

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

No, we don't agree with the development of green belt land, and what would be over-development of the land behind and around St Martins School. We disagree strongly with developing the proposed green belt land.

The land to the East of Hanging Hill Lane is land which many people, including ourselves, walk on. It is beautiful. It brings huge numbers of people in Brentwood and Hutton close to the countryside. It also has health benefits as it keeps the air fresh and free from too much pollution.

In addition, and very importantly, the roads into Brentwood and Shenfield (and Hanging Hill Lane itself) are already extremely busy. Many people use the roads on Hutton Mount and Spurgate / Woodway as a cut through, which is very problematic for those such as us who live on these roads, and this would be significantly exacerbated by the proposed development. The way the roads are currently used is already very dangerous with too many cars driving too fast on residential roads that children use to walk to school and commuters to walk and needs to be cut off, certainly not made worse.

New development should be in areas which are brownfield, and where brownfield cannot be used areas which do not over-burden the infrastructure already being used.



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

Yes  No

### Comments

Again focusing on the land to the East of Hanging Hill Lane. We do not think that the issues have been fully considered and appreciated, and consequently have not been adequately dealt with.

How can the current road system deal with people moving to the centres of Shenfield and Brentwood? The roads in the area are already excessively busy and the proposed development will significantly worsen this. How will the school system cope? How will the loss of the fields on the doorstep of so many be replaced (it can't)?

This is before the basic and fundamental point that this would be an unacceptable loss of green belt.

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

**Comments**

Yes, the land to the East of Hanging Hill Lane is inappropriate.

This is green belt land. It brings the countryside and walks to many residents of Hutton and Brentwood.

Its loss will be a huge loss to the current residents.

Its loss and replacement by houses will also be a huge detriment to the current residents. The infrastructure simply cannot take extra traffic – how will the increased number of cars get into Shenfield and Brentwood centres.

The cut through through Hutton Mount is dangerous and should be stopped. All other councils are looking at traffic calming and 20 mph limits.

? 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**

Clearly the A127 corridor. Surprised that the council is considering building more (and substantially more) in a residential centre as full and at capacity as Shenfield and Hutton, especially in a location where the new traffic will have to use routes already full.

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

**Comments**

Absolutely not. These areas are already stretched in terms of infrastructure.

“releasing” sites on the edge of urban areas already stretched poses and creates an unfair and unacceptable detriment to residents of the 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)?

**Comments**

Clearly brownfield.

? 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**

Absolutely, close to A127, M25, A12 – and not creating more traffic through residential areas

? 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**

The Town Centre (Brentwood) clearly needs to be developed, it should be far far better for the local area

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

**Comments**

We do not agree with your proposals to lose open space and open land.

? 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	X
Outdoor Recreation / Leisure Use	1	2	3	4	X
Wildlife Interest	1	2	3	4	X
Historic Interest	X	2	3	4	5
Tranquility	1	2	3	4	X
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	X	
Commercial / Industrial buildings	1	X	3	4
Nature Reserves / Wildlife	1	X	3	4
Farmland	1	2	X	4
Woodland	1	2	X	4
Degraded / Derelict / Waste land	1	X	3	4
Infrastructure (Road / Rail / Pylons etc.)	1	2	X	4
Leisure / Recreation Facilities	X	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**

By proposing the land to the East of Hanging Hill Lane we are concerned that you have not. There are already infrastructure issues in this area that need to be dealt with – rather than proposing even more houses in that area.



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

**Comments**

Traffic calming, 20 mph limits in residential areas.

**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)