

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

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

The supply of “affordable” housing has everything to do with the commercial price of land bought and sold by developer and land owner rather than the token number of affordable housing the council stipulates per development. In order to curtail profiteering and an exhalation of land prices earmarked in the current plan for possible development – wouldn’t it be better for the council to compulsory purchase its own chosen sites – within its urban curtailment in order to achieve its aim of affordable housing in areas where infrastructure already exists? Further housing development in villages will require additional infrastructure – which cost will fall to the council to supply when current infrastructure becomes inadequate.



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

Yes No

Comments

Will the council be able to provide further parking in central Brentwood and additional easing of traffic congestion into the town from the A12 – a bottleneck for commuter traffic ? Given the greater development capacity along the A127 – perhaps the council should concentrate the additional development and infrastructure requirements on those designated sites for schools housing retail and commercial as much is already in place and would encourage an easing of traffic as some would choose Basildon as a preferred shopping/commuter option to Brentwood, and there is perhaps more scope for “affordable” housing as a larger development will increase the number of affordable houses.



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

Yes No

Everyone needs to shop (food) most need easy transport links for work and leisure, not everyone has children. The main problem anywhere in Brentwood is traffic especially into the town from the A12. Development of

larger sites which will impact on this (eg in Mountnessing and Ingatestone) will detract from Brentwood as an easily accessible town. However, some smaller sites appear sustainable eg 42,018,153,078abc,225,128 and the Thoby Lane site 018 – as it will not impact on any surrounding housing and following the fire last summer, would seem an ideal choice.

The large site in the centre of Mountnessing – school and roundabout - will create strain on existing infrastructure with its aging and inadequate water tower and full capacity village school. Lack of shops other than butcher and hairdresser require an immediate car journey. Access from a minor side road will require at least traffic lights/mini roundabout. All the sewage from the site will enter Crosby Close and likely require upgrading – causing further congestion. Traffic problems highlighted at the narrow Hare Bridge Crescent Ingatestone will be duplicated by Crosby Close and Church Lane which expense will ultimately be borne by the council.

? 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

I would suggest that all sites along the A127 corridor as a development plan would enable the council to then concentrate infrastrucutre on one area and provide economy of scale on one site.

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

Comments

The council should consider its own costs of supplying further infrastructure first - whether it is better for economy of scale to develop a larger site eg A127 corridor rather than piecemeal development of medium sites within a village location resulting in strain on existing infrastructure.

? 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

Green Belt was imposed after WW2 to prevent such infill; brown sites by definition are a more sustainable development opportunity, making brownfied sites favourable. However, there is an historic exception to the Thoby Lane site – green belt but which is an industrial site and which casued a major fire incident last summer.

?

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

For reasons above, the most sustainable approach is to build one large site – requiring developers to provide additional schools, dr surgeries and contribute to the council’s requirements for road infrastructure, water and wesage supplies etc. with minimal development within village boundaries that will not impact on existing village life.

?

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, as outside retail parks detract from local businesses resulting in shop closures and will impact adversely on the town and surrounding area as a pleasant place to live.

?

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

Yes No

Comments

This question isn’t clear. There is open space in Mountnessing – farmland and village green. Any sustainable development plan in any area will surely mean less open space provision.

? 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					5
Outdoor Recreation / Leisure Use				4	
Wildlife Interest				4	5
Historic Interest					5
Tranquility				4	5
Other – please specify:					

? 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		2		
Commercial / Industrial buildings		2		
Nature Reserves / Wildlife				4
Farmland				4
Woodland			3	
Degraded / Derelict / Waste land		2		
Infrastructure (Road / Rail / Pylons etc.)		2		
Leisure / Recreation Facilities		2		
Other – please specify:				

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



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

Comments

Roads – to ease traffic bottlenecks, maintenance of existing refuse sites eg in Mountnessing in order to prevent an increase in fly tipping, additional doctor surgeries and schools.

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)