

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| 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

Yes, for the purpose of breaking down the analysis into more manageable areas with common features the three broad areas chosen are sensible.



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

Yes No

Comments Yes but with reservations:

(i) For “North of the Borough” brownland that is also greenbelt should not be released. To release greenbelt land that has been allowed to become derelict land should not be allowed as this will encourage mis-use of land in the hope it will become building land. Moreover, the 2013 sustainability report shows that “North of the Borough” has water and sewerage shortages as well as a poor road infrastructure.



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

Comments

Yes. The use of greenfield sites 143, 185, 070, 224 and 188 in Doddinghurst are unacceptable as they require to, and open the door on, yet further development in the green belt. They also join up existing residential areas, creating urban sprawl in the village, and would change its character forever. Moreover the road access to sites 143, 224, 070 and 185 is too limited to enable significant development and would create significant additional vehicular traffic on existing minor roads to the detriment of existing residents. This applies both to the extreme volume of construction traffic accessing the site and the additional traffic subsequently. The infrastructure of the village in terms of schools, medical services, water supply and sewage would not cope with this level of development.

? 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

The Dunton Garden Suburb proposal makes sense as it can be designed from scratch to be a fully fledged community with all the amenities it requires to flourish without any significant adverse effects to the existing neighbourhood.

? Q5: Should the A12 corridor accommodate growth by releasing sites on the edge of urban areas? Yes No

Comments

Yes, within reason, the A12 corridor has a number of areas that could be developed so long as it is distributed development in low density quality housing and not over compressed "affordable homes" that are squashed into one area destined to be tomorrow's slum - Officer's Meadow is in danger of becoming such an area.

? 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 No

Comments

No, this is the worst possible option and guaranteed to destroy the character of the villages that surround Brentwood. Not only is the existing infrastructure, in many cases, unable to support this development it would encourage development of the sort at Thoby Priory where a "Builders Yard" became established and ran out of control. The development by "stealth" of Green Belt land is already bad enough without this arrangement adding fuel to a fire that is already burning steadily away at the Green Belt with "Stables", "Chicken" farms, "Mushroom" Farms and other similar permitted developments inevitable turning into applications for

residential homes as has happened in the past. The developmet on Green Belt should only be permitted where there is overwhelming benefit to the community eg a Doctors' Surgery.

?

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, site 101A on the M25/ A127 junction seems ideally suited to light industry/ retail use as goods access to transport is essential in keeping heavy lorries off minor roads which are already in a poor state of repair with patched tarmac and with potholes everywhere.

?

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

Yes, but for diverse and quality retail units. Specialist DIY/ electronics/ whitegood and builders retailers will want their industrial size retail units out of town. Brentwood Town centre needs much better shops if it is to justify the expensive car parking it currently offers. The town needs to distinguish between all day parking for people who work and part day car parking for people who want to shop. The shops will only thrive if people turn up to shop - and they won't if it's cheaper to drive 10 miles to Lakeside where parking is free!

?

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

Yes No

Comments

No, not really. The area is surrounded by farms and has a network of

formal footpaths so access to the countryside on foot is not currently an issue. Clearly, for a price, additional farmland can be procured.

However, more could be done to designate “quiet” lanes and cycleways as narrow country lanes with HGV traffic do not mix well with children on their bikes with Mum and Dad. It would be relatively easy to close many of the one track minor roads to HGV through traffic to make these routes safer for walkers and cyclists.

?

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 | ✓ | 5 |
| Outdoor Recreation / Leisure Use | 1 | 2 | 3 | ✓ | 5 |
| Wildlife Interest | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | ✓ |
| Historic Interest | 1 | 2 | ✓ | 4 | 5 |
| Tranquility | 1 | 2 | 3 | ✓ | 5 |
| Other – please specify: Aircraft of all shapes and sizes - noise pollution | 1 | ✓ | 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 | ✓ | 4 |
| Commercial / Industrial buildings | 1 | ✓ | 3 | 4 |
| Nature Reserves / Wildlife | 1 | ✓ | 3 | 4 |
| Farmland | 1 | 2 | ✓ | 4 |
| Woodland | 1 | 2 | ✓ | 4 |
| Degraded / Derelict / Waste land | ✓ | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Infrastructure (Road / Rail / Pylons etc.) | 1 | ✓ | 3 | 4 |
| Leisure / Recreation Facilities | 1 | 2 | ✓ | 4 |
| Other – please specify: Ponds and rivers | 1 | ✓ | 3 | 4 |
| | | | | |



Q12: Have we considered the main infrastructure issues? Are there other important issues to consider? (Two questions) Yes No

Comments

No you haven't discussed water supplies, broadband, or power / gas supplies and Yes there are other important issues such as water supply and sewerage.



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

Comments

In a social context, the priority for me is that you invest in promoting sports and recreational activities in the Borough which will go some way to meeting objectives on education, health and community needs. In a physical context the High Street needs to be rejuvenated by providing transport, parking at reasonable or no cost and attracting traders other than pubs and restaurants into the centre of town.

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)