

Internal use only	
Comment No.	
Ack. date	



## Brentwood Borough Local Plan

# Strategic Growth Options Consultation

January 2015

## Consultation questionnaire

This consultation questionnaire relates to the Brentwood Local Plan Strategic Growth Options Consultation and is provided for you to make comments. Please take the opportunity to read the consultation document before filling in this form and returning to:

**Planning Policy Team, Brentwood Borough Council Town Hall, Brentwood, Essex, CM15 8AY**  
or by email to **[planning.policy@brentwood.gov.uk](mailto:planning.policy@brentwood.gov.uk)**

Comments need to be received by 5pm on Tuesday 17 February 2015

If you need any help completing this form please contact the Planning Policy Team using the contact details given above or by telephoning 01277 312620.

## Personal Details

## Questions

The Council is seeking responses on key issues. Focused questions appear in bold boxes throughout the Strategic Growth Options document. These questions are summarised in this consultation questionnaire. More information can be found at **[www.brentwood.gov.uk/localplan](http://www.brentwood.gov.uk/localplan)**.

Please use an additional sheet if necessary. Please note that all responses will be published online.



Q1: Do you agree with the broad areas, for the purpose of considering approaches to growth?

Yes  No

**Comments**

Yes, for the purpose of breaking down the analysis into more manageable areas with common features the three broad areas chosen are sensible.



Q2: Do you agree with the issues raised within each of these areas?

Yes  No

**Comments** Yes but with reservations:

(i) For “North of the Borough” brownland that is not also greenbelt should be released. To release greenbelt land that has been allowed to become derelict land should not be allowed as this will encourage mis-use of land in the hope it will become building land. Moreover, the 2013 sustainability report shows that “North of the Borough” has water and sewerage shortages as well as a poor road infrastructure.

(ii) The A12 corridor has the best road and rail access of all the communities and should be the area best suited for expansion without changing the character of the area significantly.

(iii) We don't agree that the A127 has more scope for development than the A12. If anything the A12 needs significant improvement as this NE segment of the London motorway network is the only key compass direction out of London without a motorway route.



Q3: Do you have any comments on the appropriateness of particular sites?

Yes  No

**Comments**

Yes. The use of greenfield sites 143, 185, 070, 224,188 and 109 in Doddinghurst are unacceptable as they require to, and open the door on, yet further development in the green belt. They also join up existing residential areas, creating urban sprawl in the village, and would change its character forever. Moreover the road access to sites143, 224, 070 and 185 is too limited to enable significant development and would create significant addition vehicular traffic on existing minor roads to the detriment

of existing residents. Site 019 already has a residence (All Saints Church Rectory) on it.

? Q4: Given the greater capacity for growth along the A127 corridor, which of the sites put forward do you think is the best location for growth?

**Comments**

The Dunton Garden Suburb proposal makes sense as it can be designed from scratch to be a fully fledged community with all the amenities it requires to flourish without any significant adverse effect the existing neighbourhood.

? Q5: Should the A12 corridor accommodate growth by releasing sites on the edge of urban areas? Yes  No

**Comments**

Yes, within reason, the A12 corridor has a number of areas that could be developed so long as it is distributed development in low density quality housing and not over compressed "affordable homes" that are squashed into one area destined to be tomorrows slum - Officer's Meadow is in danger of becoming such an area.

? Q6: In order to provide for local need is it preferable for Greenfield sites on the edge of villages to be released, or to develop brownfield sites (both within the Green Belt)? Yes  No

**Comments**

No, this is the worst possible option and guaranteed to destroy the character of the villages that surround Brentwood. Not only is the existing infrastructure, in many cases, unable to support this development it would encourage development of the sort at Thoby Priory where a "Builders Yard" became established and ran out of control. The development by "stealth" of Green Belt land is already bad enough without this

arrangement adding fuel to a fire that is already burning steadily away at the Green Belt with “Stables”, “Chicken” farms, “Mushroom” Farms and other similar permitted developments inevitable turning into applications for residential homes. The developmet on Green Belt should only be permitted where there is overwhelming benefit to the community eg a Doctors Surgery.

?

Q7: To enable future employment need to be met do you agree that the most sustainable approach is to allocate new sites close to the strategic highway network?

Yes  No

**Comments**

Yes, site 101A on the M25/ A127 junction seems ideally suited to light industry/ retail use as good access to transport is esential keeping heavy lorries off minor roads which are already in a poor state of repair with patched tarmac and potholes everywhere.

?

Q8: In order to ensure that the Town Centre remains economically sustainable, do you agree that a “Town Centre First” approach should be taken to retail development?

Yes  No

**Comments**

Yes, but for diverse and quality retail units. Specialist DIY/ electronics/ whitegood and builders retailers will want their industrial size retail units out of town. Brentwood Town centre needs much better shops if it is to justify the expensive car parking it currently offers. The town needs to distinguish between all day parking for people who work and part day car parking for people who want to shop. The shops will only thrive if people turn up to shop - and they won't if it's cheaper to drive 10 miles to Lakeside where parking is free!

?

Q9: Are there opportunities for more open space provision in the area where you live?

Yes  No

**Comments**

No, not really. The area is surrounded by farms and has a network of formal footpaths so access to the countryside on foot is not currently an issue. Clearly, for a price, additional farmland can be procured.

However, more could be done to designate “quite” lanes and cycleways as narrow country lanes with HGV traffic does not mix well with children on their bikes with Mum and Dad. It would be relatively easy to close many of the one track minor roads to HGV through traffic to make these route safer for walkers and cyclists.

? Q10: Please rate the level to which you value the landscape near where you live (on a scale of 1 to 5), as compared to other areas within Brentwood Borough, for the following aspects:

Aspect:	Very Low	Low	Average	High	Very High
Scenic Beauty / Attractiveness	1	2	3	✓	5
Outdoor Recreation / Leisure Use	1	2	3	✓	5
Wildlife Interest	1	2	3	4	✓
Historic Interest	1	2	✓	4	5
Tranquility	1	2	3	✓	5
Other – please specify: Aircraft of all shapes and sizes - noise pollution	1	✓	3	4	5
.....					

? Q11: To what extent do you think the following are present in the landscape near where you live (on a scale of 1 to 4):

Aspect:	Absent	Occasional	Frequent	Predominant
Houses	1	2	✓	4
Commercial / Industrial buildings	1	✓	3	4
Nature Reserves / Wildlife	1	✓	3	4
Farmland	1	2	✓	4
Woodland	1	2	✓	4
Degraded / Derelict / Waste land	✓	2	3	4
Infrastructure (Road / Rail / Pylons etc.)	1	✓	3	4
Leisure / Recreation Facilities	1	2	✓	4

Other – please specify: Ponds and rivers .....	1	✓	3	4
--	---	---	---	---

? Q12: Have we considered the main infrastructure issues? Are there other important issues to consider? (Two questions ?!)      Yes X    No X

**Comments**  
**No you haven't discussed water supplies, broadband, or power supplies and Yes there are other important issues.**

Air corridors and air traffic over Brentwood is significant being on Heathrow, Stansted, City, Southend and North Weald Airport flight paths. When the wind is from the west and Heathrow is in operational difficulties the air is thick with stacked aircraft circling overhead.

Water supply and sewerage. Parts of Essex are extremely dry and the document references an interim sustainability appraisal (Page 7), surely the 2013 appraisal doesn't have to be repeated at yet more expense?

? Q13: What do you think the priorities for infrastructure spending should be?

**Comments**  
 If the Infrastructure is funded by CIL then it will be generated from the houses being built and spent on the area being developed, so the priority is to make sure these incomes and expenses at least match? We don't believe that CIL earned in one place should be used as a source of revenue for other Borough developments.

**Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire**

Please ensure that you return comments to the Council by 5pm on Tuesday 17 February 2015 (see page 1 for details)