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:	ROSEMARY	Last Name: LE-ABACK.		
Organie	anisation (if applicable):					

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.

		- 9	$\overline{}$
?	Q1: Do you agree with the broad areas, for the purpose of considering approaches to growth?	es [No 🗆
	Comments	0.5	
?	Q2. Do you agree with the locate raised main each of an	/es □	No Z
	Comments The A127 both ways seems always to be a or standstill A larger village would at to these pr and the commute into London on C2C from West Horn is also at copacity.	+	
	The AIRT both ways seems always to be a	mhlari	
	a standstill. A larger village would at he share for	don	
	and the commute into London on the		
	s also at copies]
3	Q3: Do you have any comments on the appropriateness of particular sites?	Yes Z	No 🗆
	Comments 500 New Romes would be too much for a		
	small village as ours. 200 at the most, if proper		
	small village as ours. 200 at the most, if isoper infrastaucture were to be put in place, would infrastaucture were to be put in place, would still be a devastating impact Roadwise in this village.	age.	
	still be a devastating impact Road with in	0	
5	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?	е	
	Comments a lastial like of Roun	stl.	
	The AIZ shows for more policy of and L	ondon	
	Ore fields seperating us from Uprinster and Linus be protected, but Dunton Garden Suburb in screening could protect Hest Horndon to maintain	tl	
	must be protected, but son to reach to maintain		
	the interior of the second		
	its village appeal.		Page 2 of

?	Q5: Should the A12 corridor accommodate growth by releasing sites on Yes \(\sqrt{N} \) No \(\sqrt{D} \)
	There is quite a quantity of Land along the A12.
?	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)?
	Brownfield sites only should be used thus protecting what is left of Englands fields.
?	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?
	Comments Jes. but heavy traffic such as lorries will still Rat-Run through villages, Exit straight on to a highway would be more appropriate
?	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?
	Comments More transport ie buses would help in actually getting there

?	Q9: Are there opportunities for more open space provision in the area where you live?	Yes, ☑ No □

Comments

The Pack could be improved on

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

	?	Q12: Have we considered the main infrastructure issues? Are there other Yes No important issues to consider?
		Comments Road, Rail schools doctors, are all needed for this very small village, and viles in place at commencement could result in an over populated and divided community.
	?	Q13: What do you think the priorities for infrastructure spending should be?
,		

Doctors surgences, community buildings for sports and functions, a new earl station, none bases, another school.

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)

