

Essex County Council:

Members Highways Initiative – MHI for Broomfield and Writtle:

MHI for w/c 4th Aug 25

- Broomfield School Lane pavement
- Great Waltham South street adjacent to Duffries Close – where the parents park
- Great Waltham South Street/Duffries Close junction kerbs
- Edney Common broken sign
- Edney Common broken pole
- Ford End pavement
- Ford End sunken drains
- Great Waltham Barrack Lane manhole cover

By other escalation route, Church Lane, Ford End, has also been repaired, but not as part of MHI – this is too big a job for MHI, and I used the normal escalation route for this.

Also escalated and got addressed:

- A130 potholes near Gt Leighs
- White lining on Angel Broomfield pedestrian crossing

As for the roadworks on Hospital Approach 21st July, I did warn highways 10 days before they started, that there would be a problem and asked for extra measures and for them to meet me on site on the first day. Of course, it was chaos, and they did add Traffic Lights to the Main Road/Court Road junction, but agreed to remove the whole roadworks shortly afterwards. New permit was granted which allowed the contractors to work on the pavement and a bit of the road, leaving enough space for 2 way traffic on Hospital Approach. There will have to be a short closure at some point, but I am pushing for this to be overnight

I also got involved in the Broomfield Main Road closure 10th Aug and worked with the tea to minimise the disruption. I believe they are returning 17th Aug for final stages.

I received notification that Court Road would be closing for 5 days for Highways work – coinciding with CVHS return! I have managed to get this moved to half term.

Pylons

I continue to use all democratic avenues to oppose the pylons that will go through 9 of my 11 parishes!

I am also working with the Essex, Suffolk, Norfolk Pylons group (Rosie Pearson) to formulate and lobby for response from ECC, City Council, parish councils and our combine parish council group.

NGET will be submitting the project to Planning Inspectorate 29th August.

One of the primary objection will be the adequacy of consultation according to Gunning Principles – a major principle is that all options should be presented for consultation, whereas the first consultation had already ruled out all but the overhead pylon solution.

I am also trying to get a meeting between Rosie's group and the "Offset" MPs.

However, I have to say that the election of the Labour govt last year, was a major set back for the case, who are pushing for reduced ability to object to Infrastructure planning. It is possible that we can't now win the case.

In terms of detailed recent route changes, my view is that the reduced height pylons proposed between GW and LW (and therefore an extra pylon) is a worse situation, with a pylon right next to Chelmsford Road. It is disappointing that the total feedback from the targeted consultations (on these changes) was a total of 740, (in 4.5M people!)

This gives us a dilemma – whilst fighting the bigger picture (underground!), if we were to lose, we would want a step backwards to the higher height pylons but in the middle of the fields, and away from the road/house. I believe that we need to major on that position in the DCO response.

I have been talking to the planning dept in City Council and they have requested that Great Waltham and Little Waltham is flagged to the Planning Inspectorate as a Potential Main Area for Examination. It may be that City Council now have to ensure the approach is considered appropriately during the Examination, should National Grid not engage with us further.

Incinerator at Rivenhall

ECC is responsible for waste disposal (districts are responsible for collection). It is the intention to totally remove the need for landfill by high levels of recycling, and incinerating the residue waste, at the new plant in

Rivenhall. Some of the CO emissions from such incineration are routed to tomato growing greenhouses as part of the overall planning application.

The Waste Planning Authority has received notification from the operators of Rivenhall that the Combined Heat and Power Plant element of the Integrated Waste Management Facility (IWMF) is planned to commence operation on 4th August 2025, without all other elements of the approved IWMF.

The Waste Planning Authority has opened an enforcement case on this matter to consider whether this, and/or any element of that operation, is representative of a breach of planning control, and if so, whether it would be expedient to take enforcement action at this time.

A report on this case will be presented to Development & Regulation as part of the meeting on 22nd August 2025. (I am a member of that committee)

Application for Review of a Premise Licence - Chelmsford City Racecourse

As the Essex County Cllr for Broomfield and Writtle, which includes the racecourse, I have responded to the request for a review of the premises licence under the Licensing Act 2003.

Following the event and problems, I was contacted by residents (and met with some) in relation to management of the highway.

I understand from ECC Member Enquiries, that the role of ECC Highways is to implement requested Traffic Regulation orders (TRO) and that they play no role in the event, or enforcement of such TROs.

Nevertheless, I met with the Racecourse organisers to discuss the event (along with the Chelmsford City Cllr for the area – Cllr Raven)

The view of the organisers was that they had a good traffic management plan, but it failed in the implementation. They employed a reputable traffic management company.

The organisers were genuinely apologetic and recognised that improvements could be made.

I understand that the Saturday and Sunday events were better managed, but these were for a lower audience.

I get the impression that local residents welcome the presence of the Racecourse and the events that they put on. But in this case, the audience was significantly higher than their regular ones. This begs the question whether the review should find:

1. This site is not appropriate for events of this size and lower audience restrictions should be applied
- OR
2. The organisers have understood the failures and can be relied upon to ensure that the next time such an event takes place, it will be appropriately managed.

I think it would be too punitive to remove the licence in total and stop all events.

However, I will be interested to hear any representations from the residents at the review meeting, and other consultees.

Local Govt Reorganisation – LGR - Update

It is very likely that the joint ECC/12 DCs/Southend Unitary/Thurrock Unitary will make a single application but with 4 options – two 4 Unitaries, a 5 Unitary option and a 3 Unitary option.

The favoured option from ECC is the 3 Unitary model of north, mid and south Essex.

At the 18th Sept ECC Council meeting, ECC will confirm its 3 Unitary proposal (or not!) – in time for the formal submission to Central Govt 26th Sept 25. The Govt will then decide on whether to consult on these 4 options (or fewer) which will run from Nov 25 to Jan 26

One point of clarification that came out in the information sessions, is the role of the “Neighbourhood Committees”. I have noted a degree of concerns from Parish Councils about a duplication of roles, but I can report that I have a better understanding of Unitary “Neighbourhood Committees”. Whilst there is little detail on these, it seems that the intention is to have decision making closer to communities and this can be achieved by such committees led by the Unitary Cllr. These “Neighbourhood Committees” will solely deal with Unitary Council services, and not cross over with Parish Council services.

Chelmsford City Council:

31st July 2025 – planning permission was granted for the residential development of the allocated land to the North of Broomfield, promoted by Bloor Homes Ltd. Approval was granted in principle, some time ago, but the S106 agreement has only just been finalised.

Also granted was planning permission for the necessary alterations to Woodhouse Lane which were subject of a separate planning application.

The development will provide up to 512 dwellings with a neighbourhood centre (health & community facility and an early years facility).

The S106 secures, amongst other matters:

- 35% affordable housing in accordance with Local Plan policy requirements, including wheelchair user units
- 5% of the total units to be self/custom build
- Over £5million of highway/transport contributions (including the Alternative Transport Strategy, North East bypass contribution and Regiment Way bridge contribution)
- Provision of land for a healthcare/community facility
- Education and healthcare contributions

The development will also be CIL liable.

The relevant planning permissions and S106 agreement are available on our website.