From: Matt Driscoll [

Sent: 17 February 2015 12:51

To: Planning Policy

Subject: Growth Options Consultation - Robert Mullholland & Co

Attachments: 140502-SK-04B.PDF; Strategic Growth Options Comment - Robert Mullholland &

Co.docx

Follow Up Flag: Follow up Completed

Dear Sirs,

On behalf of our client, Robert Mullholland & Co., please find attached a completed consultation questionnaire for the Strategic Growth Options Consultation.

If you have any queries, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Kind regards

Matt Driscoll MRTPI Associate



THE JTS PARTNERSHIP LLP

150216 MJD/

Trading as a Limited Liability Partnership. Registered in England & Wales. Registration No. OC307263. Regulated by RICS. This document, together with any attachment, is intended for, and should only be read by, those persons to whom it is addressed. Its contents are confidential and if you have received it in error please notify us immediately and delete all record of the message from your computer. Although this e-mail, and its attachments are believed to be free from any virus, it is the responsibility of the recipient to ensure that they are virus free. The JTS Partnership will accept no responsibility in this respect. A list of partners is available for inspection on request. Telephone:

Click <u>here</u> to report this email as spam.

| ı | 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: Mr | First Name: Matthew | | Last Name: Driscoll | |
|---|---------------------|-------------------|---------------------|--|
| Organisation (if applicable): The JTS Partnership LLP on behalf of Robert Mulholland & Co Ltd | | | | |
| Job title (if applicable): | | | | |
| Address: | | | | |
| Post Code: | | Telephone Number: | | |
| Email Address: | | | | |

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 Yes ✓ approaches to growth? | No □ |
|----------|--|------|
| | Comments The Borough logically splits itself into three identified areas, which are of different character. The Borough contains two main infrastructure corridors, with more rural villages to the north and each area provides different development opportunities. The growth figure of 5,500 dwellings for the next 15 years is supported, however it is considered optimistic that 2,500 dwellings will come from the brownfield sites within the urban area. | |
| <u>;</u> | Q2: Do you agree with the issues raised within each of these areas? Yes ✓ | No 🗆 |
| | Comments These representations concern the A127 Corridor and it is considered that the issues raised in relation to this area are correct. | |
| . | Q3: Do you have any comments on the appropriateness of particular sites? Yes ✓ | No □ |
| | Concern is raised at the prospect of the West Horndon strategic allocations, particularly in regard to the development on employment sites. Whilst the development of those sites is supported, the Council must ensure that sufficient employment land is brought forward alongside the allocation of these sites to ensure that employment is not lost in the Borough. The existing, undesignated, land at East Horndon Hall is ideally suited to provide additional employment land to accommodate those lost through brownfield redevelopment. | |

Comments

Proposals for development at West Horndon are supported, in principle. Representations will be made separately to the Dunton Garden Suburb Consultation; however it is considered that this development fails in four of the five purposes of the Green Belt (Paragraph 80 of the NPPF). Such a suburb would: -

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?

- Encourage the sprawl of large built-up areas (Basildon/Laindon);
- Potentially merge Laindon with East Horndon and West Horndon. Laindon itself is already merged with Basildon
- Further encroaches upon the countryside, creating a continuous stretch of development on the southern side of the A127, running from Nevendon to the A128.
- Failing to encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

Questions are also raised over the deliverability of The Dunton Garden Suburb. Basildon Borough Council's Local Plan process has been set back, with the Council not expecting adoption until late 2018. Brentwood Borough Council will not be able to adopt their cross-boundary Development Plan Document until it is agreed and adopted by Basildon Borough Council. The proposals do not provide sufficient detail to demonstrate the deliverability of such a scheme and whether there is reasonable prospect of the full delivery of 2,500 dwellings within the 15 year period.

| | | to demonstrate the deliverability of such a scheme and whether there is reasonable prospect of the full delivery of 2,500 dwellings within the 15 year period. | | |
|---|----------|---|----|---------------|
| _ | | | | $\overline{}$ |
| | <u> </u> | Q5: Should the A12 corridor accommodate growth by releasing sites on Yes the edge of urban areas? | No | |
| | | Comments | | |
| | | The focus of this submission is centred on the A127 Corridor and employment sites. This firm makes representations on housing issues in separate representations. | | |
| | | | • | _ |
| | ? | 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 | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | J | |
| | ? | 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? | No | |
| | | Comments | | |
| | | | | |

It is a logical decision to seek to allocated employment sites close to the strategic highway network and away from the higher populated areas of residential

development. The site to the south of East Horndon Hall meets those requirements, being located on the junction of the A127 and A128. The land is currently partly used for industrial purposes, however there is potential for the land to the south to also be considered for employment use.

An Indicative Masterplan has been prepared together with a Highway Feasibility Summary (both attached), demonstrating that a mixed employment development of up to approximately 21 acres and potentially 34,000 sq m of new employment floorspace can be accommodated within the constraints of imposed by the highway and junction capacities.

The range of uses suggested is predominantly B1 light industrial uses, with elements of B2 and B8 use incorporated.

The proposals provide an opportunity to regulate the existing industrial uses and, whilst the site is heavily screened from the west and north, further landscaping and planting can be provided to create a buffer between the site and the A128.

The site is in a highly sustainable location in terms of highway networks, being located adjacent to the roundabout with the A127 and A128, with direct links to the M25, Brentwood, Thurrock and east Essex.

Furthermore, with the potential proposed allocation for housing within West Horndon, replacing the existing employment land, this site is ideally located for an increase in employment numbers resulting from the additional housing.

Given the lawful uses of the northern element of the site, the condition of the land, the containment around primary roads and the existing screening, the site currently makes only a minor contribution to the purposes of the Green Belt as set out in paragraph 80 of the NPPF.

| . | 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. | | |
| | | | |
| | | | l ——— |
| ? | Q9: Are there opportunities for more open space provision in the area where you live? | Yes ✓ | No □ |

Comments

| No further comment. | |
|---------------------|---|
| | |
| | |
| | ı |

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 / Attractivness | 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 |
| Infastructure (Road / Rail / Pylons etc.) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Leisure / Recreation Facilities | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Other – please specify: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

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

Comments

| | No further comment. | |
|---|--|--|
| ? | Q13: What do you think the priorities for infrastructure spending should be? | |
| | Comments | |
| | No comment. | |
| | | |
| | | |

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)