

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 clear answer has to be Yes but not at any cost to the Village environments which have proved to be a sound method for house holders to enjoy with benefits both psychologically and in terms of prosperity



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

Yes No

Comments

No

The issues have to be revisited as there are clear inconsistencies



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

Yes No

Comments

The proposals set out for Site 143 are inappropriately considered in the context of trying to maintain the rural nature of the "VILLAGE of Doddinghurst". It is essential that green spaces and preferably active smallholdings are allowed to survive and be encouraged for the personal development of the next generation and future villagers.

The old farm buildings are part of the sites heritage, aesthetics and charisma and it is plainly ignorant to condemn them as is mentioned on this site appraisal.

The fundamental aspects of inadequate Infrastructure seem to be glossed over in the considerations so far outlined as the adverse effects which will without doubt have significant impact upon all existing house holders.

Not least the Foul and Surface Water drainage, water and gas supplies.

The Doctors Surgery and Schooling facilities are already strained and traffic flows in the feeder roadways to the proposed site 143 will be dangerous, and unpleasant for all concerned in the potential two car family scenario which will create a further 100 cars on what can only be described as already very busy access routes.

Lime Grove in particular is an extremely overloaded road and unable to cope with the existing traffic flow and is quite frequently blocked. Peartree Lane has conditions which closely match this description. It is evident that the Planning Offices previous rejection of Mr Torrs' earlier Planning Application for this site and the comprehensive reasons given are now conveniently being ignored. I have lived in Peartree Lane since 1971 (44 years) and can confirm that the River Wid Brook frequently causes flooding at the road crossing at Peartree Lane adjacent to Site No143. I have been advised by the owners of Site 143 on 9th February 2015 that they have not been approached over this subject and one can clearly see that the truth is lacking somewhere in the various exchanges.

Referring to Site 070 it seems entirely inappropriate to once again see that having only recently been condemned by the Planning Office and refused permission this site is being considered once more with all the access hazards and problems which have been clearly defined during the previous planning application process leading to rejection.

Finally it is noted that Atkins documentation considers the available access points create unacceptably constrained site entries and are entirely unsuitable for the proposed development at Site No143.

? 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

Comments

Yes

? 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)?

Yes

Comments

It is appropriate to utilise brownfield sites where the development is not impinging on the surrounding areas by the proposals put forward and effectively overcrowding an otherwise green “Village” environment.

The use of Greenfield sites will naturally have impact on Infrastructure as do all developments but this aspect can be integrated into the new Greenfield design proposals and have a lower impact on the existing population of a balanced village community.

It is without doubt that proposals in whatever form they are presented will inevitably stress the village occupiers who are affected and the measure of this stress should be taken into account when imposing the will of others onto the final decision.

It is simply not democratic to effectively ruin 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.

?

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 at the present time the high level of Business rates are extremely detrimental to any business proposition and can be clearly seen to be driving out existing established firms. My company has withdrawn from Brentwood as a clear example. (Troup Bywaters and Anders established in 1958 had an Essex office from 1967 to 2011 and owned an Office in Lorne Road, Brentwood)



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

Yes



Comments

No



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:					
...Environmental ACCEPTABILITY.....	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? Yes

Comments

No

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

Comments

Appraisal Required not an arbitrary consideration.

This question is ill-conceived

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)