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)/Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) Screening Opinion prepared by Chelmsford City Council, November 2024;
 - the request for additional clarification sought in my letter dated 24 March 2026 and the joint response dated 14 April 2026 from Chelmsford City Council and Boreham Parish Council ; and
 - the joint response dated 14 April 2026 from Chelmsford City Council and Boreham Parish Council to my letter of 24 March 2026, concerning the revisions to the legal compliance and Basic Conditions

⁵ This revised Basic Condition came into force on 28 December 2018 through the Conservation of Habitats and Species and Planning (Various Amendments) (England and Wales) Regulations 2018.

requirements, and from one other party who took the opportunity to comment.⁶

Site Visit

- 2.4 I made an unaccompanied site visit to the Neighbourhood Plan Area on 19 April 2026 to familiarise myself with it and visit relevant sites and areas referenced in the Plan and evidential documents.

Written Representations with or without Public Hearing

- 2.5 This examination has been dealt with by written representations. I considered hearing sessions to be unnecessary as the consultation responses clearly articulated the objections to the Plan and presented arguments for and against the Plan's suitability to proceed to a referendum.

Modifications

- 2.6 Where necessary, I have recommended modifications to the Plan (**PMs**) in this report in order that it meets the Basic Conditions and other legal requirements. For ease of reference, I have listed these modifications separately in the Appendix.

3. Procedural Compliance and Human Rights

Qualifying Body and Neighbourhood Plan Area

- 3.1 The Boreham Neighbourhood Development Plan has been prepared and submitted for examination by Boreham Parish Council, which is a qualifying body for an area that was designated by Chelmsford City Council on 31 May 2024.
- 3.2 It is the only Neighbourhood Plan for the Boreham Neighbourhood Area and does not relate to land outside the designated Neighbourhood Plan Area.

Plan Period

- 3.3 The Plan specifies clearly the period to which it is to take effect, which is from 2025 to 2041.

⁶ View at: <https://www.chelmsford.gov.uk/planning-and-building-control/planning-policy-and-local-plan/consultations-on-planning-policy/boreham-neighbourhood-plan-consultation/>

Neighbourhood Plan Preparation and Consultation

- 3.4 Details of plan preparation and consultation are set out in the Parish Council's Consultation Statement, December 2025. The decision to prepare a neighbourhood plan was taken back in March 2016 and was followed by designation of the then parish in January 2017. Following boundary changes, the parish as it exists today was designated as a neighbourhood area in May 2024.
- 3.5 As indicated above, work on formulating the Plan was carried out under the auspices of a steering group. The main pieces of work carried out in preparing the Plan were a residents' questionnaire, the drawing up of evidence comprising various background reports and various community engagement events.
- 3.6 Details of persons and bodies consulted together with an explanation of how they were consulted is summarised in Section 5 of the Consultation Statement and in Appendices 2, 3, 4 and 5. A summary of the main issues and concerns raised and a description of how they were considered and addressed is to be found in Appendix 6.
- 3.7 At the Regulation 14 stage, approximately 130 discrete representations were made by a variety of public bodies, individuals and statutory consultees. These included Chelmsford City Council and Essex County Council. The consultation extended over a six-week period between 29 September 2024 and 11 November 2024.
- 3.8 The Regulation 16 consultation ran between 21 January 2026 and 4 March 2026. Some 55 representations were submitted by 16 developers and landowners, individuals and public bodies, again including Chelmsford City Council and Essex County Council. I have taken the various representations into account in writing my report and making my recommendations.
- 3.9 During the examination, changes were made to the legal compliance requirements and Basic Conditions, applying from 25 March 2026.⁷ In order to provide an opportunity for Boreham Parish Council, Chelmsford City Council and any other interested parties to comment, the Local Planning Authority contacted those who had made representations at the Regulation 16 stage.
- 3.10 A 2-week period was advertised by Chelmsford City Council on its website inviting further comments, focused only on the legislative changes. A joint response was received from Chelmsford City Council and Boreham Parish Council together with a response from one other party. I have taken these into account in my assessment.

⁷ See paragraphs 1.7 – 1.9 above and the associated footnotes.

- 3.11 I am satisfied that, at both the Regulation 14 and the Regulation 16 stages, the consultation process met the legal requirements and there has been procedural compliance. Regard has been paid to the advice on plan preparation and engagement in the PPG.

Development and Use of Land

- 3.12 The Plan sets out policies in relation to the development and use of land in accordance with Section 38A of the 2004 Act and does not exceed the appropriate scope of a neighbourhood plan.⁸

Excluded Development

- 3.13 The Plan does not include provisions and policies for “excluded development”.⁹

Local Nature Recovery Strategy

- 3.14 Chelmsford City Council and Boreham Parish Council have advised that a nature recovery strategy is in place. In my assessment, none of the Plan’s policies are in direct conflict with the strategy.

Climate Change

- 3.15 Having regard to the responses received to my letter of 24 March 2026, I am satisfied that overall the Plan policies do not conflict with the aims of securing development which contributes to the mitigation of, and adaptation to, climate change.

Human Rights

- 3.16 Boreham Parish Council is satisfied that the Plan does not breach Human Rights (within the meaning of the Human Rights Act 1998). From my independent assessment, I see no reason to disagree.

4. Compliance with the Basic Conditions

Assimilated Obligations

- 4.1 The Neighbourhood Plan was screened for Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) by Chelmsford City Council, which found that it was unnecessary to undertake SEA. Having read the Strategic Environmental Assessment Screening Opinion, I support this conclusion.

⁸ See s.38B(A1) and s.38B(2C)(a) of the 2004 Act.

⁹ The meaning of ‘excluded development’ is set out in s.61K of the 1990 Act.

- 4.2 The Boreham Neighbourhood Development Plan was further screened for Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA), which also was not triggered. The Plan would not result in any significant effects upon identified European sites. Natural England agreed with this conclusion.¹⁰ From my independent assessment of this matter, I have no reason to disagree.

Main Issues

- 4.3 Having regard for the Boreham Neighbourhood Development Plan, the consultation responses and other evidence, and the site visit, I consider that there are six main issues relating to the Basic Conditions for this examination. These concern:
- Historic Environment
 - Natural Environment
 - Built Environment
 - Infrastructure
 - Communications
 - Traffic and Transportation
- 4.4 Before I deal with the main issues, I have a few observations to make with regard to the representations. First, the Boreham Neighbourhood Development Plan should be seen in the context of the wider planning system. This includes the Chelmsford Local Plan 2013 - 2036 as well as the NPPF and PPG. It is not necessary to repeat in the Neighbourhood Plan matters that are quite adequately dealt with elsewhere.¹¹ Having said that, there may be scope to give emphasis to matters particularly relevant in the context of Boreham.
- 4.5 Secondly, the Neighbourhood Plan does not have to deal with each and every topic raised through the consultation. In this regard, the content of the Neighbourhood Plan and the scope of the policies is largely at the discretion of the qualifying body, albeit informed by the consultation process and the requirements set by the Basic Conditions.
- 4.6 Thirdly, my central task is to judge whether the Neighbourhood Plan satisfies the Basic Conditions. Many of the representations do not demonstrate or indicate a failure to meet those conditions or other legal requirements. Similarly, many of the suggested additions and improvements are not necessary when judged against the Basic Conditions, notwithstanding their potential utility.

¹⁰ Email dated 1 November 2024.

¹¹ See NPPF Paragraph 16 f).

- 4.7 The following section of my report sets out modifications that are necessary in order to meet the Basic Conditions. Some of the proposed modifications are factual corrections.¹² Others are necessary in order to have closer regard to national policies and advice. In particular, plans should be succinct and contain policies that are clearly written and unambiguous.¹³ A decision maker should be able to apply them consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications. In addition, the policies should be supported by appropriate evidence.¹⁴

Issue 1 – Historic Environment

- 4.8 Policy 1 of the Neighbourhood Plan is concerned with heritage matters. By using the word “shall” in respect of preservation, conservation and enhancement, the policy is couched in definite terms. In order to allow for a range of circumstances, I would normally expect “should” to be used. In all usages, however, “shall” is qualified by “where appropriate”, “appropriate” or “wherever possible”. In the circumstances, I consider that the policy is sufficiently flexible and no modification is necessary.

Issue 2 – Natural Environment

- 4.9 In contrast to Policy 1, Policy 2 (Biodiversity) is too categorical and needs to include reference to “as appropriate” or “where feasible”. In addition, the policy is stated to apply to “Development proposals for new buildings or structures”. However, as confirmed by the Parish Council¹⁵, the policy is intended to apply to all developments. Amendment of the policy is necessary as in proposed modification **PM1**.
- 4.10 Policy 3 has the title Landscape Setting, Character, and the Protection of High Quality Agricultural Land. The second part of the policy is concerned with safeguarding the landscape setting and character of the area as well as important views. However, the provisions are lacking in clarity in a number of respects:
- There is reference to development in the Chelmer Valley; but the Chelmer Valley is not defined.
 - There is a rather vague reference to development “to the east of the Boreham village”.
 - There is also a confusing reference to developments “outside the Defined Settlement Boundary”.

¹² Modifications for the purpose of correcting errors is provided for in Paragraph 10(3)(e) of Schedule 4B to the 1990 Act.

¹³ NPPF, Paragraphs 15 and 16 d).

¹⁴ PPG Reference ID: 41-041-20140306.

¹⁵ Email dated 14 April 2026.

- 4.11 In response to my questions, the Parish Council has suggested text that will address these uncertainties.¹⁶ This text is acceptable although the required “visual impact assessment” (a formalised technique) may not be necessary in all circumstances. Reference to “appropriate visual assessment” would suffice.
- 4.12 As to the views to be protected, these are shown on Figure 5.6. I am aware that the intention to protect the distant views in that part of the Plan area north of the A12 has been the subject of objections. Irrespective of any representations, Plan 5.6 places the related viewpoint on the eastern side of Waltham Road, south of Chantry Lane. I saw that there is a rough hedge along the western side of Waltham Road and there are no distant views from the identified viewpoint.
- 4.13 Even at points along this part of Waltham Road where there are gaps in the hedge, I did not form the impression that the views should be protected. The land in the foreground and middle ground is flat and uninteresting, comprising what I would describe as rough grazing land (although not presently grazed). It is backed by a substantial area of vegetation beyond which, on the horizon, is a run of high-voltage electricity lines and pylons.
- 4.14 The views that I have described should be omitted from the provisions of the policy. In addition, the second part of the policy should be re-written all as set out in proposed modification **PM2**.

Issue 3 – Built Environment

- 4.15 Policy 4 concerns the settlement boundary. On a preliminary point, I have considered whether the boundary should be amended to align with the boundary in the 2025 Draft Chelmsford Local Plan; also, to include the Waltham Road Industrial Estate.¹⁷ I have concluded that it should not.
- 4.16 The boundary will be defined through the examination and adoption of the emerging Local Plan. As to the industrial estate, this is designated as an employment area by the Chelmsford Local Plan. On both counts, modification of the boundary as shown in the Neighbourhood Plan may be appropriate in due course but this is not necessary in order to meet the Basic Conditions.
- 4.17 I have also considered whether major development within the settlement boundary should meet “a specific need within the village”. In this regard, and in line with the views of residents, I accept the Parish Council’s point that major development would only be supported if it brought benefits which address specific needs within the village.¹⁸

¹⁶ Email date 14 April 2026.

¹⁷ See PPG Reference ID: 41-009-20190509 (notwithstanding the ‘general conformity’ requirement has been replaced).

¹⁸ See the Parish Council’s answers date 14 April 2026 to my questions.

- 4.18 The third part of the policy addresses residential development outside the defined settlement boundary. I note that part of the area within the settlement boundary (generally to the south and southwest of Church Road) is also within the Coalescence Safeguarding Zone, the subject of the fourth part of the policy. Clarification is needed as to the application of the respective parts.
- 4.19 Finally, the fourth part of the policy covers development within the Coalescence Safeguarding Zone. For the avoidance of doubt, reference should also be made to developments the subject of an allocation in the Local Plan.
- 4.20 Necessary amendments are set out in proposed modification **PM3**. The modifications would also secure the deletion of duplicate wording in the first part of the policy, wording that has been included in error.
- 4.21 Policy 5 is a policy addressing high quality design. The policy is intended to cover all types of development.¹⁹ Whilst I support this approach, there will be instances where, in this and other regards, some flexibility is required in the application of the policy. Less mandatory wording is required.
- 4.22 With regard to parking, there is a call for adequate parking in respect of major development; but adequate parking will be required for *all* developments. The requirement should be moved to the first part of the policy. In accordance with the evidence²⁰, the latest car parking standards should also be referenced.
- 4.23 Both the above requirements are dealt with in proposed modification **PM4**.

Issue 4 – Infrastructure

- 4.24 I now turn to Policy 7 (Community Infrastructure and Developer Contributions). This sets out the need for contributions and the types of infrastructure for which contributions will be sought. In this regard, two additional matters need to be recognised:
- Contributions need to be proportionate and in line with the tests for planning obligations and/or the Community Infrastructure Levy.
 - In regard to education contributions (not including childcare), they will need to cover contributions towards Special Educational Needs and Disabilities.²¹
- 4.25 These matters are addressed in proposed modification **PM5**.

¹⁹ See the Parish Council's answers date 14 April 2026 to my questions.

²⁰ See Regulation 16 representations of Essex County Council.

²¹ See Regulation 16 representations of Essex County Council.

Issue 5 – Communications

- 4.26 In regard to mobile and broadband connectivity (Policy 8 Broadband and Communications), there is no evidence to suggest that the stated provision will be needed for *all* new development or expansions of existing properties. Suitable qualification is set out in proposed modification **PM6**.

Issue 6 – Traffic and Transportation

- 4.27 A number of amendments to Policy 9 (Sustainable Transport) are needed:
- There needs to be up-dated reference to the car parking standards.
 - The third part of the policy needs to recognise that the required provision will not be necessary in all cases.
 - Part 3 d) of the policy needs to be re-phrased since financial contributions (through planning obligations) cannot be “required”.
- 4.28 Necessary amendments are set out in proposed modification **PM7**.
- 4.29 Finally, the first part of Policy 10 (Main Road and other roads in Boreham) seeks to improve connectivity across Main Road using a number of specified means. The requirements include developments having both direct and indirect effect on traffic volumes. To my mind, this requirement would not be justified in all cases. In addition, there may be means other than those set out in the policy that could be deployed to mitigate the problem.
- 4.30 Re-phrasing of the policy would be appropriate, as in proposed modification **PM8**.

Other Policies

- 4.31 There remains one policy that has not been the subject of commentary in the above report (Policy 6 (Housing Mix and Type)). To a greater or lesser extent, this topic is covered in NPPF Section 5 (Delivering a sufficient supply of homes). I find that there has been regard for national policy and that the Basic Conditions have been met.

Other Matters

- 4.32 All policy areas have been considered in the foregoing discussion. With the modifications that I have recommended, the Plan would meet the Basic Conditions. Other minor changes (that do not affect the Basic Conditions), including those suggested by Chelmsford City Council and Essex County Council, as well as consequential amendments, corrections

and up-dates, could be made prior to the referendum at the Councils' discretion.²²

5. Conclusions

Summary

- 5.1 The Boreham Neighbourhood Development Plan has been duly prepared in compliance with the procedural requirements. My examination has investigated whether the Plan meets the Basic Conditions and other legal requirements for neighbourhood plans. I have had regard for all the responses made following consultation on the Neighbourhood Plan and the evidence documents submitted with it.
- 5.2 I have made recommendations to modify a number of policies and text to ensure the Plan meets the Basic Conditions and other legal requirements. I recommend that the Plan, once modified, proceeds to referendum.

The Referendum and its Area

- 5.3 I have considered whether or not the referendum area should be extended beyond the designated area to which the Plan relates. The Boreham Neighbourhood Development Plan as modified has no policy or proposals which I consider significant enough to have an impact beyond the designated Neighbourhood Plan boundary, requiring the referendum to extend to areas beyond the Plan boundary. I recommend that the boundary for the purposes of any future referendum on the Plan should be the boundary of the designated Neighbourhood Plan Area.

Overview

- 5.4 It is evident that a considerable amount of time and effort has been devoted to the development and production of this Plan and I congratulate those who have been involved. The Plan should prove to be a useful tool for future planning and change in Boreham over the coming years.

Andrew S Freeman

Examiner

²² PPG Reference ID: 41-106-20190509.

Appendix: Modifications

Proposed modification number (PM)	Page	Modification
PM1	Page 50	In the opening of Policy 2, replace "Development proposals for new buildings and structures" with "As appropriate, all development". At the beginning of the second sentence, replace "This includes" with "This should include". In the second numbered part of the policy, replace "shall seek to" with "shall, as appropriate, seek to". At the end of the policy (in the third part), replace "appropriately mitigated" with "mitigated where appropriate".
PM2	Pages 52 and 54	For the wording in the second numbered part of Policy 3, substitute the related text set out in the Parish Council's answers dated 14 April 2026 to my questions²³, subject to changing the end wording to "an appropriate visual assessment" rather than "a visual impact assessment". On Figure 5.6, delete the viewpoint near to the junction of Chantry Lane with Waltham Road and the related distant views to the west and southwest.
PM3	Page 57	At the end of the first numbered part of Policy 4, delete "and the Chelmsford Local Plan." In the third numbered part of the policy, after "Defined Settlement Boundary", insert "or the Coalescence Safeguarding Zone". To the fourth numbered part of the policy, add an additional category that will be supported: "are the subject of an allocation in the Chelmsford Local Plan."

²³ <https://www.chelmsford.gov.uk/media/2gwmlabe/bnp-and-ccc-response-to-examiner-procedural-matters-and-questions-14-april-2026.pdf>

PM4	Page 58	In Policy 5, at the beginning of numbered parts one and two, amend the wording so that it reads, "As appropriate, all new...". Move the requirement concerning car parking (2.c)) from the second part of the policy to the first. Change "Essex Parking Standards" to "Essex Parking Guidance as prepared by the Essex Planning Officers' Association". Provide a link to the guidance.
PM5	Page 63	Change the beginning of the first part of Policy 7 so that it reads, "As appropriate, all major development...". Change criterion c) so that it reads, "Financial contributions to early years, primary and secondary education together with Special Education Needs and Disabilities provision."
PM6	Page 65	Change the beginning of Policy 8 so that it reads, "As appropriate, proposals...".
PM7	Page 69	In the second numbered part of Policy 9, change "Essex Parking Standards" to "Essex Parking Guidance as prepared by the Essex Planning Officers' Association". At the beginning of the third numbered part, insert "As appropriate,". In Part 3 d), delete "where required by the Local Highways and Transportation Authority,".
PM8	Page 72	For the first numbered part of Policy 10, substitute the following: "All developments having a significant effect on traffic volumes along Main Road shall include measures to improve connectivity across Main Road by employing means that may include:"