



13 February 2015

Consultation Response
Planning Policy
Brentwood District Council
Town Hall
Ingrave Road
Brentwood Essex
CM15 8AY

Dear Sirs

**RE: BRENTWOOD BOROUGH LOCAL PLAN 2015-2030.
CONSULTATION RESPONSE TO THE STRATEGIC GROWTH OPTIONS
CONSULTATION (REG 18) FOR MS MAXINE ARMIGER.**

Please find a paper Response submitted on behalf of Ms Maxine Armiger comprising the following documents all forming part of the Response:

- 1 The completed Response Form.
- 2 The Attachments being further responses on pages 1-3 on the questions posed, a further two pages supporting development on the Sow N Grow Nursery site in Pilgrims Hatch with objections and comments on other sites in Pilgrims Hatch, and a feasibility plan (not to scale) for 42 dwellings for the Sow N Grow Nursery site.

Please confirm receipt.

Yours sincerely

Alan Wipperman BA MRICS MRTPI C Dip AF

consultation response brentwood local plan 2015-2030
strategic growth options
attachments to the response form and additional sheets to question 3

STRATEGIC GROWTH OPTIONS CONSULTATION.

RESPONSE FOR: MS MAXINE ARMIGER, [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

1 BACKGROUND.

This Response follows pre-application discussions and a draft scheme for the Sow N Grown site submitted for pre-application advice. This is on-going, pending progress with the development plan document being adopted, when the site can be released from the defined Metropolitan Green Belt following National Planning Practice Guidance amended in October 2014.

Following the most recent pre-application advice a possible scheme has been amended to now show both Phase 1 and Phase 2 as was requested, with a feasibility layout for some 42 dwellings. The layout prepared for further discussions is now attached and is shown in the Medusa Design drawing forming part of this Response.

This site is owned by the three members of the Armiger family who will act together to seek planning permission and develop the site once the requirements of the National Planning Practice Guidance are met or if the development plan process is sufficiently advanced to then allow for the release of this previously developed land from the Green Belt as a preferred allocation. Development could commence very quickly and be completed with five years.

It is a site in a highly sustainable location well served by public transport and other urban services and facilities within walkable distance.

It would not take any greenfield land away from agricultural use. The proposed redevelopment would give many amenity and visual improvements to the locality as well. The current mature and established tree line will be retained. The scheme would enhance the area.

The remaining small businesses need to expand and relocate to better premises and they are willing to do so on short notice terms. It can therefore be quickly developed to help meet objectively assessed housing needs in the Borough and locally.

It is understood that if the site is taken out of the Green Belt through the development plan process in accord with the NPPF and NPPG, then the local planning authority would have no objection in principle to residential redevelopment.

This Response is made with this prospect in mind and the latest feasibility plan is enclosed at A4 print out (not to scale).

In addition to the detail of the comments in the Response Form Mr Armiger would like the following comments including the above are added:

Question 1.

The broad areas for different approaches to the Strategic Growth Options are agreed. However regard should be had to the necessity for over-arching Borough wide policy guidance as well to ensure coherent treatment of development options and future applications to accord with the NPPF and NPPG.

Question 2.

The availability of previously developed land within each area needs to be known and assessed before policy can be fully determined, and the availability assessed of sites, whether within or outside the Green Belt.

Within the sub-areas where there is limited previously developed land mostly within the green belt then these should be given more weight in releasing such land than areas where there are greater areas of such land, e.g West Horndon, and there should be an overall requirement to ensure there is policy guidance for development giving weight to previously developed land being used, before the release of greenfield land, whether within or outside the green belt.

This would be important for the Brentwood and Pilgrims Hatch areas, and any other areas adjoining Brentwood's and other settlement's built up areas.

Question 3.

For the above reasons and for the reasons given in the first page of this Response a previously developed piece of land of limited visual and of no agricultural value or purpose should be given great weight for release for residential redevelopment in new policy even if within the green belt, throughout the Borough and for the local area, and for this part of Pilgrims Hatch in particular.

The Sow N Grow site is particularly suitable for release from the green belt and residential development as previously developed land. Other Pilgrims Hatch sites are greenfield or scrub open land and not so suitable and should be given lower or no priority.

Such an approach would then allow less favourable sites in greenfield and agricultural use to remain in uses appropriate to the green belt, including open space and recreational use, unless very special circumstances apply. By allowing such sites as Sow N Grow and others comprising previously developed land to be released first for development it follows the need for the use of greenfield sites would be reduced throughout the Borough until essential for release.

Accordingly large green field site are objected to being developed throughout the Borough, and only if demonstrably needed should they be released, and only after all previously developed land is first utilised. A sequential over-arching policy is required.

With regard to Pilgrims Hatch a further two page submission is made to this document supporting the release of the Sow N Grow Site No.010 with comments.

With regard to Pilgrims Hatch the following sites are not considered suitable for release from the Green Belt and/or residential development with further comments as appended in Response to Question 3:

011A, 011B, 011C, 023, 024A, 024B, 053B, 147, 148, 156, 159, 176, 189, and 198.

Questions 4.

Development of a new settlement scheme on greenfield land at Dunton Green is object to.

Development at West Horndon on previously developed employment land is supported.

Questions 5 to 13.

No additional comments made to those on the form.

Alan Wipperman BA MRICS MRTPI C Dip AF
for Ms Maxine Armiger.

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

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

Title:	First Name: MAXINE	Last Name: ARMIGER
Organisation (if applicable): —		
Job title (if applicable): —		
Address: [REDACTED]		
Post Code: [REDACTED]	Telephone Number: C/O AGENT	
Email Address: C/O AGENT.		

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.

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

AGREE IN PRINCIPLE - HOWEVER THE DEVELOPMENT PLAN ALSO REQUIRES CLEAR OVER-ARCHING BOROUGH WIDE POLICIES TO ALLOCATE SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT WITH PRIORITY GIVEN TO RE-USING PREVIOUSLY DEVELOPED LAND.

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

Yes No

Comments

BROADLY YES - HOWEVER EACH AREA REQUIRES REFERENCE TO AVAILABILITY OF PREVIOUSLY DEVELOPED LAND IN SUSTAINABLE LOCATIONS AND APPROPRIATE WEIGHT AND PRIORITY IS GIVEN TO RE-USE FOR RESIDENTIAL HOUSING LAND - WITHIN & OUTSIDE THE GREEN BOLT.

? Q3: Do you have any comments on the appropriateness of particular sites? (SEE ATTACHED MATERIALS AS WELL)

Yes No

Comments

THE SOWN GROW NURSERY SITE COMPRISES PREVIOUSLY DEVELOPED LAND IN AN AREA WHERE THERE IS LIMITED SUPPLY OF SUCH LAND IN SUSTAINABLE LOCATIONS. IT IS A SUSTAINABLE LOCATION. PRE-APPLICATION DISCUSSIONS ARE AT AN ADVANCED STAGE & A DRAFT SCHEME FOR 42 DWELLINGS HAS BEEN PREPARED AND IS SUBMITTED HEREWITH. GREENFIELD SITES ARE LESS APPROPRIATE - SEE ATTACHED INFORMATION.

? 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 RE-USE OF PREVIOUSLY DEVELOPED LAND AT WEST HORNDON IS SUPPORTED AS BETTER FOR REDEVELOPMENT THAN USE OF GREENFIELD LAND - AS AT DUNTON GREEN. PRIORITY SHOULD BE GIVEN TO PREVIOUSLY DEVELOPED LAND.

? Q5: Should the A12 corridor accommodate growth by releasing sites on the edge of urban areas?

Yes No

Comments

SITES ON THE EDGE OF URBAN AREAS (URBAN EXTENSIONS ARE PREFERRED AGAINST NEW SETTLEMENTS ON GREENFIELD LAND). THIS IS BECAUSE DEVELOPMENT ADJOINING OR ON EDGE OF A SETTLEMENT ALLOW BETTER UTILISATION OF EXISTING INFRASTRUCTURE & URBAN SERVICES.

? 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)?

Comments

FOR IDENTIFIED SUITABLE SETTLEMENTS AND VILLAGES SOME SMALL GREENFIELD SITES IN SUSTAINABLE LOCATIONS SHOULD BE CONSIDERED FOR RELEASE FROM THE GREEN BELT BUT AFTER RELEASE & ALLOCATION AS A PREFERRED SITE FOR DEVELOPMENT WHERE THERE IS PREVIOUSLY UNDEVELOPED LAND - EG THE SOWING CROU SITE.

? 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

SUSTAINABLE EMPLOYMENT AREAS SHOULD BE ALLOCATED CLOSE TO/NEAR THE STRATEGIC HIGHWAY NETWORK, ON GREENFIELD SITES IF NECESSARY, WHERE SUSTAINABLE, TO ALLOW UNSUITABLE EMPLOYMENT SITES TO BE RELEASED WHERE THERE IS GOOD ACCESS TO THE HIGHWAY AND THERE ARE ADVERSE AMENITY IMPACTS.

? 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

NO FURTHER COMMENT.

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

Yes No

Comments

THERE IS SCOPE FOR EXISTING GREENFIELD LAND ADJACENT TO SETTLEMENTS WHICH MAY BE POORLY UTILISED FOR AGRICULTURE, E.G. 'SCRUB LAND' AROUND PILGRIM'S HATCH THAT COULD PROVIDE OPEN & RECREATIONAL SPACE - THESE SHOULD NOT BE RELEASED FOR DEVELOPMENT.

? 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	4	5
Outdoor Recreation / Leisure Use	1	2	3	4	5
Wildlife Interest	1	2	3	4	5
Historic Interest	1	2	3	4	5
Tranquility	1	2	3	4	5
Other - please specify:	1	2	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	3	4
Commercial / Industrial buildings	1	2	3	4
Nature Reserves / Wildlife	1	2	3	4
Farmland	1	2	3	4
Woodland	1	2	3	4
Degraded / Derelict / Waste land	1	2	3	4
Infrastructure (Road / Rail / Pylons etc.)	1	2	3	4
Leisure / Recreation Facilities	1	2	3	4
Other - please specify:	1	2	3	4

? Q12: Have we considered the main infrastructure issues? Are there other important issues to consider? Yes No

Comments

OVERALL POLICIES REVISED WITH REGARD TO UTILISING MORE EFFICIENTLY EXISTING INFRASTRUCTURE & URBAN SERVICES AND NEW INFRASTRUCTURE AND URBAN SERVICES WHERE THESE ARE TO BE PROVIDED.

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

Comments

SUSTAINABLE DRAINAGE, RECREATION/EDUCATION & HIGHWAYS/
PUBLIC TRANSPORT SERVICES.

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)

Attached sheets relating to Question 3 in the Response Form.

Comments with regard to the sites listed in Pilgrims Hatch.

Sites with number:

010 Sow & Grow Nursery, Ongar Road, Pilgrims Hatch

Comments:

Support
development for reasons given in a separate document because this is agreed to be, and is, previously developed land.

Other sites - comments:

011A Land rear of 10-20 Orchard Lane, Pilgrims Hatch
011B Land rear of 10-20 Orchard Lane, Pilgrims Hatch
011C Land rear of 10-20 Orchard Lane, Pilgrims Hatch

Object. 3.47 ha. in total. Mainly greenfield and or agricultural land. Not previously developed land. (PDL).

012 Garage courts adjacent 49 Lavender Avenue, Pilgrims Hatch

No objection.

023 Land off Doddinghurst Road, either side of A12, Brentwood

Object. 7.2 ha. Mainly greenfield/ agricultural land. Not PDL.

024A Sawyers Hall Farm, Sawyers Hall Lane/Doddinghurst Road, Brentwood
024B Sawyers Hall Farm, Sawyers Hall Lane/Doddinghurst Road, Brentwood

Object. In total some 20.25 ha. Mainly greenfield/ animal sanctuary land. Not PDL.

053A Land rear of 146-148 Hatch Road, Pilgrims Hatch

No comment.

053B Land rear of 146-148 Hatch Road, Pilgrims Hatch

Object. 4.0 ha. Mainly greenfield or woodland. Not PDL.

054 Garages adjacent 25 Kings George's Road, Pilgrims Hatch

No comment.

086 Land at Sandringham Road, Pilgrims Hatch


No objection.

088 Bishops Hall Community Centre and land
089 Brentwood Centre and land

No objection to retention of the existing use.


Continued

097 Harewood Road bungalows, Pilgrims Hatch	No objection as above (89).
132A Land at Albany Road, Pilgrims Hatch 132B Land at Albany Road, Pilgrims Hatch	No objection if PDL.
134 Land at Gloucester Road, Pilgrims Hatch, Brentwood	No objection if PDL.
137A Land at Broomwood Gardens and Dounsell Court, Ongar Road.	No objection if PDL.
137B Land at Broomwood Gardens and Dounsell Court, Ongar Road.	No objection if PDL.
147 Land at Joy Fook restaurant, adjacent Bentley Golf Club, Ongar Road	Object. 0.47 ha. Isolated site. Not a sustainable location.
148 Land at Moat Farm, 48 Crow Green Road, Pilgrims Hatch	Object. 0.69 ha. Greenfield land and not PDL.
156 Greenacres Riding Stables & land opposite, Beads Hall Lane.	Object. 5.5 ha. The Site is not fully PDL and in an unsustainable location.
159 Land off Crow Green Lane, Pilgrims Hatch	Object. 2.8 ha. Greenfield land and not PDL.
176 Land at former Bentley Zoo, Hulleys Lane, Brentwood	Object. Garden land not PDL.
189 Former Catrina Nursery, Ongar Road, Pilgrims Hatch	Object. 2.89 ha. Greenfield land and Not fully PDL.
198 Land to South-east of Doddinghurst Road, Pilgrims Hatch	Object. 5.69 ha. Greenfield and agricultural land and not PDL.
227 144 Crow Green Road, Pilgrims Hatch	No comment.
GT009 Cottage Garden, Beads Hall Lane, Pilgrims Hatch	Gypsy site no comment.



Ground Floor Plan - 3 Bed House


First Floor Plan - 3 Bed House



Ground Floor Plan - 2 Bed House

First Floor Plan - 2 Bed House


Second Floor Plan - 3 Bed House
(Ground / First Floors Same As 2 Bed House)



Ground Floor Plan - 1 Bed Flats




First Floor Plan - 1 Bed Flat / 2 Bed Flat




Second Floor Plan - 2 Bed Flat


Proposed Floor Plans
Scale: 1:100




Ground Floor Plan - 3 Bed House - Garage



First Floor Plan - 3 Bed House - Garage




Ground Floor Plan - 4 Bed House



First Floor Plan - 4 Bed House



Proposed Site Plan
Scale: 1:500



- 11No. 1 bed flats
- 3No. 2 bed flats
- 5No. 2 bed houses
- 12No. 3 bed houses
- 7No. 4 bed houses
- 4No. 5 bed houses
- 42No. total units.



Front Elevation - 3 Bed Houses



Front Elevation - 3No. 1 Bed Flats, 1No. 2 Bed Flat



Front Elevation - 4 Bed House



Front Elevation - 3 Bed House & 2No. 2 Bed Houses



Front Elevation - 3 Bed House - Garage

Proposed Elevations
Scale: 1:100

Rev F: 20.01.2015 - Scheme Amended
Rev E: 19.01.2015 - Phase Two Added
Rev D: 24.11.2014 - Scheme Amended
Rev C: 20.11.2014 - Scheme Amended
Rev B: 17.11.2014 - Scheme Amended
Rev A: 09.10.2014 - Roof Plans Added

Status: **Feasibility**



Medusa Design
Architectural Designers
Unit 4, Stour Valley Business Centre,
Brunton Lane, Sudbury, CO10 7GB
Tel: 01787 883339 Fax: 01787 882658
E-Mail: info@medusadesign.co.uk
Web site: www.medusadesign.co.uk

Client: **Mr Armiger**

Project: **Sow N Grow Nursery, Ongar Road, Pilgrims Hatch, Essex. CM15 9JH**

Drawing Details: **Proposed Site Plan**

Date:	Scale/s:	Drawn:
Sept 2013	1:500 @ A1	MJM
Number:		Rev:
1293/13/01		F