



**BRENTWOOD
BOROUGH COUNCIL**

Draft Local Plan

2013 - 2033

February 2016

COMMENT FORM

From 10 February to 23 March 2016 we are consulting on the Draft Local Plan for Brentwood Borough. You can view and comment on the Draft Local Plan online at www.brentwood.gov.uk/localplan

Alternatively, please use this form to share your views on the contents of the Draft Plan.

All responses should be received by Wednesday 23 March 2016

Please return forms to Planning Policy Team, Brentwood Borough Council, Town Hall, Brentwood, Essex CM15 8AY, or alternatively attach completed forms and email them to planning.policy@brentwood.gov.uk

Data Protection

All personal information that you provide will be used solely for the purpose of the Local Plan consultation. Please note whilst all addresses will be treated as confidential, comments will not be confidential. Each comment and the name of the person who made the comment will be featured on the Council's website.

By submitting this form you are agreeing to these conditions.

PERSONAL DETAILS

Title: **Mr** Colin Last Name: **Foan**

Address:

[REDACTED ADDRESS]

Post Code:

[REDACTED POST CODE]

Telephone Number:

[REDACTED TELEPHONE NUMBER]

Email Address:

[REDACTED EMAIL ADDRESS]

YOUR COMMENTS

Please indicate which section(s) of the Draft Local Plan you are commenting on (where applicable please clearly state the Policy reference or paragraph number):

Please specify if you Support, Object or are providing a General Comment:
(tick as appropriate)

Support

Object

General Comment

Comments (please use additional sheet if required):

1. I acknowledge the challenges the LDP needs to address and the difficulties Brentwood Borough Council faces to deliver all the requirements
 - Strategic Housing allocation
 - 360 new home per year from 2013
 - This amounts to 5500 over a 15-year time frame or 7200 over 20 years
 - Brentwood is 89% Green Belt
 - Brentwood only has brown field locations for ~2500 houses
 - Thus needs to find locations for some 3000 extra houses
 - Inevitably some of these will have to be built on land that is currently classed as green belt
 - Green belt loss must be kept to an absolute minimum
 - Employments needs
 - Retail sites
 2. I total support for protection of the green belt, especially the area immediately next to the Village of West Horndon. Under no circumstances should this Green Belt be sacrificed to meet housing need. It would be creep and start to join the urban areas of Greater London with Basildon. It would also change the rural character of the existing village beyond recognition.
 3. I accept development of the Brown Field Industrial estate but need to find appropriate solutions to the infrastructure issues this creates. These include:
 - Safe acceptable road access onto the site – the current entrance is already a hazard. Changing the Industrial estate to mixed residential without a security gate to slow traffic would increase the hazard significantly
 - Need to ensure development has SuDs in place
 - Schools places
 - Doctors/medical facilities
 - Mixed development
 - some of the more modern industrial units to remain
 - Starter homes
 - Family homes
 - Homes for elderly/disabled residents
 - Development that is compatible with the current village style not too dense, 30 homes per ha maximum if possible somewhat less
- Maximum housing density of 30 homes per ha (pro rata down if as probable some of the

smaller industrial units remain)

4. I accept with great reluctance the concept that if Green Belt development has to take place as set out in the NPPF section 83, then it should be as separate discreet village developments and not wide spread small incremental additions. They must be big enough to be self-sustainable and generate sufficient CIL &106 money to provide appropriate infrastructure, but not so big as to become small towns. Only the absolute minimum amount of Green Belt should be reclassified in order to prevent further development at some time in the future.
- Dunton Garden Village
 - Done properly this is possibly the least harmful option
 - Accept the idea of achieving the required level of development by building new villages that are self-sustainable and developed in such a way as to deter further development creep
 - Question the size at 2500 - the new West Horndon with the development of the industrial estate will be ~ 1100 to 1200 homes. DHGV should replicate that and not be much bigger, although I might accept **slightly** more if it could be proved that a larger number was absolutely necessary to generate the required infrastructure
 - There needs to be an environmental barrier between DHGV and West Horndon so as to prevent the possibility of developmental creep in the future
 - There are a lot infrastructure issues that need to be resolved these include:
 - Road access
 - Schools – junior & senior
 - Medical facilities
 - Access to the railway station
 - A127 capacity
 - C2C rail capacity
 - If the DHGV option is progressed, then as per my comments in section 4 above only the absolute minimum of land necessary should be reclassified. In appendix 2 on page 185 site ref 200 is identified as being 237.49ha. This is vastly more land than is required for even the proposed 2500 houses. I strongly object to this whole area being reclassified as that would make further redevelopment and thus urban creep much easier to occur in the future
 - A127 capacity vs A12 corridor capacity
 - Disagree that the capacity of both the rail and road are greater for the A127 corridor than the A12
 - Much of the A12 is already 6 lane and there are plans in place to upgrade all the 4 lanes sections from the M25 to Marks Tey to 6 lanes.
 - There are no 6 lane sections on the A127 and plans to upgrade it are only at a very early stage. This would need to be done before more development takes place.
 - The railway from Shenfield station into London as 4 tracks and is currently being upgraded by the Crossrail project.
 - The C2C railway from Southend to London Fenchurch Street is only two tracks and expansion west of Upminster would be almost impossible because the tracks run through built/residential areas.

The A12 corridor already clearly has far more capacity than the A127 and plans to upgrade it even further far more advanced.
 - To prevent creep, the overriding priority must be to protect the green belt immediately around the village of West Horndon

- Any development that takes place must be preceded or at the very least accompanied by appropriate and necessary infrastructure. Under no circumstance should infrastructure come after development
- All developments must have appropriate levels of affordable housing. Where possible this should be prioritised for Brentwood residents.
- BBC will need to work out how to get/guarantee any rail infrastructure upgrades, these are not part of the same development plan and Network rail have a long history of delay and failure to implement necessary infrastructure improvements.
- I support the concept of the J29 Employment Cluster. It will be particularly good for employment that requires significant HGV activity.
 - Need to ensure that there is sufficient public transport access to the site

Thank you for taking the time to respond. Please return forms to Planning Policy Team, Brentwood Borough Council, Town Hall, Brentwood, Essex CM15 8AY, or alternatively attach completed forms and email to **planning.policy@brentwood.gov.uk**