



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	Oliver
Last Name	Milne
Job Title (if applicable)	Associate
Organisation (if applicable)	Savills (on behalf of Solum)
Address	33 Margaret Street, London
Post Code	W1G 0JD
Telephone Number	02072993074
Email Address	omilne@savills.com

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	Oliver Milne (Savills, on behalf of Solum)
-----------	--

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).

Policy R10 – Brentwood Railway Station Car Park

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 refer to cover letter for full comments.

In the first instance we note that the site allocation plan at Appendix 2 of the draft Local Plan (page 327) doesn't include the full extent of the Station Car Park (i.e. Network Rail's ownership). Please find enclosed a red line plan showing the area that Solum is looking to bring forward for comprehensive redevelopment. Such an approach, rather than a piecemeal approach, will ensure that a well-designed development is delivered in this part of the town that maximises the ability of the site to deliver new homes, key pieces of station infrastructure as well as public benefits. As such, it is respectfully requested that the site allocation plan at Appendix 2 be amended to reflect the enclosed.

Notwithstanding the above, we strongly support the proposed allocation of the site for residential development. The site is a key brownfield site in highly accessible and sustainable town centre location. Best of use of such a site should be made to relieve pressure on less suitable sites within the Borough to meet its needs.

In the context of making effective use of land, the allocation accords with the guiding principles of the NPPF which states that planning policies and decisions should give substantial weight to the value of using suitable brownfield land within settlements for homes and other identified needs, as well promoting and supporting the development of under-utilised land and buildings, especially if this would help to meet identified needs for housing where land supply is constrained and available sites could be used more effectively.

In light of the above, the identified amount of development (i.e. 'around 100 new homes') represents an ineffective use of land which is contrary to the NPPF. Given the site's highly accessible and sustainable location, and given the context of the residential blocks to the immediate north of the site, it is considered that the site can accommodate a far greater density of residential dwellings. It is therefore respectfully requested that the wording of Policy R10 be amended to read 'provide for a minimum of 150 new homes...'.

In terms of delivery, we note that the supporting text to Policy R10 states that the new homes are anticipated to be delivered between 2029/30 and 2032/33. As mentioned above, Network Rail owns the freehold of the site and Solum has been tasked with pursuing proposals for its development. It is anticipated that new homes could come be delivered from 2024. It is therefore respectfully requested that the supporting text be amended to reflect this.

In terms of development principles, whilst we fully support the wider aspiration to increase public open space within the town, we question whether such provision is appropriate on this site. The site is relatively long and thin. As such, the provision of public open space has the potential to significantly limit the quantum of development which, as discussed above, would be contrary to making effective use of land in accordance with the NPPF. We therefore respectfully request that this development principle be removed from Policy R10.

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 refer to cover letter for full comments.

In the first instance we note that the site allocation plan at Appendix 2 of the draft Local Plan (page 327) doesn't include the full extent of the Station Car Park (i.e. Network Rail's ownership). Please find enclosed a red line plan showing the area that Solum is looking to bring forward for comprehensive redevelopment. Such an approach, rather than a piecemeal approach, will ensure that a well-designed development is delivered in this part of the town that maximises the ability of the site to deliver new homes, key pieces of station infrastructure as well as public benefits. As such, it is respectfully requested that the site allocation plan at Appendix 2 be amended to reflect the enclosed.

Notwithstanding the above, we strongly support the proposed allocation of the site for residential development. The site is a key brownfield site in highly accessible and sustainable town centre location. Best use of such a site should be made to relieve pressure on less suitable sites within the Borough to meet its needs.

In the context of making effective use of land, the allocation accords with the guiding principles of the NPPF which states that planning policies and decisions should give substantial weight to the value of using suitable brownfield land within settlements for homes and other identified needs, as well as promoting and supporting the development of under-utilised land and buildings, especially if this would help to meet identified needs for housing where land supply is constrained and available sites could be used more effectively.

In light of the above, the identified amount of development (i.e. 'around 100 new homes') represents an ineffective use of land which is contrary to the NPPF. Given the site's highly accessible and sustainable location, and given the context of the residential blocks to the immediate north of the site, it is considered that the site can accommodate a far greater density of residential dwellings. It is therefore respectfully requested that the wording of Policy R10 be amended to read 'provide for a minimum of 150 new homes...'.

In terms of delivery, we note that the supporting text to Policy R10 states that the new homes are anticipated to be delivered between 2029/30 and 2032/33. As mentioned above, Network Rail owns the freehold of the site and Solum has been tasked with pursuing proposals for its development. It is anticipated that new homes could be delivered from 2024. It is therefore respectfully requested that the supporting text be amended to reflect this.

In terms of development principles, whilst we fully support the wider aspiration to increase public open space within the town, we question whether such provision is appropriate on this site. The site is relatively long and thin. As such, the provision of public open space has the potential to significantly limit the quantum of development which, as discussed above, would be contrary to making effective use of land in accordance with the NPPF. We therefore respectfully request that this development principle be removed from Policy R10.

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.

Due to the ownership interest in the site.

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.