

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: Mrs	First Name: Joyce	Last Name: Bunker
Organisation (if applicable): n/a		
Job title (if applicable): Retired Civil Servant		
Address: Rustlings, 46 Pear tree Lane, Doddinghurst, Essex		
Post Code: CM15 0RH	Telephone Number: 07710296926	
Email Address: barry_bunker@hotmail.com		

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

But not at any cost and certainly not to the detriment of existing residents.



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

Yes No

Comments

No. The information gathered should be reviewed as there are discrepancies.



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

Yes No

Comments

Site 143

The proposals set out for site 143 would be detrimental to the lives of the people in the surrounding area. With regard to Lime Grove and Peartree Lane the roads are hardly wide enough for adequate parking of the existing residents the suggestion that these two lanes be used for access is ludicrous. As per your consultants, Atkins, documentation the available access points create unacceptably constrained site entries and are entirely unsuitable for the proposed development at Site No143.

More traffic in the village as a whole would put a strain on the community and increase the risk of accidents.

It is offensive for you to dismiss the value of the smallholding between the two residential houses No's 77 and 79.

I don't get out much in my old age. However, I take a short daily walk with my little dog to the bottom of Peartree Lane to see the animals at the small holding which gives me great pleasure and validation for all the years of hard work to live in a village.

The residents do not share your opinion that the smallholding is run down and in my view this area enhances the local environment.

The existing facilities are barely adequate for the current village population.

If new properties were to be introduced where would the new residents send their children to school. There is not room to expand the existing local schools which are at the very least at capacity as stated in your document "a significant deficit of primary school places".

This therefore only leaves the option for children to be driven to schools further away. Hardly an environmentally friendly approach. A large majority of parents currently walk their children to the school in the village.

We moved to this area in 1975 because we wanted to live in a quiet area having lived in London.

Significant development has already been undertaken in Doddinghurst over the years namely the new estate on the corner of Outings lane and Church Lane.

As your proposal does not take into consideration the views of the existing residents. I imagine the only people to agree with the proposal are the ones that would gain financially.

It seems the question of the problematic infrastructure has been evaded. Speaking from experience the doctors surgery finds it difficult to accommodate appointments with the existing residents of the village without the addition of 50 more families.

?	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?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
---	---	---	-----------------------------

Comments

Brownfield site near junction with M25



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

Yes No

Comments

Yes



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

The proposal for Site 143 in Doddinghurst is not on the edge of the long established village and it is in the middle of an already fully housed residential area. This proposal will impact to the detriment of all existing home owners in the area.

It is simply not democratic to destroy the village environment and its occupants with unacceptable proposals to satisfy politically driven targets. The powers that be should have the spine to resist unsatisfactory and unachievable objectives and at least do their job by ensuring the demands of their community members is followed not run roughshod over.



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.



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

Only if it makes commercial sense and the supporting infrastructure developed to meet demands. Current infrastructure is not up to standard as demonstrated by the extreme poor quality of the road surfaces.



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

Yes No

Comments



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: Low levels of light pollution.....	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

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

Comments

A review of the information provided is required and an appropriate design study is essential.

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)