

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](mailto: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](http://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



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

Yes  No

### Comments

The Strategic Assessment document mentions that there is an above average use of rail travel (20%) and below average car travel. Most of these journeys are towards London.

Given the A127 congestion problems (as mentioned in the Strategic Growth Options Consultation document and as witnessed by myself), this is not surprising.

Once Crossrail arrives at Brentwood and Shenfield stations, it will act as a magnet to people, so they will be looking for housing in these areas. It makes sense that these areas are where the development should be. There is no rail link from West Horndon to these stations and no suitable regular bus link.

So a large development in the West Horndon area would mean a greatly increased amount of traffic heading onto the A127 and A128, the latter of which is not fit for purpose with existing traffic levels, looking to park near to Brentwood or Shenfield station. Plus there would be an extra increase in traffic on the A127 for those attempting to drive London bound.

Each proposed location has its drawbacks due to infrastructure capacity problems, and all will require significant infrastructure investment. It makes sense to direct this investment to into new development that will benefit the most people. Given that most people will be looking to live near Brentwood and Shenfield for the above reasons, this is where the new development and infrastructure spending should take place.

It should also be noted that expansion at West Horndon would require the rail link to be expanded, which is not directly under the control of Brentwood Council, and the rail operator would be looking for money from either the council or the developers to cover the cost and disruption if the operator decides to carry out the upgrade.

Crossrail is already being built, which eliminates a large slice of infrastructure cost associated with the new development.

? Q3: Do you have any comments on the appropriateness of particular sites? Yes  No

**Comments** I note that in various places of the Strategic Growth Options Consultation document, it is mentioned that Gypsy and Traveller provision should be in mixed use development sites. In West Horndon's case, these are sites 020 and 021.

Such a site would harm the character and appearance of the village and result in an unacceptable visual impact. House prices in the area would plummet. The events of Dale Farm have proved how a supposed limit of a legal number of pitches can mushroom out of control.

Given the above, the travellers with their larger than average families, could soon start overwhelming such a small rural village as West Horndon.

It is no coincidence that many existing traveller sites are situated in locations away from developed areas because the travellers have chosen these secluded locations for compatibility with their lifestyle. Their wishes should be respected by allocating similar sites unbounded by other development.

Such a lifestyle has little or no requirement for a rail link so the advantage of sites 020 and 021 with their proximity to the rail station would be better used for other people who would rely heavily on the rail link.

The above points illustrate why West Horndon, particularly in respect to sites 020 and 021, is not a suitable location for a travellers' site.

I have read that the animal sanctuary in Brentwood may need a new location as Brentwood Council are considering this site for 2500 new homes.

The rural setting of West Horndon could be an ideal place to relocate it.

? 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**  
Just the brownfield sites.



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

Yes

No

**Comments**

This would upset the least amount of people. Those who like living in busy urban areas would still be in an urban area. Those living in a small rural area such as West Horndon chose such a location because of their dislike of urban areas would be very angry if their rural area was turned into an urban area against their wishes.



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 land should not be released unless it would be a huge benefit for the local community and hugely sought after by those residents. Once gone it could never be restored.  
Brownfield site development is far more preferable.



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**

Not necessarily. The brownfield sites of 020 and 021 could accommodate offices for example, where traffic travelling through the village to the offices would be limited to cars and only in normal office hours with lulls after 09:00 till 17:00. This would bring employment to the village and custom to the shops without the current disadvantages of lorries travelling through the village 24 hours a day to the warehouses and factories currently located on those sites.



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**

I think Brentwood Town Centre is a lost cause as far as travelling from West Horndon is concerned. It may be fine for those living nearby but expanding the Town Centre will do little to attract more people in from outside the immediate area, unless a new dual carriageway road link that links the A127 to the A12 is constructed, public transport is greatly improved, and more car parks are built around the town. Towns to the west and east of West Horndon are easy to get to by road and rail and are therefore much more attractive to West Horndon residents as places to go.



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: Rural landscape	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**

It can be seen that whatever option is taken for the location of development, the current infrastructure of the target location is not fit for purpose to support further development.

No development should therefore be permitted until all infrastructure requirements have been implemented.

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

**Comments**

Flood alleviation must take the highest priority. The village of West

Horndon has flooded in a major way in 1958, 1981 and 2012. There have been less minor floods at additional times.

**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)