

1st October 2013

Comment 4 on the BRENTWOOD LOCAL PLAN 2015 – 2030
Preferred Options



The comments below should be read in conjunction with my Comments 2 and 3 since they are related to the problem of traffic congestion.

Policy CP13: Sustainable Transport

Paragraph 3.60 – The proposed Shenfield Park and Walk facility (Crossrail)

Such a large increase proposed in the number of dwellings is totally unacceptable without any improvement in the road network. It seems ridiculous for the council to say that the highway network is a county responsibility and ignore the problem in its plan. Such increases in dwelling numbers cannot be proposed in isolation from other very significant factors such as traffic congestion, especially when the plan itself recognizes in paragraph 1.26 that Brentwood has a very high level of car ownership compared to the national average.

As such, it is contrary to the council's own proposed policy CP13, in particular, the part which states the following:

The Council will support the development of Crossrail, maximising the potential for an overall improvement to Borough rail services, and mitigating any environmental or transport impacts as a consequence of the proposals through improving and encouraging sustainable transport, and other measures as required. In suitable locations, the Council will consider the scope for 'park and walk' schemes

It is naïve to suggest that the traffic to use the car park will arrive only via Chelmsford Road. Clearly, many cars will arrive via Alexander Lane, exacerbating the current levels of traffic congestion. In addition, the distance proposed for people to walk

from the car park to the station is obviously more than most people would find acceptable, especially if they are carrying a lot of luggage. After all, the rail link is with Heathrow Airport. Therefore, there will inevitably be a large number of car journeys made between the car park and the station, either to drop off passengers or luggage. There may be an increase in the use of taxis, which cannot be considered sustainable, especially when the taxis already cause much nuisance and numerous safety risks at the station.

Thus, the whole scheme needs much more careful consideration in conjunction with a redesign of the traffic system at the station itself.

This proposal is also contrary to the council's own **Policy CP17: Provision of Infrastructure and Community Facilities** which states that the Council will require all new development to meet on and off-site infrastructure requirements necessary to support development proposals and mitigate their impacts. These proposals are clearly not addressing the wider issue of general local traffic congestion.