

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

Splitting the borough in to the three areas of “North”, “A12 Corridor” and “A127 Corridor” appears to make sense given the different characteristics of these areas



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

Yes

No

### Comments

- These areas are the same as the previous consultation (now considered illegal) and the responses received in that consultation should be addressed along with this consultation to show fairness and transparency to this consultation process.
- Road and rail infrastructure in the A127 Corridor is already at (and during the rush hour well over) capacity
- It is not clear why the A127 Corridor has greater potential for improvements than the A12. The A127 is tightly bounded by Southend (where it is in essence, a local road) and the London area where traffic is extremely heavy.
- There are also many areas where houses run all the way to the edge of the A127. As such, widening of the A127 is not necessarily easy. The A12 could potentially be expanded in a number of areas without material impact to the surrounding residential properties.
- The consultation document also implies that the A127 has greater development potential due to it having a “different landscape character”. Whilst it does indeed have a different landscape character to say, the North of the Borough, the local residents’ value of the open space and farmland should not be considered any lower than residents of the North of the Borough. The open, fenland landscape is valued extremely highly by local residents, and contributes to an open rural feel to this area and local settlements.
- The A12 slip road from the M25 has gone through major improvements in the past three years. It contains three lanes in many areas. A127 is 2 lane.
- Developments in the North area could be done using green technology to address sewage, water and power requirements. There does not appear to be much investigation in alternative technologies.
- Flood risk is not addressed for any of the sites. It is clearly a major problem in the A127 Corridor and needs to be fully assessed before any development decision can be made.



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

### Comments

- 020 and 021 (Industrial Estates in West Horndon) are already in the 5 year land supply, and are brownfield sites that could be developed in a positive manner for West Horndon village, although probably at a lower density than the 500 indicated in the 5 year land supply.

It should be noted however that development of these sites alone could increase the residential size of West Horndon village by c. **90%** and as such, sufficient planning and infrastructure will need to ensure that the impact to existing residents is managed appropriately.

The present infrastructure (including roads, school and healthcare provision, public transport and superfast broadband) would be extremely inadequate in light of such expansion of the village.

- 037A, B and C, 038A and B, and 126, are all Green Belt sites surrounding West Horndon village. Development of these sites would change the existing West Horndon village beyond all recognition, and put a very significant strain on local residents and infrastructure. West Horndon Parish Council believe that the very significant development this would represent within the Green Belt would be inappropriate development and represent significant harm to the local environment, harm which would not be outweighed by the need for housing within the Borough.

The consultation document makes no reference to the major flood problems that would occur if development took place on any of these sites.

- Site 200 (Dunton Garden Suburb) would be strongly preferred to 037, 038 and 126 as a means to provide the required level of housing within the Borough, whilst managing this growth in a sustainable manner. However, given the level of infrastructure that would be required, again this would need to be managed in a sustainable and appropriate manner to safeguard the existing West Horndon community, and create a self sufficient community within the Garden Suburb. It would also be necessary to ensure a sufficient buffer of land is maintained going forwards, between the Garden Suburb and the land surrounding West Horndon village. WHPC suggest that this could be achieved through creating a woodland area reaching from the west of the Garden Suburb, up to Thorndon Country Park.



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

- In line with my response to Question 2, I question the statement that the A127 corridor has greater capacity than the A12 corridor.
- In line with my response above, site 200 (Dunton Garden Suburb) is preferred to all other sites in the A127 Corridor as development on this site will create the least harm.
- I believe that, if undertaken in a sensitive manner, site 200 has the potential to provide Brentwood Borough Council with the required level of residential development, whilst creating a self-sufficient, sustainable development with access to a levels of infrastructure funding that would offer the best chance for a positive outcome for existing and new residents of the A127 Corridor.
- Developing site 200 would also enable potential residential development in and around West Horndon village to be limited to the existing industrial estates, which, taking the Strategic Housing Allocation numbers faced by Brentwood in to account, is my preferred strategy
- Whilst such development would still significantly alter the nature of West Horndon village, if undertaken appropriately, the **village** could retain its current “small community” feel, with surrounding farmland, open spaces and nature preserved.
- Whilst site 200 is my preferred option (versus the alternative of potentially extensive development in and around West Horndon village), an appropriate buffer zone needs to be incorporated on the western edge of the development up to the A128 to prevent future urban creep, and minimise the impact of development on existing residents.
- Development of the land immediately adjacent to the village would destroy the current village environment.
- Brentwood Borough Council must use the duty to cooperate to negotiate with other authorities to prevent development taking place in Thurrock to the south of West Horndon.  
Such development would also cause harm similar to that identified for sites 037, 038 and 126.
- The consultation document fails to identify the flood risk issues, including where it exists and how it will be managed. Given the recent history of frequent flooding in the West Horndon area it is essential this is addressed. Sites 037A, B and C, 038A and B, and 126 all act as buffer stores and prone to becoming water logged following heavy rain. Any development in these areas would be contrary to paragraph 100 of the National Planning Policy Framework.



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

Yes

No

## Comments

Given the level of projected housing need within the Borough, sustainable

development requires Brentwood Borough Council to consider all available and suitable sites across the rest of the Borough. The A12 Corridor has the ability to meet a significant portion of the Borough's increased housing needs, and suitable sites should be included in any spatial strategy.



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

- Where there are available, suitable sites, brownfield should always be considered above greenfield sites. There may be instances where the release of small amounts of Green Belt land around villages provides opportunities for these villages to grow in a sustainable manner. However, this should only be considered once brownfield options have been exhausted, and where the development would create a positive and balanced impact on the community.

Releasing all of the Green Belt land around West Horndon village for example would not create a positive or balanced impact on to the existing community.

- There may be some isolated instances where **limited** development in the Green Belt provides benefits which exceed the harm they cause. For example in West Horndon the current access to the park is limited. A small amount of development which improves the access is an example of such a possible development.



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

With the industrial estates at West Horndon expected to be developed for primarily residential development, it is key that replacement employment opportunities are provided within the local area (A127 Corridor). These must however be accessible via **regular and reliable** public transport as well as via road



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

- Whilst local shops need to be provided at the village level, primary “destination” shopping locations should be focused within existing town centres.
- Town Centre First retail development must also be accompanied (or preferably, preceded by) appropriate infrastructure improvements including regular and reliable public transport to all areas including the more rural ones, car parking facilities, and improvements to the road network to prevent unmanageable congestion.

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

**Comments**

West Horndon village currently benefits from a small community park on Cadogan Avenue. As part of any potential future development within the village (and indeed, the Dunton Garden Suburb), there are significant opportunities to enhance this park, both from a facilities and access perspective.

? 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	<b>4</b>	5
Outdoor Recreation / Leisure Use	1	2	<b>3</b>	4	5
Wildlife Interest	1	2	3	4	<b>5</b>
Historic Interest	1	2	3	<b>4</b>	5
Tranquility	1	2	3	4	<b>5</b>
Other – please specify:	1	2	3	4	<b>5</b>
Community Spirit					

? 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

- Development must not increase the challenges to the borough's infrastructure (i.e. it must be small enough not to create a significant demand on current infrastructure, or big enough to generate money to create/improve infrastructure to meet the new need).
- Whilst transport is considered, the focus appears to be on Crossrail and links to Brentwood Town Centre. Although important, given the scale of potential development within the A127 Corridor, a completely fresh transport strategy needs to be developed for this area. This will need to consider both the impact of Brentwood and Basildon's development along the Shoeburyness to Fenchurch Street rail line, and other local councils looking to develop along this line as well (significant knock-on impact that may not be considered by looking at just Brentwood and Basildon's plans alone). It also needs to consider how residents of the Garden Suburb (if developed) travel to West Horndon, Laindon and Basildon, and how West Horndon village residents travel to the Garden Suburb, Brentwood and Basildon town centres. The transport strategy will also need to incorporate regular public transport to local employment locations given the potential redevelopment of the West Horndon industrial estates.
- From a road perspective, the consultation document focuses heavily on the A12 and A127. However the A128 links these two roads, and importantly links the south of the Borough to Brentwood Town Centre (including related infrastructure (importantly, secondary schools). Any development within the A127 or A12 corridors will need to consider how to alleviate what will become intolerable strain on this specific road.
- In addition to transport; education, healthcare, community facilities and green

infrastructure are all identified as significant infrastructure considerations. The detail on these within the consultation document is limited and significantly more detail will be necessary to ensure future development is carried out sustainably.

- Timing of infrastructure needs to have a stronger focus than currently seen in the consultation. Given the scale of potential development within the A127 Corridor, supporting infrastructure needs to be in place first, to prevent a significant and materially negative impact on existing residents. This will also ensure that any new development is undertaken in a sustainable manner.
- Consideration of the additional Thames Gateway crossing needs to be factored into any future plans.
- Consideration of future airport expansion needs to be factored into any future plans.
- Consideration of the Paramount Studios Leisure Park in Kent needs to be factored into future plans
- Increase in use of the Dartford Crossing very quickly affects the M25/A13/A12/A127 roads.



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

#### **Comments**

Given the scale of development proposed within the A127 Corridor, whilst there will be priorities, the development will require infrastructure spending across all categories (education, healthcare, transport, green space, community facilities, superfast broadband, etc.). Failure to provide any one element of this infrastructure will have a materially negative impact on both existing residents, and the new development. As such, whilst there may be priorities in areas where development is expected to be lower/less significant, in areas expected to see high levels of development, a holistic infrastructure plan needs to be delivered to ensure the development is undertaken in a sustainable manner.

**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)