

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



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

Yes No

It is not clear why the A127 corridor could be improved and developed easier than the A12 corridor could. Both roads have buildings close to them in places, and with regard to flooding, the area to the south of the A127 is the lowest laying part out of the "North", "A12 Corridor", and "A127 Corridors" being only a few feet above sea level overall which makes it the least desirable location to develop in.



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

Yes No

Comments

Sites 020 and 021 would be best suited to housing and office space given the proximity to the rail station, ignoring for the moment the fact that the rail line is currently at capacity.

They would not be suitable for a Gypsy and Traveller site because the travellers would have 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.

Sites 037A, 037B, 037C, 038A, 038B, and 126 are all Green Belt sites. The National Policy Framework specifies that the use of Green Belt sites for Gypsy and Traveller sites is "inappropriate development" for such land.

In addition to the above, any Gypsy and Travellers site 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 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 Gypsy and Travellers 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.

The above points illustrate why the above West Horndon sites are not suitable locations for a Gypsy and Travellers' site.



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

Developing sites 020 and 021 alone for 500 new homes would double the size of the West Horndon village as it is. Limiting development to just these sites would at least retain the outer boundaries of the village. Any more development than this would ruin the village community and environment.

Even with this limited development would require significant infrastructure expansion before going ahead as the existing infrastructure around West Horndon can barely cope with the existing number of residents.

The green borders need to be retained to ensure West Horndon remains a small village especially considering that attempts have been made to develop on land south of West Horndon in the past, land which is not controlled by Brentwood Council. Should such a plan be resurrected by Thurrock Council, West Horndon would otherwise be engulfed by large urban sprawl, something which the Green Belt was designed to protect against.



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

Yes No

Comments

At least this option would not change the type of area, being urban already.

? 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

Exceptional circumstances must exist to justify the loss of Green Belt land. The Government has recently clarified that housing demand is unlikely to constitute the exceptional circumstances to justify such loss. Brownfield site development could be advantageous for a community, especially derelict sites.

? 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

It depends on the nature of the employment. For a distribution warehouse I would say "Yes" because of the need for deliveries and collections. For a superstore I would probably say "Yes" again. For smaller shops the case is not so clear cut. For non-industrial employment premises I would say it is probably more important to allocate the sites near to the rail network.

? 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

Out of town retail development has been hugely successful because of ease of travel, ease of parking, free parking, parking in close proximity to the shops.
I never go to Brentwood Town Centre because none of the above are true.

The A128 is horrendous with its many junctions, mini-roundabouts, traffic lights, the amount of traffic, the constantly changing speed limits etc. On arrival, the only credible place to park is the one multi-storey car park.



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

Yes No

Comments

The surrounding Green Belt provides the desired open space.



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)	1	2	3	4

etc.)				
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
 The “Green Infrastructure” category should be divided into “Primary Green Infrastructure” and “Other Green Infrastructure”. Flooding and open spaces should be considered as “Primary”, other less important issues such as habitat, footpaths, bridleways, climate change mitigation, green roofs, whilst important, should belong in the “Other” group.

 In my opinion, outdoor sport, recreational and play opportunities belong in “Community facilities” and whilst nice to have, these cannot seriously be treated with the same importance as flooding and open spaces.

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

Comments
 Flood alleviation must take the highest priority and should be in a category for consideration on its own, not rolled into “Green Infrastructure” in general. I remember the serious floods in 1958, 1981 and 2012 when people's houses were flooded.
 It follows that green spaces including the Green Belt should be preserved as these are required as drainage areas to act as a soakaway for normal rainwater to prevent it cascading down into the West Horndon village.

 Next should come Healthcare. The West Horndon surgery is not even open for the full five weekdays. Phoning as soon as the surgery opens is not a guarantee of getting an appointment the same day.

 Next should come Transport infrastructure improvements. It is disgraceful that there is no regular public transport to Brentwood despite West Horndon being part of the Brentwood council area. Similarly, the A128 linking the village to Brentwood is clearly not designed to accommodate

today's volume of traffic.

It is far easier to get to Laindon, Basildon, Cranham, and Upminster, even though none of these are part of the Brentwood area.

As a result, I never ever travel to Brentwood Town Centre.

Next should be Education.

Lowest should be Community Facilities.

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)