



Brentwood Pre-Submission Local Plan (Regulation 19)

January 2019

COMMENT FORM

From Tuesday 05 February to Tuesday 19 March 2019 we are consulting on the next stage of the Brentwood Local Plan: Pre-Submission Local Plan (Regulation 19). You can view and comment on the consultation document online at: www.brentwood.gov.uk/localplan

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

All responses should be received by 5PM Tuesday 19 March 2019.

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

How to complete the representation form:

This form consists of two sections – Section A: Personal Information, and Section B: Your Representation. Please note that your representation cannot be accepted without completing information identified in Section A.

The Local Plan Pre-Submission (Regulation 19) consultation consists of more formal and technical questions focused on the four Tests of Soundness and whether the Local Plan is compliant with relevant legislation. Comments are to be focused on three core areas – is the Plan positively prepared (referred to as ‘soundness’), does the Council adhere to the Duty to Cooperate, and is the Plan legally compliant (addressed by question 3 of this comment form). These terms are defined below:

- a) **Soundness:** Local Planning Authorities must prepare a Local Plan based on relevant and appropriate evidence base. They are required to publish these documents on their website. The evidence used to develop the Brentwood Local Plan can be found on the Council’s website under Evidence Base.
- b) **Duty to Cooperate:** Throughout the plan-making process discussions have taken place with various statutory consultees and neighbouring authorities. A summary of these meetings can be found within the Duty to Cooperate Statement, published as part of the Regulation 19 consultation. This is a live

document and will be updated prior to being submitted to the Secretary of State.

- c) **Legally Compliant:** Local Planning Authorities must prepare a Local Plan which adheres to the requirements as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), planning practice guidance, and other relevant planning regulations & legislation.

Question 4 of this comment form asks for further information on your opinion of the Plans 'soundness'. According to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) para 35, Local Plans are examined to assess whether they have been prepared in accordance with legal and procedural requirements and whether they are sound. Plans are 'sound' if they are:

- a) **Positively prepared** – providing a strategy which as a minimum seeks to meet the area's objectively assessed needs, and is informed by agreements with other authorities, so that unmet need from neighbouring areas is accommodated where it is practical to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development
- b) **Justified** – an appropriate strategy, taking into account the reasonable alternatives, and based on proportionate evidence;
- c) **Effective** – deliverable over the plan period, and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic matters that have been dealt with rather than deferred, as evidenced by the statement of common ground; and
- d) **Consistent with national policy** – enabling the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the NPPF.

Please keep in mind the information provided above to assist with correctly completing your comment form. For additional information on what the difference is between a Regulation 18 and Regulation 19 Local Plan consultation, please view the FAQ's published on-line www.brentwood.gov.uk/localplan

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 the above conditions.

Section A: Personal Details

Title	Mr
First Name	Mike
Last Name	Taylor
Job Title (if applicable)	Director
Organisation (if applicable)	On behalf of LaSalle Land Limited Partnership
Address	c/o Chilmark Consulting Ltd. Cambridge House Henry Street Bath
Post Code	BA1 1BT
Telephone Number	██████████
Email Address	planning@chilmarkconsulting.co.uk

Section B: Your Representation

Please complete a separate sheet for each representation that you wish to make. You must complete 'Part A – Personal Details' for your representation to be accepted.

Representations cannot be treated as confidential and will be published on our Consultation Portal. Any representations that are considered libelous, racist, abusive or offensive will not be accepted. All representations made will only be attributed to your name. We will not publish any contact details, signatures or other sensitive information.

Full Name	LaSalle Land Limited Partnership
-----------	----------------------------------

Question 1: Please indicate which consultation document this representation relates to?

The Local Plan

Sustainability Appraisal

Habitat Regulations Assessment

Question 2: Please indicate which section of the indicated document identified above that you are commenting on (where applicable please clearly state the section / heading or paragraph number).

Section 2, Settlement Hierarchy, Figures 2.2 and 2.3 and supporting text

--

Question 3: Do you consider the Local Plan is:

Sound?

YES

NO

Legally Compliant?

YES

NO

Compliant with the Duty to Cooperate?

YES

NO

Question 4: If you consider the Local Plan unsound, please indicate your reasons below (please tick all that apply):

The Local Plan has not been positively prepared

The Local Plan is not justified

The Local Plan is not effective

The Local Plan is not consistent with national planning policy

Question 5: Please provide details of either:

- Why you consider the Plan to be sound, legally compliant, or adheres to the Duty to Cooperate; or
- Why you consider that the Local Plan is unsound, is not legally compliant, or fails to comply with the Duty to Cooperate

Please see the attached.

Please continue on a separate sheet if necessary

Question 6: Please set out what modification(s) you consider necessary to make the Local Plan sound or legally compliant, having regard to the matters that you identified above.

You will need to say why this modification will make the Local Plan sound or legally compliant. Please be as accurate as possible.

Please see the attached.

Please continue on a separate sheet if necessary

Question 7: If your representation is seeking a modification, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the Examination in Public (EiP)?

NO, I do not wish to participate in the oral part of the EiP

YES, I wish to participate in the oral part of the EiP

Question 8: If you wish to participate at the oral part of the Examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary.

The matters and issues raised by this representation are fundamental to the Local Plan Inspector's consideration of the Brentwood Borough Local Plan and our client, LaSalle Land Limited Partnership, wishes to ensure that their views and position are fully heard and taken into proper consideration.

Please continue on a separate sheet if necessary.

Please note that the Inspector (not the Council) will determine the most appropriate procedure to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate in the oral part of the Examination.

Brentwood Borough Local Plan

Pre-Submission Local Plan (Regulation 19)

Representations for and on LaSalle Land Limited Partnership

Settlement Hierarchy – Figures 2.2 and 2.3 and Supporting Text

March 2019

Introduction

1. Chilmark Consulting Ltd. (CCL) are instructed by and write for and on behalf of LaSalle Land Limited Partnership (LLLLP) with respect to the Brentwood Borough Local Plan: Pre-Submission Plan (BBLP) published for consultation by Brentwood Borough Council (BBC) in January 2019.
2. This representation is concerned with the proposed settlement categorisation and hierarchy set out in **Section 2** and **Figures 2.2 and 2.3** and supporting paragraphs.
3. This representation must be read in conjunction with the other representations submitted by LLLP dealing with related matters.

Nature of Representation

Overall Settlement Hierarchy

4. LLLP support the overall settlement hierarchy and categorisation of individual existing towns and villages set out in Figure 2.2 of the BBLP but have concerns with respect to the categorisation of Dunton Hills Garden Village (DHGV) as falling within Settlement Category 2.

Settlement Category 1 - Brentwood

5. LLLP support the identification of Brentwood town as forming part of Settlement Category 1 and agree with the description of such settlements in the Figure 2.3 (table following paragraph 2.10). It is agreed that Brentwood is correctly identified as a 'Large Town'.

6. LLLP are however concerned that Figure 2.3 does not provide sufficient emphasis in the text to the effect that Settlement Category 1 towns provide the most sustainable locations in the Borough for future development and services. The text should also be modified, in LLLP's view, to include reference to the need to use greenfield and Green Belt land in and at the edge of Brentwood town for future housing and economic development.

Settlement Category 2 - Dunton Hills Garden Village

7. LLLP object to the inclusion of Dunton Hills Garden Village as part of Settlement Category 2. The Garden Village does not exist and does not relate to the text in Figure 2.3 that describes Settlement Category 2 as larger villages in a rural setting.
8. DHGV is an untested, future, strategic development proposal using greenfield, Green Belt land. The development proposals are aspirational and it is not an existing settlement location.

Conclusions

9. LLLP supports the overall approach to the identification of the Settlement Hierarchy and categorisation.
10. LLLP does however object to the inclusion and approach to Dunton Hills Garden Village in Figures 2.2 and 2.3 and the supporting text of paragraph 2.14. The Settlement Categorisation is not sound as it is not:
 - *Justified* – for the reasons identified in this representation, the inclusion of DHGV as a Settlement Category 2 location is not justified. The settlement hierarchy needs to reflect the situation now. Future development proposals (including the provision of a new settlement such as DHGV), which have yet to be tested in detail and which have not been found to be the most appropriate growth strategy fall outside the settlement hierarchy. Their inclusion as if they already exist (and have received planning approval) is not justified.

- *Effective* – the inclusion of DHGV in Settlement Category 2 fails to reflect the proposed scheme’s status and that its development is an aspiration of the BBLP rather than forming part of the existing settlement hierarchy.

Modifications Sought

11. DHGV should be deleted from Settlement Category 2 and separately identified in both Figures 2.2 and 2.3 of the Plan in order to make plain its current situation. Paragraph 2.14 should then be modified accordingly to clearly articulate that the Garden Village does not yet exist and remains an aspiration of the BBLP rather than a final development scheme.

Chilmark Consulting Ltd.

E: planning@chilmarkconsulting.co.uk
www.chilmarkconsulting.co.uk