

**Maldon Local Development Plan Examination**  
**Chelmsford City Council Hearing Statement to Matter 4**

**Representation References:**  
**0145-5273-S2-12, 0145-5274-S2, 0145-5276-I1-12**

**Matter 4: Strategic Housing Growth – South Maldon Garden Suburb + Park Drive + Heybridge Swifts S2, S3 and S4 (also H1, H2, I1 and I2 – but only as they affect these sites)**

**Issue 1: Whether policies S2, S3 and S4 with their associated text dealing with South Maldon Garden Suburb + Park Drive + Heybridge Swifts is justified by the evidence, consistent with national policy, and effective**

**Q4: How much development can take place on each allocated site before a specified piece of infrastructure in CED10 Appendix 13 has to be provided?**

**Q7: What further work has been carried out since DOC100 regarding highway improvements at Eves Corner at Danbury, and what does it indicate needs to be provided? Does this alter the IDP and CED10 Appendix 13?**

**Q8: Should policy S4 refer to the above highway works?**

**Q11: In the policy S4 general development principles:**

- (b) Is the road network capacity capable of accommodating the developments?**
- (c) What mitigation measures and junction improvements?**

**Response**

This Hearing Statement should also be read in conjunction with Chelmsford City Council's (CCC) Hearing Statements in respect of Matters 2, 3 and 10.

1. CCC has sought to avoid repeating comments made in its other Hearing Statements. In brief, the City Council considers that the Local Development Plan (LDP) transport and access evidence base<sup>1</sup> indicates that the new Garden Suburbs are predicted to have a direct adverse cross-boundary impact on Eves Corner junction and Well Lane mini-roundabout in Danbury. From the City Council's review of the LDP transport and access evidence base, these junctions are currently operating over capacity during peak times on their A414 arms. This means that drivers can experience lengthy queues and congestion. Therefore, CCC considers that these junctions would be incapable of accommodating additional traffic flows from the planned developments in their current form.
2. CCC is satisfied that whilst not a perfect solution, the potential traffic impacts at Well Lane mini-roundabout in 2026 could be potentially mitigated by the implementation of a new priority junction. The effectiveness of a priority junction is indicated in Table 5-2 of EB004d<sup>2</sup>. As such, CCC specifically requests that the LDP and Infrastructure Delivery

---

<sup>1</sup> Including Refs: EB004a, EB004b, EB004c and EB004d

<sup>2</sup> Technical Note - Impact of Proposed Development Sites in Heybridge and South Maldon at Eves Corner and Well Lane Junctions on A414, Danbury (Essex Highways, November 2014)

Plan (IDP) be modified to require this mitigation measure as part of strategic sites S2(a) and S2(d). Please refer to the City Council's Hearing Statement on Matter 2.

3. CCC does not consider that the installation of pre-signals at Eves Corner could provide adequate mitigation once the LDP developments are in place. Instead the City Council considers that the residual impact along the A414 arms (post pre-signals mitigation) as assessed in the LDP highways transport and access evidence base is likely to be severe. This is considered contrary to paragraph 32 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Please refer again to the City Council's Hearing Statement on Matter 2.
4. In specific response to Question 4, CCC considers that the Essex Highways analysis demonstrates that pre-signals would not provide suitable mitigation at Eves Corner (see Hearing Statement to Matter 2). However, if the Inspector disagrees and finds the LDP sound on this matter, CCC request that the Infrastructure Phasing Plan Update (Ref: CED10 Appendix 13) be modified to require pre-signals at Eves Corner to be a Section 106 requirement of at least strategic sites S2a (see also paragraph 5 of CCC's Hearing Statement to Matter 3).
5. Having reviewed the more recent LDF transport and access evidence base, the Infrastructure Phasing Plan Update (Ref: CED10 Appendix 13) should also list a priority junction at Well Lane mini-roundabout in the same way i.e. a S106 requirement of S2a and S2d, and for construction in 2016/17. This is considered essential given that each scheme is directly related and both would be necessary to reduce the traffic impacts on the highway network through Danbury arising from the proposed LDP developments.
6. In response to Questions 7 and 8, more recent LDP transport and access evidence has emerged since the submission of the plan and DOC100, namely EB004d and Eves Corner Traffic Flows (Appendix 3 of the City Council's Hearing Statement to Matter 2). CCC has also published an additional highway study undertaken by Rowland Bilsland Traffic Planning Ltd (Appendix 2 of the City Council's Hearing Statement to Matter 2). . These reports are discussed in CCC's Hearing Statement for Matter 2.
7. In short, CCC is of the view that the LDP transport and access evidence base indicates that the preferred option of pre-signals would not provide suitable mitigation of traffic impacts at Eves Corner. However, if the Inspector finds the LDP sound in this respect, CCC requests that Policy S4 specifically mentions this mitigation measure. CCC also agrees with Essex Highways that a priority junction at Well Lane mini-roundabout be taken forward as a potential mitigation measure for the LDP. Therefore, Policy S4, the IDP and CED10 Appendix 13 should be modified to require a priority junction to be a Section 106 requirement of at least strategic site S2a (see paragraph 4 above).
8. For the avoidance of doubt, having reviewed the LDP transport and access evidence base, CCC considers that Eves Corner junction and Well Lane mini-roundabout are not capable of accommodating the proposed Garden Suburb developments in their current form (Question 11). Both junctions are considered to be currently operating above capacity during peak periods and would naturally come under greater pressure in 2026 once further background growth and the LDP developments are factored in. CCC accepts that whilst not a perfect solution a priority junction at Well Lane mini-roundabout could provide potential mitigation. However, CCC does not believe that the evidence base demonstrates that there is a suitable or available solution for Eves Corner junction.

If the Inspector is not of this view, CCC request that Policy S4 specifically mentions both of these mitigation measures for the reasons given above.

Chelmsford City Council 9.1.15